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Abstract

Critical Indigenous scholars and their explicit allies have emphasized the need for curriculum and pedagogy in teacher education to address settler colonialism in Canada (Cannon, forthcoming(a); Cannon and Sunseri, 2011; Dion, 2009; Friedel, 2010a; Haig-Brown, 2009; Schick, 2010; Schick and St. Denis 2003, 2005; & St. Denis, 2007). This thesis is primarily concerned with the existence of and possibilities for such a curriculum. In this thesis, I analyzed the curricula used in the three required courses of the secondary consecutive Initial Teacher Education (ITE) program in the 2011-2012 year at OISE for representations of settler colonialism in Canada. This study finds that while the curriculum in the ITE program at OISE focuses broadly on social justice, it shies away from addressing the ways that Canadians are complicit in ongoing colonialism. The thesis ends by highlighting some clear possibilities and challenges for a curriculum of settler colonial responsibility.
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CHAPTER ONE
Introduction:
Moving Beyond Indigenous Cultural Inclusion Towards Decolonization

Rationale
In 2007, the Ontario Ministry of Education (OME) introduced a policy framework on First Nation, Métis, and Inuit education. The goal of the policy was to close the gap in the areas of literacy and numeracy, retention of students in school, graduation rates, and advancement to postsecondary studies by 2016 (OME, 2007). Through it, the OME calls on governments, educational institutions (including faculties of education) and First Nation, Métis, and Inuit families, communities and organizations to work together to implement the policy recommendations, which range from changing the curriculum, to providing programming for Indigenous students, to drawing greater connections between the school and Indigenous families and communities (ibid.). The policy focuses on inclusion of Indigenous history, culture, and knowledges into the Ontario school system and, by extension, the Canadian nation state. My thesis is primarily concerned with going beyond such policies and practices of inclusion of information about the indigenous ‘other’1, to focusing on the power structures undergirding the need for such policies of inclusion in the first place.

The 2007 OME policy comes in a historical line of efforts for education policy initiatives directed at remedying the past mistakes of the education system for Indigenous students (Dion, 2009, p. 69). The focus of this policy and many current “Aboriginal education”2 practices is largely on Indigenous history, culture, and helping Indigenous students to reclaim their Indigenous identities (Dion, 2009; Friedel, 2010; St. Denis, 2007, 2011a). The OME policy statement, for example, includes a focus on developing strategies to, “increase the capacity of the education system to respond to the learning and cultural needs of First Nation, Métis, and Inuit students,” and “provide quality programs . . . that

---

1 I use the term indigenous ‘other’ throughout this thesis to signify the binary of identities – Settler/Indigenous that has been constructed. Indigenous peoples are constructed as ‘other’ to maintain a white settler norm. I discuss this construction in detail in chapter two.

2 The term “Aboriginal Education” is commonly used to describe education efforts to include Indigenous content in Canadian educational institutions.
support improved academic achievement and *identity building*” (OME, 2007, p. 7, emphasis added).

This policy is seen by many Indigenous scholars and other educators as a step in the right direction and indeed has set in motion important education initiatives. Of particular importance, perhaps, is the slight shift it makes from previous efforts of education for Indigenous students to the inclusion of content for all students about Indigenous peoples. The policy states that all those involved in the education system will develop strategies for providing, “a curriculum that facilitates learning about contemporary and traditional First Nations, Métis, and Inuit cultures, histories, and perspectives among all students, and that also contributes to the education of school board staff, teachers, and elected trustees” (OME, 2007, p. 7). One result of this policy was an “Urban Aboriginal pilot project” in the Toronto District School Board, which aimed to make education worthy of Indigenous children and ancestors (Dion, Johnston, & Rice, 2010). The policy may have also contributed to an increase in Indigenous content in faculties of education in Ontario, where, according to some teacher-educators, increases have taken place in the last 5 or 10 years.³ For instance, in September 2011, at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) where I am completing my Master’s degree, the dean appointed a special advisor on Aboriginal Education. Also, a relatively new program called, the *Deepening Knowledge Project*, had begun to address the need for more Indigenous content in the Initial Teacher Education program at OISE.

Although this focus on Indigenous content inclusion may be a step in the right direction, critical Indigenous scholars and their explicit allies argue that we must not stop there (Cannon, forthcoming(a); Dion, 2009; Friedel, 2010; St. Denis, 2007 & 2011). Friedel (2010) and St. Denis (2007) both explicitly argue that a focus on culture does not address the structural inequalities that Indigenous students face and note that although education systems shifted their focus to include Indigenous culture in the 1970’s, structural inequalities and educational disparities still persist and have not decreased. They argue for a focus on the system of racism in Canada and specifically the racialization processes impacting Indigenous

---

³ This information comes from a Métis Education Study on the nature and extent of Aboriginal and specifically Métis content in Faculties of Education in Ontario teacher education programs. I worked as a research assistant and conducted some interviews with instructors in faculties of education and alumni of teacher education programs. In this thesis I will broadly refer to some of the information I gleaned from this work. The study has not yet been released to the public.
peoples and the construction of white/settler dominance. While they argue for the implementation of anti-racism education primarily for Indigenous students, Cannon (forthcoming(a)) contends that what is needed also is for non-Indigenous students, and particularly teacher candidates, to understand how they have benefited from and maintain the injustices of colonization:

. . . so long as we remain focused on racism and colonialism as an exclusively Indigenous struggle, we do very little in the way of having non-Indigenous peoples think about what it might mean to be an “ally” of Indigenous sovereignty and education . . . think about matters of restitution, their own decolonization, and what it might mean to transform their complicity in ongoing dispossession (draft p. 2).

In this thesis, I add to the arguments of critical Indigenous scholars and their explicit allies to emphasize that what is also needed is a curriculum focused on settler complicity and responsibility. Coming to an understanding of complicity and responsibility within systems of privilege and oppression is a complex process and many scholars have highlighted varied pedagogical routes and bumps along the path towards this understanding. Freire’s (Pedagogy of the Oppressed, 1970) seminal work in socio-political consciousness-raising of the oppressed provides a base for pedagogy of critical thinking. However, this thesis shifts from pedagogy for the oppressed to focus on pedagogy for privileged learners. Such pedagogy necessarily includes the development of socio-political consciousness, critical self-reflection, and self-reflexivity through which senses of self and privileged identities are questioned and disrupted (Kumashiro, 2002).

By critical Indigenous scholars and their explicit allies, I mean those scholars who trouble and critique the academy and North American social, economic, and political institutions and discourses for their Euro-centric colonial dominance, while attempting to operate within the academy, an institution that privileges Euro-centric knowledge production. In their research and writing they take on themes of decolonization and anti-colonialism and seek to disrupt the normative of Euro-centrism and settler dominance. One of the ways settler colonialism functions in North America is to minimize the voices of Indigenous peoples. In a decolonizing project such as this it is important to subvert that norm and listen carefully to Indigenous scholars about what is needed for their own communities. More specifically, it is important to listen to the voices of those scholars who are working towards decolonization, as it is these voices that the system of colonialism tries to silence the most.
Curricula aimed at settler complicity and responsibility is necessary throughout the education system in Canada (and the U.S.), however, it is of utmost importance in teacher education programs where teachers learn how to educate others. Historically, schools have been a primary space to pass on the values of the nation state, which maintain hegemony and reproduce social inequalities (Kumashiro, 2000; Schick, 2000). Schools have the potential to also become spaces where dominant discourses are resisted or disrupted (van Dijk, 2002).

Teacher candidates should be aware of their positionality in relationship to colonialism. This knowledge is important no matter who their students will be or where they will be teaching. Non-Indigenous teachers in urban, suburban, or rural areas are equally implicated in colonization and thus should be aware of these implications. We need our teachers to counter hegemonic discourses and norms so that students can learn ways of being in society that can help dismantle systems of privilege and oppression. Teachers, when they accept the opportunity to understand their own positionality as it relates to colonialism, will hopefully make choices to infuse such an understanding into their curriculum and practices. Through such an infusion, students will also be able to come to this understanding and act in solidarity towards decolonization.

Although some critical Indigenous scholars and allies have implemented curricula and pedagogies which address settler complicity in their own teacher education courses, the question remains as to if such curricula exist and/or how settler colonialism is represented more broadly in teacher education programs. Are teacher education programs providing teacher candidates opportunities to critically engage with and reflect on their own positionality in a system of colonialism? Are non-Indigenous teacher candidates given the tools to think about their own complicity and responsibility in a settler colonial system?

In this study I analyzed the curricula used in the three required courses for the secondary Initial Teacher Education (ITE) program in the 2011-2012 year at OISE. Although other teacher education programs in Ontario may provide different curricular resources to their students and implement curricula about colonialism quite differently, this study gives rise to particular questions about the extent to which settler colonialism is represented in teacher education programs in the province and elsewhere. It also speaks to the learning expectations for a large number of teacher candidates in Ontario regarding their complicity and responsibility in colonialism. I employ the method of critical discourse
analysis to highlight the ways that dominant discourse is reified or disrupted and aim to illuminate spaces for de-centring dominant discourse around settler colonialism in teacher education curricula. As teacher education programs in Ontario become longer – moving from one to two years in length beginning in 2014 (Rushowy, 2012) - now is an important time to take a careful look at these learning expectations so as to contribute to the changes that take place when teacher education programs expand.

**Defining Racism and Settler Colonialism**

Two main concepts in this study are that of racism and settler colonialism. I want to start this project with defining what I mean by these two concepts and how they relate to each other. In Omi and Winant’s (1993) influential essay, *On the Theoretical Concept of Race*, they define race as more than an ideological construct and not an objective, unchanging condition, but socially constructed through historical context and present experience. Race is a construct that is in constant process; it is performative and situated historically across time, in contemporary political relationships of power, and in a global context (ibid., p. 7). Racism refers to the creation and use of the race construct to privilege whites at the expense of people of colour. It is systemic and pervasive and can be seen in individual actions as well as institutional policies and practices. Everyone in North America exits within a structure of systemic racism – we cannot escape it or the other interlocking oppressions which together maintain power and privilege for white, middle and upper class, able-bodied, heterosexual, cis-gendered males (Razack, 1998).

Colonialism refers to the “conquest and control of other people’s land and goods” (Loomba, 1998, p. 2). In modern colonialism, as conducted by western European nations, the European colonizers restructured colonized economies into capitalist systems (ibid., p. 3) and by the 1930’s Europe’s land and resource grabs had touched 84.6 percent of the land surface of the globe (ibid. p. xiii). Many people in North America commonly know of the British colonization of India, where British rule ended in 1947, and the European colonization of the continent of Africa, the majority of which was decolonized during the mid-20th century. In this thesis I am speaking specifically of settler colonialism and its enduring presence in North America and therefore it is important to distinguish between colonialism and settler colonialism.
The difference between colonialism and settler colonialism

In recent years, scholars have begun to study (again) the separate phenomena of settler colonialism, “where outsiders come to stay and establish territorialized sovereign political orders” (Veracini, 2007, para. 2). Whereas colonialism is marked by its conquest for material and labour resources, settler colonialism is distinguishable by its claim to land (Wolfe, 2006, p. 388). Colonialism and settler colonialism often overlap and operate together, but whereas colonialism can end when the colonial empire is forced out or leaves, as was the case with India and much of Africa, the ending of settler colonialism is marked by the evacuation of settlers from the colonized territory and this has rarely taken place (Cavanagh & Veracini, 2010). Settlers come to stay and attempt to destroy the existing society to replace it with a new colonial society (Wolfe, 2006, p. 388). A distinction of importance here is that while colonialism has lasting impacts wherever it touches, settler colonialism is active in both the past and the present (Cavanagh and Veracini, 2010).

The relationship of racism and settler colonialism

Conversations between Indigenous anti-colonial scholars/activists and anti-racist scholars/activists about the ways that racism and settler colonialism intersect have been limited (Smith, 2010, p. 1). This may be a result of the fact that anti-racist scholarship and activism has primarily included Indigenous peoples as racialized groups, without accounting for the differences in racialization processes and also often excluding Indigenous claims to sovereignty (Smith, 2010; see also Lawrence and Dua, 2005). On the other hand, Indigenous and anti-colonial scholars and activists sometimes disregard anti-racist analyzes because of the fact that anti-racist frameworks have considered colonization and genocide a thing of the past and have assumed the settler state to be a given – essentially denying Indigenous nationhood (Lawrence and Dua, 2005, p. 123; Smith, 2010). Cannon and Sunseri’s edited collection, *Racism, Colonialism and Indigeneity in Canada*, is one recent example of scholarly literature that brings racism and colonialism into conversation (2011).

Although the interconnection of colonialism and racism is not altogether prominent in scholarly literature, much scholarship does exist on racism as it relates to Indigenous peoples in North America (Cannon & Sunseri, 2011). I will touch more specifically on the racialization of Indigenous peoples in Canada in the next chapter, but here I want to point out that the moment of “contact” between Indigenous peoples and Europeans in history is often
conceived of as Indigenous peoples’ first contact with racism as well (Kirby, 1998; Mohanram, 1999; Razack, 2002b). Critical Indigenous scholars, Cannon and Sunseri (2011) state,

On the one hand, we agree with scholars who insist that we refuse at every turn the invitation to citizenship (Henderson, this anthology) and who reject the fashioning of sovereignty grievances under racial minority statuses (Porter, 1999). At the same time, we cannot help but be concerned by race and racialization, largely because it is so fundamentally tied to colonialism in the first instance (p. 265).

Systems of racism and colonialism are intricately tied together. White Europeans brought racist conceptions with them to North America, maintaining that Indigenous peoples and their ways of life were inferior to European ways of life. This ideological racialization and the institutionalized racialization processes that followed justified colonization – if Indigenous peoples were inferior than they could not or did not deserve to maintain claims on the land and its resources. These racialization processes were and are an attempt at ethnically cleansing the land of Indigenous peoples.

Much anti-racist scholarship assumes this genocide to be complete or complete enough, such that claims for sovereignty and self-determination are no longer feasible (Lawrence & Dua, 2005; Smith, 2010). Thus, the dominant framework within which Indigenous peoples exist in anti-racism scholarship and activism is as one of the people of colour groups impacted by white supremacy (Smith, 2006 & 2010).

Andrea Smith (2006 & 2010) offers an alternative framework to conceptualize the relationship between racism and colonialism, which does not consider genocide complete, recognizes differences in racialization processes, and enables an understanding of how people of colour can also be complicit in white supremacy while at the same time being victims of it. She refers to this framework as the “three pillars of white supremacy” and describes the pillars as separate but interrelated logics through which white supremacy/racism is organized (Smith, 2006, p. 67). Smith has developed this framework specifically in the context of the United States, but I contend that, with the possibility of modifications, it is a useful framework for the Canadian context as well.

The three pillars of white supremacy are “slavery/capitalism, genocide/colonialism, and orientalism/war” (Smith, 2006). Slavery/capitalism is the logic through which blackness is equated with slave labour or property and within this pillar black people remain at the
bottom of a racial hierarchy. The pillar of “genocide/colonialism” maintains that Indigenous peoples must be constantly disappearing in order for non-Indigenous people to maintain a “rightful claim over this land” (ibid., p. 68). The third pillar called “orientalism/war” marks certain nations and people as inferior to the West and as a permanent threat to western civilization.

Of note in this framework is the way it highlights the different racialization processes that maintain white supremacy. Smith points out that the “survival strategies and resistance to white supremacy are set by the system of white supremacy itself” (2010, p. 3). For Indigenous people, the logic of genocide has meant racialization processes that are constantly trying to eliminate them from the land through killing, forced transfer, assimilation, or inclusion into whiteness and/or the Canadian or U.S. nation state. This means that although some Indigenous people benefit in some ways from having whiter skin in a racial hierarchy, their proximity to whiteness is a strategy of elimination, which enables the continued colonization of the land. Differently, black people in the U.S. were legally racialized through the one-drop rule, where one drop of African blood meant that they were racialized as black. Hence, while the strategy of white supremacy is to include Indigenous people into whiteness, the strategy of white supremacy in relation to black people is to maintain their distance from whiteness so as to be used for their labour.

Understanding the various logics of white supremacy and how groups are differently racialized through these logics also allows for an understanding of how people of colour participate in white supremacy which impacts other racialized groups. For example, when people of colour join the Canadian or U.S. military, they are contributing to the imperial conquests that are upholding a white supremacist and orientalist global system. I do not mention this in a spirit of blame, but rather with the understanding that other aspects of interlocking systems of oppression also contribute to such choices. However, an important point here is that in order to dismantle white supremacy, all of these logics must be fought against (Smith, 2006 & 2010). Sunera Thobani reflects a similar sentiment in *Exalted Subjects* when she writes,

> Transcending the racialization that shapes the national-formation and immigrants’ exclusions requires a fundamental challenge to the colonial dominations of Aboriginal peoples. This racial domination lies at the very heart of Canadian
nationhood, at the core of its identity and its social, juridical, and moral order (2007, p. 18)

Racism or white supremacy cannot be fully dismantled without dismantling settler colonialism as well (Smith, 2006 & 2010). Since racism is often theorized as existing within the democratic nation state, white supremacy is fought against within this framework without questioning the legitimacy of the nation state itself. Fighting for equal rights for all within the model of a democratic nation state is one way to build a movement, but it should not be done without an explicit focus to decolonize North America as the end goal. If such organizing is to take place within the model of the democratic, settler, nation state, organizers should be explicit that the end goal is decolonization (Smith, 2010, p. 11, citing Michelle Alexander).

**What Does Justice Look Like? What Are We Aiming For?**

What does decolonization look like and what role should non-Indigenous peoples play in it? Becoming allies in a social justice struggle requires the ability to listen and take direction from those whose struggle it is. Cannon and Sunseri (2011) quote an Indigenous anti-colonial activist (first quoted in Amadhy’s 2008 *Listen, Take Direction, and Stick Around*):

> At the reclamation site, some settler activists came and wanted to fight the police. They yelled, threw things, and egged the other side on, getting our people all worked up. We have to live there. Remember, no white people were arrested in that raid but 50 of our people have been charged. If they want to help, they have to listen, take direction, and stick around (p. 271).

Maya Angelou, in her poem *On Working White Liberals*, expresses a similar sentiment:

> . . . I’m afraid they’ll have to prove first  
> That they’ll watch the black man move first  
> Then follow him with faith to kingdom come.  
> This rocky road is not paved for us,  
> So, I’ll believe in Liberals’ aid for us  
> When I see a white man load a Black man’s gun (1994, p. 47).

The message is stark. The point is to understand that being an ally does not mean making decisions of how to fight, or defining the end goal of the fight, but instead being with, listening, supporting, and struggling together at the invitation and direction of those who are facing, and struggling against oppression.
I cannot define what justice will look like for Indigenous peoples. That is not my role. Instead, the role of non-Indigenous peoples in this is to understand our complicity and responsibility in colonization so that we may act in solidarity with Indigenous peoples. By complicity I mean the part we play in maintaining unjust systems of colonialism and racism. This “part” is about privileges or benefits, identities of superiority, and actions to maintain these privileges and superiority. Complicity is more than a surface-level understanding; it is a deeply internalized “shift in consciousness” (Thielen-Wilson, 2012, p. 312). I will engage more with the concepts of complicity and responsibility in chapter two. Here, I want to point out that coming to an understanding of our complicity is not the only necessary element of taking action against colonization, but it is one necessary component (see also Applebaum, 2010, regarding white complicity). The importance of a curriculum aimed at settler complicity goes beyond the arena of the classroom, extending into Canadian society, where non-Indigenous peoples could potentially become allies in Indigenous struggles. The importance of allyships is strategic (the more people, the more power to shift oppressive structures), interpersonal (for building relationships across difference), and personal (colonizers also need to decolonize their minds).

Many Indigenous peoples are asserting that justice means sovereignty, self-determination, and reparations for their nations. Indigenous sovereignty does not mean the creation of Indigenous nation states in the western model of the nation state, since it is the west, not indigenous nations, that value territory, boundaries and the nation state (Sunseri, 2011, p. 156, citing Alfred, 1995 and Monture-Angus, 1995). Rather, Indigenous self-determination means living by a unique set of values that is determined by Indigenous nations themselves rather than the imposition of certain forms of governance by the Canadian nation state (ibid.). Indigenous sovereignty could take many forms, such as autonomous and independent federal states (ibid.) or a shared sovereignty model, as is exemplified in original nation-to-nation treaty agreements (Cannon & Sunseri, 2011). The point is that Indigenous peoples would decide for themselves what these forms of governance would look like (Sunseri, 2011).
Clarification of Terms

One strategy of colonialism and racism is to maintain power and control through the legalized imposition of names (Cannon & Sunseri, 2011). This means that the labels I use in this thesis can contribute to upholding or dismantling these systems of oppression. In clarifying the following terms, I aim to unmask the power held by colonialism/racism in the ‘naming’ process.

One of the markers of oppressive social systems is that they impose identities on groups of people. Although it is important to look beyond these imposed identities, it is from those imposed identities that we can collectively fight against the system. For example, patriarchy imposes on me the name and identity of ‘woman’, while I see my gender identity as fluid and not an either/or (either woman or man). I know that binary constructions of gender are false and therefore recognize that one goal is to move beyond these gender binaries. However, the power to move beyond does not lie in my hands alone and in order to move beyond, I must fight against the system of patriarchy with others through the imposed name and identity of woman.

Similarly, I recognize that colonially imposed terms can be re-appropriated and used by those who have been directly impacted by colonialism/racism as a way of resisting these systems. It is with this understanding that I clarify the following terms:

• Indigenous – For the purposes of this thesis I prefer to use the term *Indigenous* to signify those diverse groups of people who were first on the land that is now known as North America and their descendants, including both those who are recognized by the Canadian or U.S. states as Indigenous and those who are not (status and non-status). Although the term Indigenous lumps together a large number of people with distinctly different ways of life, it provides a way to speak about the common impacts of colonialism and racism. To signify the vast diversity between and among Indigenous nations, I have chosen to use the plural “peoples”.

• Indian – Indian is a term imposed by North American colonial structures, which lumped together distinct and varied Indigenous nations and cultures in a process of distinguishing them from European settlers and making them into an inferior ‘other’ (Cannon and Sunseri, 2011, pp. xvi-xvii). As Cannon and Sunseri (2011) state, “Indigenous peoples became Indians under a legal classification that did not distinguish between their
linguistic and cultural differences, or the multiplicity of Indigenous nations at the time” (ibid. p. xvi).

• Aboriginal – Aboriginal is probably the most commonly used term to refer to Indigenous peoples in Canada today and refers to First Nations, Métis, and Inuit peoples. It is also a colonially imposed term, which reduces vast differences between Indigenous peoples to three distinct groups and then lumps them all together as one. I use this term when citing or quoting scholars who use it in their work and to refer to what is commonly known as “Aboriginal Education” as I have done, earlier in this chapter.

• Native American – Native American is the name commonly used for Indigenous peoples living in what is now known as the United States. It is also colonially imposed and ignores differences in various Indigenous nations. This term specifically erases claims of sovereignty by imposing the name of the U.S. nation state on Indigenous peoples. The term Native American contributes towards muting separate claims to land.

Who am I? Why am I Doing This? Who am I Doing This For?

The interconnectedness of the researcher to their research is a fact that should never be forgotten. No one can separate themselves from their work, as Euro-centric systems of knowledge production would like people to believe. In fact, Indigenous scholar Kathleen Absolon (Minogiizhigokwe) (2011) asserts that the researcher is as much a part of the research as the research itself. In her recent book about Indigenous research methodologies, she asserts that it is important for scholars to ask themselves ‘who am I?’, ‘why am I doing this?’ and ‘who am I doing this for?’ throughout their work (ibid.). Although Absolon (Minogiizhigokwe) writes for an audience of Indigenous scholars, I find in her words an important lesson for all researchers. We must be self-reflective and share those reflections about our intricate ties to the work that we do. Absolon states, “...we, as learners and searchers, accept responsibility for our intentions, understandings and knowledge by writing self into our research” (2011, p. 68). My personal story is an integral part of this project. Although I cannot claim to know all of the pieces of who I am and why I am doing this work, because understanding myself and my identity related to systems of oppression is an ongoing process, I aim to describe here some of what I know. My research comes from who I am, what I believe, and my hopes and responsibility for a better future for generations to come.
Who am I? I am a white woman of German and English heritage and I grew up in a small working-class town in Iowa, in the U.S. Like many white people in the U.S., I know very little about my own family history. The farthest back I have traced my family history is to one of my great grandmothers on my mother’s side who was the first of her family to be born in Iowa. Her parents had emigrated from Germany sometime prior to her birth in 1898. My surface-level search (through conversations with parents and grandparents) has left me with the impression that my entire family has been in North America for over a century.

I do not know why my family left Europe. I do not know why they came to the middle of North America. I do not know if or how they actively participated in the dispossession of Indigenous peoples from their lands. It is not uncommon for many white people in the U.S. not to know these details. In fact, the white supremacist melting pot project⁴ makes it difficult for white people in the U.S. to hold onto any cultural differences or understandings of their family histories related to settlement. In exchange for erasure of cultural difference, my family received social, economic, and cultural benefits at the expense of those people who are Indigenous to Turtle Island⁵ and other people of colour.

Although I do not know the specifics of my family history and their interactions with the white colonial settler project, I have learned that these specifics do not matter as much as the recognition of the fact I have benefitted from and continue to benefit from settlement. What matters is that I recognize that I am a white settler and an inheritor of stolen land and resources and that my white settler identity continues to provide me social, cultural, and economic benefits. I now recognize that my relationship to Indigenous peoples is one that exists within power structures of inequality and know that my responsibility in that relationship is to stand with Indigenous peoples in their fight for equality and justice.

Why am I doing this? Several experiences in my life have led me to the point where I am pursuing this particular research and writing project. These experiences have impacted my decision to work for the development of a pedagogy of settler responsibility specifically in the space of teacher education programs.

---

⁴ I am referring to the process through which people were (or are) expected to give up their various cultural identities, including languages, and assimilate in order to become “American”. The melting-pot idea is often referenced without a racial analysis, assuming that all people were invited to assimilate for the same benefits. In reality, however, only white people could receive all the benefits of citizenship.

⁵ Turtle Island is the name commonly used by Indigenous peoples for North America (Cannon & Sunseri, 2011).
While Iowa, my home state, was at one time the home to many Indigenous nations and is currently the home to the Meskwaki nation, my understanding of myself in relationship to Indigenous peoples did not really take shape until I was in my late twenties and I took a trip to another colonized land - Palestine. This was because Indigenous peoples were represented in my public school and dominant discourses elsewhere in ways that regulated them to mythic figures in history and as the victims of ‘necessary’ colonization. After graduating from college with a teaching license, I began teaching in a small high school in rural Iowa with a nascent, but under-developed, understanding of systems of oppression and even less of an understanding of colonialism. I did not know how we (my students and I) had benefitted from and were continuing to participate in colonialism. I taught what I knew and still reinforced dominant histories and socio-cultural norms, just as they had been reinforced with me.

It was not until I began to work on issues related to Israel’s colonization of Palestine and travelled to Palestine in 2005 at the age of 29 that I began to draw some comparisons between colonization processes there and back home. I needed to see a process of ongoing colonization, with my own eyes, to really interrogate American dominant national discourses and reflect on my relationship to Indigenous peoples in North America and responsibility in that relationship.

As a white settler with U.S. citizenship, I am also complicit in, and benefit from, global racism. My understanding of this came slightly earlier in my life because I was lucky enough to engage with some progressive white people and people of colour in my mid-twenties. Although racism and white privilege is still often a taboo subject within many white social spheres in the U.S., it is a topic of conversation in many progressive circles. There is a plethora of progressive books that deal with issues of racism in the U.S., there are several national organizations that conduct anti-racism workshops with other organizations on a consultant basis, and there are organizations that hold yearly conferences for people to come together and organize around fighting racism and white supremacy. With the election of Barack Obama in 2008, the public discourse around racism has grown (and explicit racial bigotry and hatred have become even more pronounced). However, still today there is very little public discourse explicitly around the impacts of racism and colonialism on Indigenous peoples in the U.S.
This past year, I read an article by Bonita Lawrence and Enakshi Dua titled, *Decolonizing Anti-Racism*, which really struck a chord with me (2005). I realized that in the anti-racism work which I was involved in for the past ten years we talked about Indigenous peoples only as another racialized group, rather than as separate and sovereign colonized peoples. The anti-racism trainings which I both attended and at times helped plan began with the history of colonization and genocide in the U.S., and later briefly discussed treaties and treaty breaking. They also sometimes touched on the way Indigenous people were racialized through the idea of blood quantum. However, the goal of these workshops was always to get to an understanding of systemic racism within the U.S. and start to think about how to dismantle it in smaller institutions and organizations within the U.S. They did not touch on what it might mean to decolonize the U.S. or work with Indigenous peoples towards reparations or sovereignty.

In my eleven months since arriving here in Canada for graduate school, I have experienced Canada to have much broader discourse about the plight of Indigenous peoples. This may be simply a result of the fact that I have been focusing much more attention to land rights struggles and other Indigenous justice issues, or it may be because of the different ways that the Canadian and the U.S. governments have interacted with Indigenous peoples on Turtle Island. Likely, both of these are contributing factors. Although there are differences, the colonization of Turtle Island also has many similarities. My focus on Indigenous peoples and settlers in Canada will, I hope, contribute to future work in the U.S. context that helps to raise the level of discourse around settler colonialism there as well.

*Who am I doing this for?* At one level I am doing this for other non-Indigenous teachers. I believe that they should have an opportunity to understand their own complicity in colonization so they can become allies in the struggle for justice as well as bring that understanding into their classrooms. I wish that my understanding of settler complicity could have come earlier in my life and without a trip to Palestine; a trip which was born out of the privilege of white mobility and financial support. I wish I had this understanding and a greater understanding of systems of racism when entering the teaching profession, so that I could disrupt, rather than reify dominant norms. It is out of the belief in the possibility for

---

6 Blood quantum refers to the ideology in the U.S. of regulating Native American identity through percentage of Native American ancestry.
social change and teachers’ potential for playing a role in that change that I focus this study on teacher education. My hope is that future teachers be better prepared than I was to resist systems of oppression in their curriculum choices, pedagogy, and practices.

**Organization of Chapters**

This thesis is divided into six chapters. In chapter one I have introduced and provided the rationale for this study. I also defined racism, settler colonialism, and the relationship between the two and clarified some important terms used in this thesis. I have also hopefully made clear my personal interest and agenda in taking on research which engages with anti-colonial pedagogy in teacher education programs.

In chapter two I lay the foundation for this study through a review of literature. I begin the chapter with a description of the discourse of multiculturalism and the challenges it presents for building anti-colonial pedagogy. I turn next to critical Indigenous scholars’ critiques of Indigenous cultural inclusion. Anti-racist, critical whiteness, and white complicity pedagogies are outlined as I examine them for their strengths and weaknesses in addressing settler complicity. I then highlight some current curriculum and pedagogical practices that critical Indigenous scholars and their allies are engaging in to help non-Indigenous teacher candidates come to an understanding of their positionality in relationship to colonialism. In my conclusion of this chapter I lay out some of the challenges of developing an anti-colonial pedagogy.

Chapter three describes my research sample and methodological choices. I have chosen to study the secondary consecutive Initial Teacher Education program at OISE for the year 2011-2012. Within this case sample, I am focusing my analysis on the curriculum in the three foundational courses – Teacher Education Seminar, Psychological Foundations of Learning and Development, and School and Society. I describe these three courses, my process of collecting syllabi and course materials, and my analysis of the data. I also define textual analysis and critical discourse analysis, the two methods used in my research, and provide a rationale for focusing on the curriculum in these courses.

In chapter four, I explicate my findings in the School and Society curriculum using Kumashiro’s framework of the four approaches to anti-oppressive education, beginning with education for or about the indigenous ‘other’. I move on in this chapter to describe how colonialism exists in the text and examine whether or not a broad emphasis on critical
thinking includes a focus on settler colonialism. Finally, I describe my predominant finding in the School and Society curriculum – that the curriculum upholds the sacrosanctity of the nation state and therefore mutes Indigenous claims to sovereignty and responsibility of non-Indigenous teacher candidates in decolonizing.

Chapter five is divided into three sections: Teacher Education Seminar (TES), Psychological Foundations of Learning and Development (PF), and a core theme of overlap between the two courses – developing a “good teacher” identity. In the TES section I introduce the reader to the three cohorts that were a part of my study and describe my findings. I first review the entire curriculum from these three cohorts and then zero in on the spaces in the curriculum that exist under the topic heading “Aboriginal Education” for a more in-depth analysis. This section concludes with an extension of my analysis to a cohort that was not included in this study. The PF section of this chapter engages in a textual analysis of the required textbook for the course, *Educational Psychology*. I focus my discussion on how settler colonialism exists in the text and whether a settler self/indigenous other binary is disrupted or reified. I conclude this section with an analysis of the ways that Euro-centric knowledge remakes its dominance through the myth of objective neutrality. Finally, I close this chapter with an analysis of the underlying logic of the “good teacher” identity in teacher education curricula and the way this logic shows up in the TES and PF curricula.

In the final chapter, I return to the concept of complicity to highlight the importance of settlers coming to this understanding. I also summarize my findings in terms of what teachers are expected to learn in the three foundations courses in the OISE ITE program. Finally, I outline some potential elements of a curriculum of settler responsibility and discuss again the challenges of engaging with anti-colonial pedagogy.
CHAPTER TWO
A Literature Review:
From a Cultural Lens to Anti-Colonial Pedagogy:
Attempts and Challenges

Introduction
The teaching of Indigenous culture and history came as a welcome change from the former assimilationist and culturally genocidal policies and practices of residential schools (Friedel 2010a; Dion, 2009). After the Canadian government closed residential schools in the 50s and 60s, they opened Federal Day schools on reserves and integrated approximately 60 percent of Indigenous students into Canadian public schools (Kirkness, 1999). In 1972, the National Indian Brotherhood/Assembly of First Nations put forth a policy paper to address the education of Indigenous students. They called for control of Indian education to lie in the hands of Indian parents rather than the Canadian government and the opportunity for Indian children to learn their languages, cultures, and histories in the classroom (National Indian Brotherhood, 1973). These demands would require a revision of the school curriculum to represent Indians’ contributions to Canada (ibid.). They also called for more opportunities for Indigenous people to become teachers and for non-Indigenous people, who are to teach Indigenous students, to learn about Indigenous history and culture (ibid.). The Canadian government adopted the policy the following year, and in 1975 and 1977, the Ontario Ministry of Education published a People of Native Ancestry guide and a Multiculturalism in Action support document, which provided teachers with curricular units and ideas for presenting Indigenous material (Dion, 2009, p. 68). Together, these three documents played a critical role in providing more accurate descriptions of First Nations people in curriculum which included appreciation for traditional and contemporary Indigenous cultures and Indigenous contributions to Canadian society (ibid., pp. 69-70).

These movements towards Indigenous cultural inclusion exist side by side with the larger turn towards multiculturalism in Canada. In 1971, then Prime Minister Trudeau, institutionalized a policy of multiculturalism – a strategic move by the government to deal with the demands of French language speakers, an increase in culturally diverse citizens, and Indigenous land claims (St. Denis, 2011b). The policy became a national law in 1988 (ibid.)
The law and subsequent discourse of multiculturalism and its implications for policy and practices in Canada provide unique challenges to implementing successful anti-colonial pedagogy.

Some critical Indigenous scholars and allies have advocated for and turned to anti-racism pedagogies to teach towards an understanding of settler complicity and responsibility. (see Friedel, 2010a; Schick & St. Denis, 2003 & 2005; St. Denis, 2007). While anti-racism and specifically whiteness pedagogies more readily address structures of power and encourage critical self-reflection for white people in relationship to racism, these pedagogies do not always address the specific logics of colonialism. Additionally, implementing whiteness pedagogies with teacher candidates has not been easy. There are many challenges with engaging in whiteness pedagogies and anti-colonial pedagogies in teacher education and although some scholars have recognized some success with these pedagogies, they are also confronted by actions which prohibit such learning.

I begin this chapter, which engages in an overview of relevant literature, by describing multiculturalism in Canada and its impact on the formulation of national identities. Highlighting these constructions is important for anti-colonial pedagogies to disrupt national identities. Influenced by dominant discourses of multiculturalism, pedagogical practices often take up culture as the lens through which they attempt to address inequalities. In the next section I describe three main concepts within the field of educational anthropology, which have influenced this focus on culture specifically aimed at addressing the inequalities impacting Indigenous peoples. I then go on to describe what critical Indigenous scholars are saying about what happens pedagogically when culture is the lens used to address these inequalities. I move on to anti-racism pedagogies, and specifically whiteness pedagogies, to outline both their strengths and weaknesses in addressing settler complicity, and theorize some of the particular pedagogical challenges related to an anti-colonial curriculum. Finally, I outline some of the curricula and pedagogies that have been tried in regards to settler complicity. This chapter concludes by reiterating some possibilities and challenges for anti-colonial pedagogy.
A Major Challenge in Developing Anti-colonial Pedagogy: The Myth of Multiculturalism

Multiculturalism in Canada provides some unique challenges to developing anti-colonial pedagogy in that it masks the hierarchy of belonging and racial inequalities that exist and contributes to national identity constructions which uphold this ‘benevolent’ (false) promise of equality for everyone. The discourse of multiculturalism has become widespread, existing now as state policy, as underlying ideology, in public discourse, and as a way of “imagining what it means to be Canadian” (Simpson, James, & Mack, 2011, p. 287, citing Mackey, 2002 & Leung, 2010). This discourse is so widespread and imbedded in Canadian society that it is taken up not only by white settlers, but also by “visible minorities” and its construction and existence is often the invisible norm (ibid., citing Thobani, 2007). In its essence, multiculturalism claims that difference resides in culture, rather than race, and that everyone in Canadian society has equal opportunity because of Canada’s benevolent inclusions of cultural difference (ibid.). The discourse includes the assertion that racial and ethnic minority groups benefit from a multicultural framework. It is within this context that any critique of Canada for its racism and colonialism, is often met with disbelief and perhaps even outrage.

For more than a century after Confederation, Canada organized a white racial citizenry by encouraging white European immigration and limiting and in some cases practically excluding non-white immigration (Haque, 2012; Thobani, 2007). It was through such immigration policies that Canada was able to provide individual land rights to white Europeans and create an enduring understanding of the “Canadian” as white (Thobani, 2007). When immigration policy shifted from primarily racial and ethnic exclusions to a point system, emphasizing economic and labour needs, greater numbers of people from Africa and Asia immigrated to Canada (Haque, 2012). Because of the increased immigration of people of colour, Indigenous organizing around land claims, and the French nationalist movement, the federal government determined that a new definition of Canada was needed in order to encourage national unity (Haque, 2012; St. Denis, 2011b).

The official policy of multiculturalism in Canada was preceded by the Royal Commission of Bilingualism and Biculturalism (the B and B Commission), which was in existence from 1963-1970 to:
report upon the existing state of bilingualism and biculturalism in Canada and to recommend what steps should be taken to develop the Canadian Confederation on the basis of an equal partnership between the two founding races, taking into account the contribution made by the other ethnic groups to the cultural enrichment of Canada and the measures that should be taken to safeguard that contribution (Haque, 2012, p. 5, quoting Book I of the B and B Commission, 1967, Appendix I).

As is apparent in the description of the B and B Commission’s mandate, French and English (“the two founding races”) nationalism was taken up as the primary crisis of national unity, regulating the concerns of other ethnic groups and Indigenous peoples to marginal cultural inclusions (ibid., p. 53). Group language rights were granted to French nationals, differentiating between the rights of linguistic minorities and other ethnic minorities, and instituting a hierarchy of belonging within the nation state (ibid.). With the goal of assimilating Indigenous peoples, their central concerns, although a part of the preliminary hearings, were eliminated from the framework altogether (ibid., p. 239). People of colour and Indigenous peoples were differently impacted by the policy of multiculturalism. While people of colour were limited in their access to power and privilege through the institutionalization of multiculturalism, Indigenous peoples were denied their rights to live as sovereign nations (Razack, 1998, p. 62).

Essentially, multiculturalism was and continues to be a purposeful attempt to slow or stop the anti-racist and anti-colonial movements which seek to change the structures of power in society (Goldberg, 1993; Schick, 2002; Simpson, et al., 2011). Simpson, et al. (2011) state,

> By focusing on the existence of a “cultural mosaic,”’ those allied with a multicultural perspective simultaneously distinguish Canada from the United States and the racism there and render invisible or immaterial the ways in which race and racism operate within Canada. This acknowledgement of culture, yet refusal of race and relations of power (Mooers 2005), is an effective discursive strategy: Canada benevolently and magnanimously acknowledges cultural difference and simultaneously rejects the significance of race and power (p. 288).

Indigenous groups view the policy and practice of multiculturalism as a form of colonialism (St. Denis, 2011b), which blames oppression on the oppressed and requires those experiencing oppression to change or learn in order to end oppression (St. Denis, 2011a). It is the turn towards culture that also implies that everyone has equal opportunity to succeed in Canadian society. However, as Haque states, “. . . the entrenchment of group-differentiated citizenship rights, predicated on a particular reading of national history, makes the
assumption of equal citizenship for all members of the polity impossible.” (2012, p. 247).

Additionally, Thobani (2007) argues that multiculturalism has “facilitated a more fashionable and politically acceptable form of white supremacy, which has had greater currency within a neocolonial, neoliberal global order” (p. 148).

The fact that multiculturalism has become a part of what it means to be Canadian has specific implications for understanding the reproduction of identities of belonging to the nation state. The citizens of a nation state tend to embody the concepts of the nation (Schick, 1998, p. 78). In terms of multiculturalism, citizens have a tendency to see themselves as tolerant and inclusive of cultural diversity (Thobani, 2007). In this context, any critique of the nation state is also a critique of the individual. When Canada’s ongoing colonialism is exposed, for example, this information comes into conflict with an individual’s understanding of themselves as inclusive and thus is often resisted or denied (Schick, 1998, p. 130).

A hierarchy of belonging in exists in the nation state, but is cloaked by multiculturalism. Thobani (2007), discusses this hierarchy of belonging for racialized immigrants as complex:

Propelled into the circuit of migration by structural conditions within the global economy, as well as by their desires for economic advancement, migrants have been party to the ongoing colonization of Aboriginal peoples. . . The more immigrants have sought their own inclusion and access to citizenship, the more invested they have become, with very few exceptions, in supporting the nation’s erasure of its originary violence and its fantasies of progress and prosperity (p. 16).

People of colour in Canada may, along with white people, take up the discourse of multiculturalism as their own and engage in constructing themselves in the national image. Thobani (2007) argues that those citizens who identify with the characteristics of the nation are provided “ontological and existential capital” (p. 5). Part of this “capital” is a sense of belonging and space in the world community. Thobani further states, “The endowment of specific characteristics to particular subjects conceals the social relations within which these subjects are enmeshed, fetishizing them instead as the naturalistic origins of these particularly laudable human qualities” (ibid., p. 9). The rights granted to Canadian nationals are conceptualized as innate to their being, rather than understood as being granted through the production of inferior others (ibid., p.11).
The Turn Towards Culture: Critical Indigenous Scholars’ Critiques

Critical Indigenous scholars have studied the problems that pedagogies focused solely on Indigenous culture maintain and accentuate. In the following section, I review what these scholars are saying about a sole focus on culture, beginning with Verna St. Denis’ seminal work on the influence of educational anthropology on Indigenous cultural inclusions. This anthropological framework speaks especially to revitalization of Indigenous culture through education and the attempts to remedy educational disparities through cultural solutions. Cultural revitalization attempts are complicated by the racialization of Indigenous peoples and in this section I spend some time defining such racialization processes and the connection to cultural revitalization pedagogies. St. Denis and other scholars argue that although Indigenous cultural inclusions are intended to help Indigenous students reclaim an Indigenous identity, they often instead create hierarchies of authenticity among Indigenous students and lead non-Indigenous students to essentialize Indigenous peoples and their cultures. Other outcomes of a focus on culture include: the maintenance of a self/other binary, responsibility falling on Indigenous peoples to change inequalities, and finally the fact that such a focus does not offer a solution to the racial/colonial oppression that Indigenous students face.

Anthropology’s influence on the inclusion of Indigenous culture

The colonial history of the field of anthropology is well known and therefore it is important to understand how that field influenced the inclusion of Indigenous culture in education. Verna St. Denis (2011) illuminates the history of educational anthropology in Rethinking Cultural Theory in Aboriginal Education. Around the same time that curricula began to include representations of Indigenous people and culture, a theoretical shift in educational anthropology was taking place (ibid.). Up until the 1970’s, educational anthropology held that racialized “minority” children failed in school because their cultural beliefs and practices were deficient (ibid.). In the 1970’s, however, the dominant framework shifted so that cultural differences were not seen as better or worse, but merely different. This lead to celebrations of cultural differences in classrooms and for educational anthropologists, it lead to research that focused on different learning styles and the difficulties ‘multicultural’ students had existing between two different cultures, which were
said to be the main reasons why ‘multicultural’ students were not doing well in schools. The tension in existing between two or more different cultures is known as cultural discontinuity.

The cultural discontinuity hypothesis maintains that the main problem in educational disparities is that cultural differences exist between the school and home (St. Denis, 2011). The argument is such that when ‘multicultural’ students do not succeed in school it is because they do not fully understand the culture of the school and teachers and administrators do not fully understand the culture of the home. Proposed solutions to cultural discontinuity for Indigenous students are: to bring some of the home culture into the school through educating and hiring Indigenous teachers, to train non-Indigenous teachers in cultural practices, to incorporate more Indigenous knowledge and culture into the curriculum, and to increase connections between the home and the school through parental involvement (Friedel, 2010a).

A second anthropological notion, which has informed a focus on Indigenous culture, is called cultural incommensurability and stems from the German philosopher, Herder (St. Denis, 2011). Cultural incommensurability signifies that different cultures have little in common and therefore cannot be easily compared. In studies of Indigenous cultures, this idea has led to attributing the effects of colonial oppression to the incommensurability of culture. St. Denis states, “In the example of Aboriginal people, effects of oppression are cast as ‘value conflicts’ between white and Indian cultures, suggesting that inequality is inevitable, and merely an effect of different orientations to work, education, and family” (ibid, p. 180). When societal disadvantages and differential access to resources are assumed to be the result of cultural differences, cultural education appears to be an appropriate solution. The goal is to teach individuals about Indigenous cultures so they no longer unknowingly discriminate against Indigenous peoples.

The concept of enculturation, which became a central concept in educational anthropology, has also contributed to a focus on cultural revitalization (St. Denis, 201, p. 181). Enculturation posits that people can be educated into culture and therefore exist as separate from culture. People are not the creators of culture, rather culture determines who people are or become. This idea leads to the concept of cultural revitalization – where people, first separated from their culture (and part of their identity), can be reconnected to it through exposure. Within this context, culture, which has been lost, is unchanging;
Indigenous culture exists as a traditional, pre-contact object for people to (re)claim. This idea of an unchanging culture is embedded in racism and colonialism where inferiority is explained through inability to progress or conform to contemporary society (ibid., p. 184).

These three anthropological notions of cultural discontinuity, incommensurability, and enculturation have together influenced a focus on cultural revitalization for Indigenous students, bridging the cultural gap between the school and the home, and educating non-Indigenous students about Indigenous culture. In the following sections I describe the problems that critical Indigenous scholars point to when these three concepts are put into pedagogical practice.

*Cultural revitalization and racialization*

The revitalization of Indigenous cultures, with an emphasis on the reclamation of Indigenous identities for Indigenous students, has been a main goal of cultural inclusion (Friedel, 2010a). This goal stems from an understanding of culture as existing outside of people (enculturation) and often results in the inclusion of pre-contact, traditional, static culture (Friedel, 2010a, p.14). Even when there is an attempt to include more contemporary Indigenous cultures into curricula, the results can contradict the intention (St. Denis, 2007). While the intention of Indigenous identity reclamation is to subvert the impact of colonialism and racism by reclaiming Indigenous identities which were forcibly taken from them, the results are often a form of cultural fundamentalism and hierarchies of authenticity. The difficulty lies in subverting the power of racialization processes when it is culture rather than race that is the focus. In the next section I will define what I mean by cultural fundamentalism and hierarchies of authenticity. But first, it is important to understand the way that racialization processes have impacted Indigenous peoples and how these processes create difficulties for accomplishing the goals of cultural revitalization.

Racialization refers to the processes used to produce and distinguish people as different social groups through which these groups are subjected to unequal treatment (Dei, 1996). In chapter one, I mentioned that many scholars conceive of the first point of contact between Europeans and Indigenous peoples to be the first racist experiences for Indigenous peoples. Racism towards Indigenous peoples was later institutionalized through the Indian Act and residential schools. There are other distinct times and experiences through which Indigenous peoples have been racialized, both institutionally and otherwise, and many
scholars have written about these racialization processes. In this section, I focus specifically on how Indigenous peoples were racialized through the Indian Act because of its immense importance to understanding the relationship of Indigenous Nations to Canada, and the residential schools because of their significance for the field of education.

In 1876, the Canadian parliament enacted the Indian Act, under the authority of the Constitution Act of 1867, which gave Canada the legal “right” to legislate Indigenous lands. The Indian Act lumped all Indigenous peoples together under the legal classification of “Indian” and imposed Indian status distinctions under the guise of “protecting” Indigenous lands from outside land encroachments (Cannon & Sunseri, 2011). However, these encroachments, prior to the Indian Act were all a part of the colonial project. Wolfe (2006) states, “Characteristically, officials express regret at the lawlessness of this process [of frontier elimination and settlement] while resigning themselves to its inevitability” (p. 392).

Early on in the process, some “Indians” were given the option to give up their legal status and become Canadian citizens (Cannon & Sunseri, 2011). The goal of such an offer was in line with the strategy of erasure of Indigeneity (Smith 2006, 2010). The offer was essentially a choice between remaining “Indian” and being seen as inferior, or giving up parts of their identity and claims to the land to become “civilized” (Cannon & Sunseri, 2011).

The Indian Act and its amendments continue to regulate who is considered “Indian” today. For example, the Act to Amend the Indian Act, which passed in 1985, stated that children of women who married non-Indians prior to 1985 were not able to pass on Indian status to their children if they also marry non-Indians (Cannon, 2011, p. 90). In 2010, this act was amended again under the title Gender Equity in Indian Registration Act, to restore Indian status to the grandchildren of the women whose children lost status. This is a change that impacts, at most, 2,000 people of the 10,000 or more who were denied status in the original amendment (Eberts, 2010; see also Cannon, forthcoming(b)). Such convoluted laws serve to determine who is eligible for the rights granted to Indigenous peoples by the Canadian state. Additionally, the Indian Act defined territorial boundaries of “Indian” lands, imposed systems of governance on Indian bands, and rendered all prior treaties and nation-to-nation agreements void (Cannon & Sunseri, 2011). Today, the Indian Act, although it has been
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7 For more information on the racialization processes regarding Indigenous peoples, see St. Denis, 2007; Mawani, 2002; and Cannon & Sunseri, 2011.
repeatedly amended, still purports to give Canada the power to control Indigenous governance, landholding practices, and cultural practices in addition to defining who is a “true Indian” and who is not (Cannon & Sunseri, 2011, p. 276, quoting Henry, Tator, Mattis, and Rees, 1998). The Indian Act institutionalized the negation of rights held by sovereign Indigenous nations prior to European arrival on Turtle Island.

Residential schools employed different practices to convey inferiority of and establish superiority over Indigenous peoples. Early in the colonization of Turtle Island, church leaders sought to ‘educate’ Indigenous children into Christianity. They did this through setting up boarding schools and when those failed, schools closer to Indigenous communities (Fournier & Crey, 2011) and by providing scholarships to a select few Indigenous males to attend schools in Europe (Haig-Brown, 2009). Indigenous resistance to these church-run schools was primarily successful until the colonial government intervened in 1846, to provide financial backing to church-run “residential schools” as a means to control more land and “naturalize” Indigenous children and youth (Chrisjohn, Young & Maraun, 2006; Fournier & Crey, 2011; Thielen-Wilson, 2012).

The church run residential schools, backed by the government, forced assimilation on Indigenous peoples by teaching English, Christianity, and Euro-centric knowledge through Euro-centric knowledge systems (Fournier & Crey, 2011; Haig Brown, 1988). Children were taken from their families and communities to be educated in residential schools off the reserve. Boys and girls were taught differently gendered roles which reflected patriarchal gender norms that existed in European society (Ng, 1993) and they were severely punished for speaking their own languages or engaging in their own customs (Haig-Brown, 1988; Fournier & Crey, 2011). Through these acts as well as physical, sexual, and verbal abuses which occurred in these schools⁸, residential schools left devastating long-term impact on Indigenous communities including the alienation of family members from one another and the erasure of Indigenous languages (St. Denis, 2007). Of significant importance here is the understanding that these racialization practices all contributed to the “disappearance” of legal and cultural Indigeneity and with it Indigenous claims to land and resources (Smith, 2010).

---

⁸ See Fournier & Crey, 2011 and Haig-Brown, 1988 for more information on the devastating abuses in residential schools.
Several problems arise when cultural revitalization is the goal. One major problem is that Indigenous identities have been defined historically by the colonizers through such racialization processes, rather than by Indigenous peoples themselves (Friedel, 2010a). This means that the colonizers’ definition of static, pre-contact Indigenous cultures and identities is often what is used as a measuring stick. Additionally, because of Canada’s assimilation policies and practices and racism’s effects on those who maintained their Indigeneity, many people stopped practicing their cultural traditions. For example, in order to teach Indigenous languages, teachers must be found who know their languages and cultures. However, because of racialization processes and the fact that some Indigenous people chose enfranchisement as a way to circumvent discrimination and oppression, many Indigenous peoples do not speak their traditional languages (St. Denis, 2007). A lack of linguistic and cultural knowledges leads to a hierarchy of authenticity. Additionally, cultural revitalization often engages in cultural fundamentalism, or the understanding of identity as “a precise set of cultural, ideological and most worryingly, genetic markers” (St. Denis, 2007, p. 1075, quoting Joyce Green). The preciseness of this understanding of identity as it relates to Indigeneity results in hard boundaries around who is a “real Indian” and who is not. A racial analysis is required to understand the implications of racialization on cultural revitalization (Friedel, 2010a).

Hierarchies of authenticity and essentialism

Since Indigenous identities have been both defined by and constructed as inferior by the colonizers, a hierarchy of authenticity is often formed (Friedel, 2010a, p. 12-14). St. Denis (2007) states that this hierarchy of authenticity produces the question of “who is a real Indian?” amongst Indigenous peoples (p. 1069; see also Lawrence, 2004). Indigenous peoples who know their traditional languages, participate in “their” spiritual practices, know traditional stories, and know other cultural practices are often seen as the most authentic (ibid.). This hierarchy of authenticity creates conflicts among Indigenous peoples and can play a significant role in dividing Indigenous students from one another (ibid.). Indigenous peoples can resist oppression through these identity politics, as was pointed out in chapter one in the section on clarification of terms. However, without an understanding of how identities were imposed by colonizers in the first place, a hierarchy of authenticity can result. This hierarchy is impacted by cultural inclusion because the inclusion of culture tends to define some Indigenous people as “real” and others as “not real enough.”
For non-Indigenous students, Indigenous cultural inclusion often leads to essentialism. A focus on culture requires the defining of material cultures and these definitions are often inaccurate, incomplete, or unchanging\(^9\). In the act of defining, because of the tendency towards cultural fundamentalism, variations and differences are often forgotten. This problem is exacerbated by the fact that Indigenous culture is most often taught as an add-on to a specific unit (Hermes, 2005) with little time allotted for including the vast array of material cultures as they relate to Indigenous knowledges and worldviews. Non-Indigenous students often come away from such lessons with a ‘concrete’ concept of Indigenous peoples as mono-cultural and imbedded in pre-modern traditions. When culture is the topic, non-Indigenous people often engage in essentializing Indigenous peoples, believing that once they have had a lesson in the culture of the indigenous other, they know about ‘them’ and can relate to ‘them’. They are also able to use this acquired language and knowledge to engage in colonizing actions and behaviours in more sophisticated ways.

*Maintaining a self/other binary*

Although non-Indigenous students may feel like they know Indigenous peoples as the result of such cultural lessons, cultural inclusions maintain a distance in the relationship of self/other. The self/other binary refers to the construction of distance between “us and them” which allows for or justifies unequal treatment (Dei, 2006, p. 9). Notions of superiority and inferiority are produced and reproduced through this construction of distance. The shift, throughout the 1970s, to include more accurate and respectful representations of Indigenous peoples in the curriculum is generally regarded as a positive shift in focus. However, these new representations continued to set Indigenous culture apart. Rather than disrespecting or ignoring Indigenous peoples in curriculum, the new curriculum placed Indigenous culture “as something to be respected,” and put non-Indigenous students in the position of respectfully admiring the cultures of Indigenous ‘others’ (Dion, 2009, p. 71). Susan Dion (2009) refers to this representation of Indigenous people as the “romantic, mythical other.”

There are several different ways the “romantic, mythical other” exists in the curriculum which reproduces this distance: as static - existing in pre-contact time, as victims of colonialism or “European progress” (and therefore now in need of help), or as people with vastly different material cultures (Dion, 2009). Social Studies education curriculum still uses

---

\(^9\) See also Kumashiro, 2002, *education about the Other*
A pre-contact material culture survey approach to teaching about various First Nations (ibid., p. 73). Students learn about First Nations housing, dress, dance, and spiritual practices. This information is often presented in a way that disconnects it from beliefs, values, and worldviews. Additionally, Indigenous peoples are mentioned in footnotes related to European pioneering, settlement, and nation building as having lost their homes, families, and cultures in the process of inevitable European progress (ibid.). Through these representations, students are allowed and encouraged to regulate Indigenous people to history or see them as separate from the realities of their lives. In Dion’s work, she found that teachers take up the dominant discourse of the “romantic, mythical other”, even when the curriculum is written in a way that represents Indigenous peoples as extant resisters of conquest, destruction, and attempted genocide. Dion found that the complex dominant discourses around what it means to teach and learn restricted teachers’ abilities to engage with the alternative stories in the curriculum (ibid.). Teachers inevitably brought classroom conversations back to what they knew best, which was static cultural representations of Indigenous ‘others.’

*Placing the blame and responsibility on Indigenous peoples*

Cultural inclusions also place the blame and responsibility for changing inequalities on Indigenous peoples (St. Denis, 2007). This happens through a sole focus on them, their social ills, and their culture. The message seems to be, ‘we understand that Indigenous peoples were harmed by colonization, but now that that is over, it is up to Indigenous peoples to do better.’ A focus on identity reclamation also places the entire onus on Indigenous people to correct the “errors” of the past, while white settlers and others are still able to disengage from their role in colonialism.

*Continued educational disparities*

Although Indigenous cultural inclusion has taken place since the 1970’s, educational disparities for Indigenous children and youth have not decreased (Friedel, 2010,a). In Friedel’s (2010b) study with Indigenous youth, she highlights the import that they give to racialization and racism as dehumanizing experiences in their lives. Friedel also points out that a review of relevant literature (done by St. Denis and Hampton in their *Literature Review on Racism*) describes the racism that Indigenous youth experience as complex. They have found that racism exists “as curricular expression, as verbal and psychological abuse, as low expectations/self-fulfilling prophecy, as social marginalization and/or isolation, as denial of
professional support and/or attention, and as rules and procedures to facilitate failure” (2010b, p. 2). Although a focus on cultural revitalization has been known to help Indigenous people to withstand injustice, it has not contributed towards ending that injustice (St. Denis, 2007, p. 1076).

Although the practice of cultural inclusion is fraught with problems and complexities, many scholars agree that such cultural education is a necessary part of anti-racist and anti-colonial education (Dei, 2011; Dion, 2009; Hermes, 2005; Kumashiro, 2009). Indigenous cultural inclusion in education has had some positive results, especially regarding Indigenous “identities, self-esteem, and attitudes toward school” (Hermes, 2005, p. 12, quoting Deyhle & Swisher, 1997; see also St. Denis, 2007). Dei (2011) has argued that “a culturally grounded perspective helps center indigenous peoples’ worldviews” (p. 4). However, as I have described above, critical Indigenous scholars and have also pointed to the problems that emerge pedagogically when culture is the lens and especially to the fact that such a focus hides structures of inequality.

**Anti-racism Pedagogies and the Problematic of Only Focusing on Racism**

Some critical Indigenous scholars have advocated for and turned to anti-racism pedagogies to address the power dynamics related to colonialism that are hidden through a sole focus on culture. Specifically, pedagogies which address whiteness and white complicity are emphasized as a way to, as Cannon (forthcoming(a)) puts it, “change the subject”. Rather than focusing on the Indigenous other, whiteness pedagogies help to focus on the settler self. However, these pedagogies contain their own challenges and can fall short of addressing the specific logics and identity constructions related to settler colonialism.

In this section, I outline the educational frameworks of anti-racism, whiteness studies and white complicity theory to build a theoretical base for pedagogy which aims to help non-Indigenous teacher candidates come to an understanding of their complicity and responsibility in colonialism. Several studies have been conducted on the challenges faced when these pedagogies are the focus and I briefly outline some of their findings here. I also discuss the construction of racial/colonial identities, an offshoot of anti-racism education, as it is such identity constructions that are important to highlight and disrupt to get at the relationship of non-Indigenous peoples to settler colonialism. Finally, I discuss the problem
that colonialism is often missing from a focus on race and the pedagogical possibilities and challenges of an anti-colonial focus.

*Anti-racism, whiteness studies, and white complicity*

Anti-racism is a large field of theory and practice, which seeks to address systemic, institutional, and individual racism (Cannon & Sunseri, 2011, p. xiv, citing Henry and Tator, 2006) and contains overlapping theories and praxis with anti-colonial education, anti-oppression education, social justice education, and critical pedagogy. In fact, the end goal for all of these theories is to create a just and humane society for all people. However, critical anti-racism in education posits that race and race difference (not only skin colour difference, but also other aspects of racialization – i.e. religion, language, culture, etc.) are salient and should be foregrounded in education (Dei, 1996).

Anti-racism education focuses on the societal disadvantages and marginalization experienced by people of colour and the power and privilege granted to Euro-centric knowledges, discourses, structures, and white bodies (Dei, 1996). Anti-racism researchers and educators seek to interrogate notions of superior and inferior based on race and the way race interlocks or intersects with other social differences such as gender, sexuality, class, and ability (ibid.). Importantly,

Anti-racism calls for putting power relations at the center of the discourse on race and social difference. It seeks to center critiques of the (discretionary) use of power and privilege in discussions about race identity and social difference and how historically constituted relations of domination and subordination are embedded in institutional structures of society” (Dei, 1996, p. 26).

Whiteness studies is one area of study within anti-racism theory which focuses on the ways that white superiority is constructed and reproduced within society. Whiteness studies assume that examining and dismantling racism requires more than examining the oppression that racial ‘others’ face; it requires examining the often invisible “norms” that perpetuate and reproduce privilege and supremacy (Schick & St. Denis, 2005). Whiteness is a somewhat difficult concept to define, as it is both an ideology and an unstable, constantly reforming identity. Schick and St. Denis (2003) offer this useful definition from Frankenburg’s (1993)

*White women, race matters: The social construction of whiteness:*

Whiteness refers to a set of locations that are historically, socially, politically, and culturally produced and moreover are intrinsically linked to unfolding relations of
domination. Naming "whiteness" displaces it from the unmarked, unnamed status that is itself an effect of its dominance (p. 62).

Thinking of whiteness as a set of locations is useful in that these locations are located outside of bodies. It is important to understand that access to whiteness can go beyond skin colour. Whiteness is accessible to more than white people although its primary function is to maintain power and privilege for white people at the expense of people of colour. While whiteness is inscribed onto white bodies readily, people of colour need to give up aspects of themselves in order to enter into whiteness and they can never be completely integrated into whiteness.

Recognizing the fact that teachers in North America are still overwhelmingly white, while the student population is becoming more racially diverse, teacher education programs in North America have begun to implement critical whiteness pedagogy (Applebaum, 2003, p. 6). One of the major critiques of the way whiteness studies pedagogy is implemented in teacher education programs is that they focus solely on white privilege (Applebaum, 2010). The problem with “white privilege” pedagogy, as it is often taken up in classrooms, is that this privilege is seen as individual rather than a part of a larger system (ibid.). Some scholars claim that this is because individual privileges are emphasized within the curriculum (ibid.). However, others highlight that the dominant discourse of pervasive individualism plays a part in why white students are unable to understand that their privilege exists as a part of a much larger system (Schick & St. Denis, 2005; Solomona, Portelli, Daniel, & Campbell, 2005). Either way, a simplistic, individualistic analysis leads to naïve solutions and a focus on confession and forgiveness as the stopping point (Applebaum, 2010). It is at this point that white students often declare publicly that they have white privilege, all the while doing nothing to change the way they participate in the system that grants them this privilege. Students also often state that everyone should have these same privileges and resolve to ‘help’ others to receive these privileges as well. White privilege pedagogy has a tendency to leave students at a point of self-absolution, where they see themselves as existing on a moral high ground compared to those white people who do not recognize their own privilege. This approach falls short of getting white students to understand their complicity in racism (ibid.).

Applebaum (2007) defines white complicity as a connection of individuals to systems of oppression in which the privileges granted to some are understood to come at the expense
of others (p. 456). White complicity is not about what someone does or does not do, but is about being or existing in a social position that grants white people dominance (ibid.). Therefore, there is nothing that whites, even those who consider themselves good whites, can do to escape from this social positioning and the privileges it has provided. Applebaum’s (2010) “White complicity pedagogy” seeks to interrogate white privilege, but also the white moral goodness that often results from the examination of this privilege. White complicity pedagogy highlights the “ontological, epistemological, and ethical frameworks that support and maintain racial injustice” (ibid., p. 183). Applebaum argue that a critical pedagogy must interrogate systems of power, even those imbedded in “progressive” movements and spaces. Uncertainty, humility and the ability of white students to examine their own internal defences are central aspects to white complicity pedagogy.

There have been many studies centred on understanding the potentials and challenges of whiteness pedagogies in teacher education programs. While the studies discuss some elements deemed successful, more often they highlight the distinct and difficult challenges of engaging white students in an examination of their privilege and/or complicity. Although it is beyond the scope of this thesis to engage in a detailed review of these challenges, it is important to recognize these limitations exist and hold some relevancy for the difficulties of creating and implementing anti-colonial pedagogies as well. In this brief review, I discuss the challenges for white students, for teachers or teacher candidates, and for students of colour.

Whiteness pedagogies often lead white students to engage in a range of emotional and other responses that can leave them stuck rather than engaged in learning. Schick and St. Denis (2003 & 2005) describe their teacher candidates’ reliance on dominant discourses as a defence against learning and the need for whiteness pedagogies to examine and disrupt these discourses. As teacher candidates are brought to a point of challenging their own worldviews, it is also necessary to interrogate the defences that arise or alternatively the assertion of moral goodness that students engage in (Applebaum, 2010). Boler and Zembylas (2003) assert that challenging dominant worldviews requires paying attention to and inquiring into the emotional reactions to such challenges. They state, “[b]y closely examining emotional reactions and responses – what we call emotional stances – one begins to identify unconscious privileges as well as invisible ways in which one complies with dominant
ideology” (ibid., p. 108). These emotional responses can range from anger or guilt, to indifference and distancing, to an amnesia which leads to superficial engagement with the concepts (Boler & Zembylas, 2003; Urietta & Riedel, 2006).

Other challenges are related to the concept of what it means to be a teacher as defined by what is deemed important in the process of teaching and learning. Dion’s (2009) study pointed to a dominant understanding of teacher identity, which included such ideas of what it means to teach well, to care for students, and nurture good citizenship, and how this understanding organized teacher’s interactions with students. Schick (1998 & 2010) points to similar identity constructions of the teacher and the underlying discourse that teaching and learning is conceived of as a politically neutral activity as reasons why anti-racism education is challenging. I take up these identity constructions of the teacher more in my analysis of the Teacher Education Seminar and Psychological Foundations of Learning and Development in chapter five.

Importantly, although less studied specifically in teacher education programs, are the challenges for racialized students when pedagogies focus on whiteness. Blackwell (2010) explains that whiteness pedagogies marginalize students of colour, while expecting them to offer their personal stories as learning tools for white students and teachers. For this reason, Blackwell advocates for a model of racially separate spaces for students of colour and white students (ibid.)

*Racial/colonial identity constructions*

Racial/colonial identity constructions are an offshoot of anti-oppressive theory, which maintains that identities of superiority and inferiority are historically and socially produced. In this thesis I examine the construction and disruption of identities of superiority related to settler colonialism in North America. Anti-racism theories maintain that identities of superiority must be challenged and deconstructed through highlighting dominant discourses, actions, and systems of oppression. In the section on cultural revitalization and racialization above I described some of the processes of identity construction (racialization) imposed on Indigenous peoples. Here, I want to focus on the ways that white identities are produced and reproduced through colonial encounters.

While the continuation of whiteness and white privilege are dependent upon the construction of an inferior ‘other’, whiteness is also largely invisible to those who embody it,
including myself. Trying to understand whiteness, for white people and some people of color who easily enter the social location of whiteness, is often described as trying to get a fish to recognize the water it lives in. Whiteness is parasitically co-constructed as the norm (Schick & St. Denis, 2005); a process through which a people of color ‘other’ is recognized and named in order to reify white dominance without naming it as anything other than ‘normal.’ In this section, I attempt to explicate some of the processes surrounding the construction of whiteness and white dominant identities. Since whiteness is historically, socially, politically, and culturally produced, it is constructed differently in different locations. Here I focus on the constructions of white dominance in Canada.

Because white dominance is an unstable identity and in constant need of an ‘inferior other’, white people participate in actions with the goal of solidifying their identity and reclaiming dominance. Although this has happened in North America since the point of contact, here I want to focus on the contemporary processes of white identity construction. One primary way that these processes are taking place is through the journeys of white subjects from white spaces to racialized spaces and back again (Razack, 2002b). It is the access to privileged positions that allows white subjects to move through space and time while the black (read racialized) subject is static and immobile (Mohanram, 1999).

These journeys can be both physical and metaphorical. A physical journey to remake whiteness is exemplified in story of the murder of Pamela George. Two young, middle class, white men drove Pamela George, a Saulteaux woman working as a prostitute, to an empty field near Regina, Saskatchewan, in April 1995, forced her to perform sexual acts and proceeded to beat her, leaving her to die face down in the mud (Razack, 2002a). Through this physical journey, these two white men re-enacted sexual violence that was an integral part of the strategy for settler domination in the nineteenth century, and in crossing this line between whiteness and “degeneracy” they reconfirmed their dominance and control (ibid.). Other contemporary physical journeys to reconfirm white identities contain less overt violence, but are just as strategically important to maintaining the settler/indigenous binary. The journeys I am speaking of here are those done by white people in so-called ‘helping’ professions, which bring them into contact with racialized ‘others’. Without an understanding of how systems of oppression have historically shaped the need for such ‘help’, ‘helpers’ see themselves as separate and superior and this construction of themselves is reconfirmed
through the encounter. Teachers also reconfirm this racial/colonial superiority with the attitude of trying to “save” their racialized students from the harm of their families and communities (Schick, 2000; see also Schick & St. Denis, 2005). Contemporary metaphorical journeys to reconfirm whiteness often take place when stories about racialized ‘others’ are read or told to white students. These stories, read uncritically and through a dominant lens, often reconfirm difference and superiority in the minds of these students as well.

White dominant identities are also discursively produced. These discursive constructions seem normal and natural to most white people and often are a part of their identity. I was first introduced to such constructions in the context of institutional racism and the values that white dominant institutions operate by (Dias, 2008, see Appendix A). The white institutional values of either/or thinking, scarcity worldview, secrecy mode, and individual action were named in the non-profit organization that I was working for (ibid.). As a result, we were able to better analyze our actions in the organization through the understanding that these values were contributing to continued white dominance and, as allies in anti-racist struggle, we tried to hold ourselves accountable to changing these values. In Canada, some of the discourses that contribute to a white identities constructed as superior are: Canada as a raceless, but multicultural nation; the ideology of meritocracy – that everyone has equal opportunity and with hard work they can succeed in Canadian society; and the idea that individual acts and good intentions can lead one to innocence (Schick & St. Denis, 2003). These and other discursive constructions allow white people to maintain access to societal privileges at the expense of people of colour.

Colonialism can drop out when the focus is race/ the challenges of anti-colonial pedagogy

White complicity pedagogies are useful in helping to understand and interrogate whiteness in relationship to colonialism. However, these frameworks are not always enough to help teacher candidates come to an understanding of themselves as complicit in settler colonialism because they often lack a focus on the logics and identity constructions specific to settler colonialism. White supremacy’s pillar of colonialism/genocide and the logic of eliminating Indigenous peoples from the land in order to legitimate control of the land and resources (Smith, 2006) while paradoxically needing an Indigenous other to maintain a dominant white settler identity (Razack, 2002a) are often missing in anti-racism education.

As discussed in chapter one, Indigenous nationhood is not often taken up in anti-
racism activism and scholarship and without centring Indigenous sovereignty, anti-racist theories do not address the entirety of the lived realities of Indigenous peoples (Lawrence & Dua, 2005). Anti-racist theoretical frameworks often ignore the ongoing colonization of North America or view it as complete and work within the nation state towards racial justice. Smith (2010) provides an example of the way that Indigenous peoples are exempted from anti-racist scholarship through an analysis of Omi and Winant’s important work, *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s* (p. 4). The one instance in their book where they address colonialism is through a discussion of “internal colonialism”, which refers to understanding communities of colour as colonies within the U.S. (ibid.). They conclude that the idea of internal colonialism is limited, “with significant exceptions such as Native American conditions”, but do not discuss why or how Native Americans are an exception (ibid., quoting Omi & Winant, 1994). It is such inclusions into the system of racism without differentiating between the varying logics of white supremacy that leaves settler colonialism uninterrupted in anti-racism education. When the land and the political sovereignty of Indigenous peoples are left out of anti-racism education, Indigenous peoples become another racialized minority group fighting for equal rights within the nation state.

The land is the central piece of white supremacy’s pillar of colonialism/genocide in that land and resource confiscation are the reasons for racialized processes of eliminating Indigenous peoples from the land (Smith, 2006). Wolfe (2006) importantly centres the land in his analysis of the relationship of colonialism to genocide stating, “[t]erritoriality is settler colonialism’s specific, irreducible element” (p. 388). In his foregrounding of land, however, the question of why settler colonialism is ongoing arises (Thielen-Wilson, 2012). If settlers use violence and genocide to gain access to land, what is stopping settlers from the horrible possibility of completing the ethnic cleansing of Indigenous peoples in order to finalize the colonial project? I have no intention of underestimating the force of Indigenous resistance to such a summary elimination, while at the same time I agree with Smith (2010), Razack (2002a), Thielen-Wilson (2012) and other scholars that there is a benefit to the colonizer in continued, ongoing colonization of North America. Thielen-Wilson (2012) points out that Wolfe’s analysis needs a “tweaking” to understand the desire for territory as a racialized and racializing desire (p. 41). “That is, within settler contexts, a racial identity claim is embedded in the “economic” desire for control of territory, land, and resources” (ibid.). White
supremacy needs an inferior Indigenous other to maintain a superior white/settler self.

White settlers benefit from ongoing colonialism through the reproduction of identities of white superiority, while a benefit to all non-Indigenous peoples, although varied through racial hierarchies, is access to land and resources. I have mentioned some of the physical and metaphorical journeys that white people engage in to remake identities of superiority earlier in this chapter. Relationships between people of colour and Indigenous peoples in Canada have been under theorized, particularly in the field of education (Cannon, forthcoming(a)). However, Beenash Jafri (2012) examined the concept of settler complicity in relationship to people of colour in Canada in a recent blog post. Jafri asks, “[I]s it also possible to be complicit within a system of hierarchal power without at the same time accruing its benefits?” (para.3) and follows with a critique of (white) privilege pedagogy, similar to that of Applebaum’s detailed above, as it relates to settler privilege. Instead of settler privilege, Jafri suggests coming to an understanding of settler complicity, which requires, “that we think about settlerhood not as an object that we possess, but as a field of operations into which we become socially positioned and implicated” (para.8). I appreciate Jafri’s concept of a “field of operations” because it helps to visualize that although we may not be running, managing, or organizing the field ourselves, we are positioned inside of it. Just as Applebaum’s definition of white complicity is that complicity in racism is not a matter of doing, but a matter of being, complicity in settler colonialism is also a matter of existing or being on land that was and continues to be stolen from Indigenous peoples.

The elements often missing from anti-racism education as I see them are threefold: 1. centring of the land and political sovereignty of Indigenous peoples, 2. white identity constructions particularly related to Canadian nationalism and citizenship, and 3. how people of colour are implicated in settler colonialism on Turtle Island. The last point is a question both of how people of colour (often recent immigrants, sometimes refugees, and often having come to Canada as a result of white supremacy’s other pillars of slavery/capitalism or orientalism/war (Smith, 2006)) are in relationship to the land, as well as how they may participate in national identifications to maintain the hierarchy of belonging through which Indigenous peoples are located at the bottom (Thobani, 2007). I have prominently focused on the first two missing elements in this thesis. The third missing element requires further research and writing in order to better understand these relationships and how to address
them through anti-colonial pedagogies.

What are the pedagogical challenges in incorporating these missing elements into curriculum and pedagogy? In the case of centring the land and Indigenous sovereignty the question may be ‘why has it not often already been done?’ To provide insights into these questions, I discuss some of the challenges in two parts: struggles over the land and national ideologies. This discussion is just a beginning to examining the pedagogical implications of a focus on the land and Indigenous sovereignty.

**Struggles over the land.** In Razack’s work on Aboriginal deaths in custody, she discusses the attitudes of extreme dehumanization that come with struggles over the land (2011 & 2012). These struggles are embodied in the spaces, outside of reserves, where policing subjects of the state find Indigenous bodies (Razack, 2011). For example, in Paul Alphonse’s story, a public park was the space from which police officers violently removed him (ibid.) and in Frank Paul’s story the Downtown East Side of Vancouver, where Mr. Paul was frequently seen, was marked as a space of death, where humans are considered already dead (2012). Settler societies first destroy and dispossess so they may rebuild in a colonial order (Razack, 2012; Wolfe, 2006). This dispossession is accomplished through the complete dehumanization of Indigenous peoples, a dehumanization that is reflected in the indifference and disregard of settlers towards Indigenous peoples as in the case of both Indigenous men (Paul Alphonse and Frank Paul) who died in police custody and in the murder of Pamela George (Razack, 2002a, 2011, & 2012).

How can pedagogies engage with such deeply entrenched internalized superiority, which seem to become even more entrenched and violent when questions of rightful ownership of the land are raised? Pedagogies that engage with internalized white superiority may be a useful starting place, but they may not account for the virulent level of dehumanization that takes place. Certainly, we must take seriously the potential harm caused to Indigenous peoples, and particularly Indigenous teacher candidates sharing the same space in the teacher education classroom, as violent internalized supremacy is bound come to the fore within classroom discussion.

**National ideologies.** Schick and St. Denis (2003 & 2005) have focused their teacher education pedagogy on the disrupting of white identities as they relate to colonialism. I detail their pedagogy as they describe it in *What makes anti-racist pedagogy in teacher*
education difficult? in the section below (2003). Through this pedagogy, they found that common ideological assumptions and national discourses prove to be challenges that get in the way of teacher candidates coming to an understanding of their positionality in relationship to colonialism (2003 & 2005). These assumptions are: that Canada is a multicultural nation where race is not an issue, that everyone has equal opportunity and with hard work they can succeed, that individual acts and good intentions can lead one to innocence, and that Canada is benevolent and innocent (ibid). Dominant discourses of the nation state as “good” and its citizens as “responsible . . . , compassionate, caring, and committed to the values of diversity and multiculturalism” (Thobani, 2007, p. 4) make it difficult for pedagogies to engage with critical reflection on the nation state and colonialism (Schick, 1998). As Schick states,

In the context of the Canadian image, the split between the national identification as a tolerant, compassionate country as well as one that is profoundly racist is mediated in the denial of the split and rationalized by tradition. As patriotic citizens entering the helping professions, teachers are expected to be tolerant and compassionate. In the case of white teachers, whatever contradictions they meet between their identifications as ‘good’ people and a racist rejection of the Other can be rationalized by the subjects in a variety of ways that maintain the popular production of themselves as ‘good’” (ibid., pp. 128-129).

What has been tried in countering these dominant national ideologies is highlighting them as such and tracing their historic social production (Schick & St. Denis, 2003). Similar to the pedagogies which engage with internalized white superiority, these pedagogies assume that making the invisible visible will lead to a disruption of these dominant identifications. Furthermore, the underlying hope is for such disruptions to translate into action for social justice. Further research is necessary to understand these and other challenges of implementing anti-colonial pedagogy.

**Tried Teacher Education Pedagogies Aimed at Understanding Settler Complicity**

Critical Indigenous scholars and their allies have implemented curricula and pedagogies aimed at an understanding of settler complicity. Kumashiro (2000 & 2002) notes that there is no one correct and complete approach to anti-oppressive pedagogy and the approaches highlighted below may in some ways contradict each other or other important pedagogical approaches (ibid.). It is also important to note that these approaches are fluid and unbounded. I have chosen to highlight these approaches because the teacher educators who
have tried them have noted some successes in the ways that teacher candidates internalize their positionality related to colonialism. These pedagogies can help identify some possible useful components of a curriculum aimed at settler responsibility and illuminate the possibilities for the existence of such curriculum in teacher education classrooms. It is with these goals in mind that I introduce the reader to the following pedagogies.

Indigenous scholar, Mary Hermes, in her research with non-Indigenous teachers of Native Americans in Minnesota, has found that “more powerful than [teachers’] knowledge of cultural difference is their knowledge of the big picture – the context of socioeconomic and cultural oppression of Native Americans” (2005, p. 21). The big picture she refers to is an understanding of historic and present-day oppression that impacts the lives of Indigenous students. She also found that successful white American teachers of Indigenous students had an understanding of their own position as European-Americans in relationship to colonization. These teachers understood that their position required them to not exist solely in an expert teacher role, but also as a learner of Indigenous culture. Not only were these teachers aware of their position in relationship to the Native American oppression, but they were aware of the negative stereotypes and prejudices they held towards Native Americans and that these needed to be unlearned. Hermes states, “In an important way, it is this appropriate discomfort with and critical reflection upon their own whiteness that positions these teachers as allies and underpins their success” (ibid., p. 18).

In an attempt to get her teacher candidates to comprehend the bigger picture, Haig-Brown (2009) highlights the connections of her teacher candidates to the land they are on and the history of the land. She begins her pre-service education courses with telling her students that the “foundations of Canadian education are land and Aboriginal people” (ibid., p. 7). They examine Indigenous experiences with education in Canada including, “land claims, the Indian Act, treaties, and tuition agreements” (ibid.). She later asks her teacher candidates to write “decolonizing autobiographies”, through which they are to consider their relationship to the land they are currently on at the moment and those who walked this same land previously. She asks them to think about the historic footprints that exist in the space that they now call home and where the bodies belonging to these footprints have gone. She also asks them to trace their family histories – the steps that brought them to the land. The decolonizing autobiographies help to deepen discussions about “race, colonization, Diaspora,
class, gender and decolonization” (ibid., p. 15). Through her pre-service courses, Haig-Brown encourages students to understand the big picture and reflect on themselves in relationship to Indigenous peoples. One of her students reflected on his learning in this way, “Not until being asked to consider my relationship to the land and the original people who live on it was I able to learn how to listen and therefore learn differently” (ibid.).

Knowledge of the big picture of colonialism also means focusing on how racial identities are constructed. Carol Schick and Verna St. Denis (2003 & 2005) have employed a critical anti-racist approach in their courses with mostly white teacher candidates in Saskatchewan to help them understand their positionality in racial/colonial systems. Since their work is based in the province of Saskatchewan, where Indigenous peoples are the largest population produced as ‘other’, they particularly focus their teacher-education curriculum on “exploring the racialized positioning of white pre-service teachers with respect to Aboriginal peoples” (2005, p. 297). Their pedagogy begins with readings which highlight the ways that some knowledge is socially and materially valued while other knowledge is marginalized (2003). They then offer a visual of a “power triangle” to explain how inequalities operate at the personal, systemic, and ideological levels (ibid., p. 59). With this simplified analysis and a set of readings, students explore the productions of interlocking identities – how these are related to each other and how dominant identities rely on marginalized identities for definition (ibid.). They focus mostly on race privilege through these interlocking identities and how racial identities are produced in the specific context of nation building.

They then engage teacher candidates in reflective writing about their own positionalities, after a process of examining power relations (Schick & St. Denis, 2003). Through these autobiographies, teacher candidates are given the opportunity to reflect on their own family histories and social construction and to analyze the basis for granting or denying privileges (ibid.). Through their teacher candidates’ writings, they have identified the three common ideological assumptions which can be a challenge to student learning. (In the previous section I discussed these assumptions.) Throughout the course, they highlight and discuss these common assumptions in a pedagogical process of countering their effect on learning. This process often brings teacher candidates to the point of challenging their own worldviews in relationship to whiteness and Canadian nationhood.
Susan Dion helps her teacher candidates to disrupt the self/other binary through an exercise titled, “the file of (un)certainties” (2009, pp. 177-190). In this exercise, teacher candidates are asked to find artifacts from their own personal histories “that reflect their relationship with Aboriginal people or learning from ‘indigenous knowledge’” (ibid., p. 180). They then have the opportunity to examine these artifacts in relationship to the stories (Aboriginal ways of knowing, history, culture, stories of colonialism) represented in Aboriginal artists’ works (ibid.). It is the teacher candidates’ personal stories, juxtaposed with the stories of Aboriginal artists, that help teacher candidates come to an understanding of themselves in relationship to Indigenous peoples. They investigate their relationship to historic and ongoing colonization in Canada through critical self-reflection on this relationship (ibid.). This critical self-reflection can lead to an understanding of oneself as a product of history and an understanding of complicity in that history. One of her students used an artifact from the summer camp she attended as a child. In her reflections she stated,

“In not forgetting, I attempt to take on the responsibility of acknowledging this history, of not erasing but rather allowing myself to work through the uncomfortable awareness that the land I have the luxury to live on, attend summer camp on, and call my country was founded upon the attempted and violent erasure of Aboriginal peoples (Dion, 2007, p. 337).

Another example of pedagogy which disrupts the Settler self/indigenous other binary is a discussion of treaty rights. Cannon (forthcoming(a)) notes (via Tyler McCreary) that the late Professor Patricia Monture asked her classes, “Who here has treaty rights?” (McCreary, 2005, p. 6). When none of the white students in the class raised their hand, she went on to explain that treaties are documents of relationships, so settlers have treaty rights too. For example, “First Nations granted settlers the right to an independent economy based on agriculture” (ibid, p. 8). Rights to certain resources were also granted, but not to sub-surface resources such as oil. McCreary’s experience of Monture’s pedagogy led him (a white Canadian settler) to come to a more personalized understanding of his responsibility in relationship to Indigenous peoples (Cannon, forthcoming(a)).

**Conclusion**

While there are a variety of ways to implement curriculum and pedagogy related to Indigeneity and settler colonialism, it is clear that critical Indigenous scholars and their allies are calling for an examination of structures of power and racialized and national identity
making processes that produce and reproduce those structures. Razack (1998) states, “As long as we see ourselves as not implicated in relations of power, as innocent, we cannot begin to walk the path of social justice and to thread our way through the complexities of power relations” (p. 22). These scholars are calling for anti-racist/anti-colonial education in teacher education to provide an opportunity for non-Indigenous peoples to understand their own complicity and responsibility in colonialism. Although we know that the scholars listed above are trying such pedagogies in their own teacher education courses, what is needed now is to determine if and how settler colonialism is broadly represented in teacher education programs and explore what might be done to create a pedagogy aimed at settler responsibility.

There are specific challenges to developing such a pedagogy. The dominant discourse of multiculturalism in Canada is often invisible in educational spaces, yet it exists to structure pedagogies towards cultural inclusion as the solution to racial/colonial inequalities. Anti-colonial pedagogy needs to engage with the myth of Canadian multiculturalism in order to highlight its false promises and real consequences and to move from a cultural lens towards one which engages with relations of power (Simpson, et al., 2011). The dominance of underlying assumptions of cultural discontinuity, incommensurability, and enculturation also lead educators to pedagogies where cultural inclusion is seen as a solution to societal ills – an education through which Indigenous peoples are to overcome oppression and non-Indigenous people are to no longer oppress. Although cultures are impacted by racism and colonialism, engaging with culture alone does not change the effects of racism and colonialism.

Anti-racism and critical whiteness pedagogies have been tried as anti-colonial pedagogy, with some success and also major challenges. These pedagogies, specifically aimed at engaging white people in an understanding of the ways they reproduce identities of superiority/inferiority through colonial encounters, often leave Indigenous sovereignty out of the picture. Without the framework of land and sovereignty, Indigenous peoples are seen as a racially oppressed group, fighting for rights within the Canadian nation state. Additionally, teacher educators run into many challenges in using whiteness pedagogies to engage white students in an understanding of their own complicity. They are confronted with a variety of emotional responses that can either hinder or help such learning, and with national ideologies that teacher candidates claim as truth. Sometimes whiteness pedagogies also add to the
oppression of Indigenous students and students of colour to whom these pedagogies do not particularly speak. Additionally, a focus on whiteness does not allow for people of colour to understand how they are also implicated in colonialism.

Pedagogies which centre the land and Indigenous sovereignty are less prevalent in teacher education programs, however there are indications in other social spaces of the challenges such pedagogies would encounter. The extreme dehumanization of Indigenous peoples as understood through inquests of Indigenous deaths in custody and trials related to violence against Indigenous peoples indicates that pedagogies focused on the land would give rise to similar extreme dehumanization at the hands of teacher candidates. The question then arises as to how to deal with such dehumanizing internalized ideologies about Indigenous peoples as pre-modern, and almost, already dead. Is highlighting the construction of these ideologies enough to counter the strong desire to remake the settler self? If not, what more might be necessary?

It is notable that the approaches outlined in the final section in this chapter most commonly address the historic and present-day relationships between settlers and Indigenous peoples through engaging the teacher candidates in a process of self-reflexivity. With the exception of Patricia Monture’s treaty pedagogy, the pedagogies highlighted above are not necessarily centred on Indigenous sovereignty or land. Rather, they (perhaps first) attempt to engage students in a disruption of dominant norms and ideologies. Dion’s approach, for example, takes into account the capacity of white students to resist such learning and the understanding that white students’ learning about colonialism requires a long-term approach (2007, p. 331). Rather than centring her pedagogy on Indigenous sovereignty, she centres it on “a process that will provide the possibility for the individual to, “as Gramsci says, ‘know thyself” as a product of the historical process to date” (ibid., p. 334, as cited in Sarris, 1993 p. 153).
CHAPTER THREE
Methodology:
A Critical Discourse Analysis of the OISE ITE Curriculum

Introduction
Non-Indigenous teachers need to understand their own positionality in relationship to colonialism in order to teach that understanding to their students. Ladson-Billings notes that most of the pre-service and in-service teachers that she works with have not developed their own socio-political consciousness and therefore do not know how to help students develop this understanding as well (2008, pp. 171-172). To Ladson-Billings, the development of a socio-political consciousness is an important part of culturally relevant pedagogy, in which the primary goal is to improve the lives of poor students of colour (ibid.). As I have argued throughout this thesis, a socio-political consciousness is also important for teachers and teacher candidates who are working with white settlers.

All teachers start their careers in teacher education programs. This requirement makes it an opportune space for acquiring an understanding of their social positioning. This opportunity is, of course, impeded to some degree by other political and financial requirements of the institution to be accountable to forces outside of the institution. However, a 2008 study found that most of the power in how to educate teachers lies in the hands of the educational institutions and their governing bodies (Gambhir, Broad, Evans, & Gaskell, 2008, p. 9). These institutions are imbedded in the same colonial and racist systems as the rest of society, so those of us who advocate for infusion of social justice education within teacher education programs are contending with dominant discourses and structures, which are intended to keep power in the hands of the already powerful.

Nonetheless, there is some room in teacher education to focus on alternative discourses. A study of ITE programs in 2008 concluded that the most frequently mentioned themes were, “some variation of ‘producing competent professionals’ with an emphasis on knowledge and skills along with specific competencies, as well as references to social justice
and equity: ‘respect for diversity’ and producing ‘reflective’ teachers” (Gambhir, et al., 2008, p. 15, quoting Crocker & Dibbon, 2008). These themes suggest the possibility for pedagogies aimed at social justice and equity in teacher education programs. Thus, teacher education is an important space and a space filled with possibility.

**Research Area and Data Sources**

*OISE/UT – BEd in secondary education: A case sample*

This study is localized in the consecutive secondary program in the Initial Teacher Education (ITE) program at OISE/UT for several reasons. OISE is committed to equity and social justice in education and society and they are one of the largest teacher education programs in Ontario. Additionally, the consecutive secondary program, the largest of the ITE programs, is where one might expect more explicit content on settler colonialism since these future teachers will teach students with higher-level cognitive abilities. Within this program, I am focusing on the curriculum in the three foundations courses. These courses are required for all students, and thus provide a solid base of understanding about that which all teacher candidates educated in the consecutive secondary program at OISE/UT are expected to learn.

The OISE/UT ITE program purports a strong focus on social justice, which is exemplified through the following description:

> OISE is strongly committed to the values of equity and social justice for all students and the schools where we work. These values are foundational principles of each of our programs and an explicit focus within our course work. There is an expectation that all courses embrace and infuse these principles through discussion and application (OISE, 2012c, p. 4)\(^{10}\).

OISE’s commitment to social justice in education is not entirely unique in Ontario\(^{11}\) or in Canada (Gambhir, et al., 2008), yet their explicit focus lends itself to expectations for the existence of alternative discourses in contrast with other institutions, which may not explicitly state such a focus. Equity and social justice are especially emphasized in certain courses, such as School and Society and the Teacher Education Seminar, but are also

---

\(^{10}\) Although this publication is for the 2012-2013 program year and the wording may have changed from previous years, the same sentiment can be found at the OISE ITE website.

\(^{11}\) For the Métis Education Study, the other research assistants and I reviewed teacher education program websites and noted that out of the 13 teacher education programs in Ontario, several programs included an emphasis on social justice in their program descriptions.
expected to be infused into all the courses (OISE, 2012a). Additionally, the Learner Document\textsuperscript{12}, which provides a basic overview of the learning expectations for teacher candidates at OISE, states that graduates of the program will, “[u]nderstand themselves as change agents and community members committed to act in socially just and environmentally responsible ways” (OISE, Dec. 2011b). Not only does OISE expect their teacher candidates to learn how to teach for equity and justice, but they also expect them to act in the larger community for social justice. Translating these broad expectations to teaching and acting for equality and justice in relationship to colonialism in Canada seems to be in line with the expectations outlined. The values of the program seem to match the end goals I outlined in chapter one – for teachers and their students to become allies and take action with Indigenous people in their struggles for equality and justice.

Other teacher education programs in Ontario and Canada may or may not have a similar focus or even a more explicit focus on settler colonialism. A study of teacher education programs in Ontario found that programs located in close proximity to rural Indigenous communities, enrolling a larger number of Indigenous students, or those with an Aboriginal-specific programs tended to have more Indigenous content in their curriculum.\textsuperscript{13} As such, OISE is not a representative case for other teacher education programs in Ontario, in Canada, or elsewhere. A larger study of teacher education programs provincially or nationally may be useful in the future to understand and inform learning expectations in regards to settler colonialism on a broader scale.

Although OISE may not be representative of other teacher education programs, it is an important space for such a study for another reason: it is one of the largest teacher education programs in Ontario.\textsuperscript{14} OISE graduates approximately 1100 prospective new teachers yearly. In the consecutive secondary program alone, there are approximately 700 students (OISE, 2012a). It is important to understand the kinds of opportunities such a large number of teacher candidates are given to learn about settler colonialism in their ITE program.

\textsuperscript{12} See Appendix B
\textsuperscript{13} From the Métis Education Study
\textsuperscript{14} This information also comes from the Métis Education Study review of teacher education program websites and general collection of information about teacher education programs in Ontario. Two other programs in Ontario are close in size – Nippising University and York University.
I have focused this study specifically in the consecutive secondary program because it is the largest of the possible programs and currently the shortest in length. There are four different possible ITE programs to enrol in at OISE – the consecutive, the concurrent, the Master of Arts (MA) in Child Study, and the Master of Teaching (MT) program. The consecutive program requires seven total courses, two practicum placements, and an internship in one year of study. The other three programs are longer and have different course requirements. The concurrent program and the MT are also held to expectations of the Learner Document and therefore, this study may contribute to the future development of those programs as well.

Within the secondary program there is at least equivalent and perhaps greater possibility of finding content about settler colonialism and complicity than the elementary program. Those teacher candidates who graduate from the secondary education program are recommended for Ontario teaching certification to teach intermediate/senior (grades 7-12). It is the nature of teacher education programs to combine theory and practice (Gambhir, et al., 2008). If teacher-educators are planning their courses in a way that links the curriculum in their classrooms to the curriculum teacher candidates may be teaching to their future students, information about settler colonialism is more likely to exist in secondary education in a way that emphasizes critical self-reflection on positionality. Understanding oneself as complicit in settler colonialism requires a sense of responsibility, something that we cannot expect from younger children in the same way that we can from older children and youth. Teachers in the secondary school are more likely to engage in pedagogy which raises students’ socio-political consciousness. That said, there are other ways that settler colonialism can be introduced to students at the elementary level and work to infuse “Aboriginal Education” into the curriculum has taken place in the elementary education program (Stewart-Rose & Montemurro, 2011). It may be worthwhile in the future to conduct a similar study at the elementary level.

Since the consecutive program is one year in length, I decided to study the curriculum offered in the three required courses during 2011-2012. As I mentioned in the introduction, consecutive teacher education programs in Ontario will be expanding to 2 years in length at the beginning of 2014 (Rushowy, 2012). Now is as good of a time as any to understand what is being done to perhaps inform changes that may be made when the program expands.
**Why curricula?**

I have chosen to focus on the curriculum in the ITE program for two main reasons. The first has to do with the saliency of curricula in the way that it is often regarded as reality in Euro-centric dominant spaces. The second has to do with what the curriculum can tell us about that which teacher candidates are expected to learn. As with any methodological choice, this one has its strengths as well as its weaknesses and in this section I highlight some of these.

In my teacher education program in the U.S. in the late 1990’s, much of the curriculum focused on the nuts and bolts of teaching – how to manage a classroom, how to create a lesson plan, what the laws were around reporting child abuse, etc. At the time, I was not as equipped with the critical thinking skills that I have since developed and most of what we learned through education courses was not about critically questioning the content presented or engaging in a social justice-focused analysis of it. Instead, I thought I was learning how to be a good teacher. The curriculum I was presented with represented the reality of good teaching to me.

I was not alone in thinking that curricular documents contained almost absolute truth. The view of knowledge as objective and neutral truth is an ideology that is deeply embedded in society and especially in university spaces. Canadian universities were founded on Euro-centric notions that certain types of knowledge were superior to others and this view has persisted in Canadian academies. Particularly, knowledge that was produced by keeping the researcher separate from their research was valued; the idea being that this distance would contribute to the ability to remain neutral. Today, knowledge in the academy is still commonly valued for its rationality, objectivity, logic, and neutrality (Schick, 2002, pp. 109-110). Because the academy is often viewed as objective and neutral, the curriculum used in the academy is also viewed in this light. When curricula are embedded with dominant discourses and they are viewed as neutral truth, the dominant discourses are normalized (Schick & St. Denis, 2005). Therefore, what exists in the curriculum can either reify or resist dominant discourses that exist in society at large.

Additionally, curricular documents are an expression of the knowledge that is deemed as a valuable contribution to the learning process. These written words are not the only content that students learn, but they do often provide a basis for what is to be taught. The
curricula in teacher education programs reflect what is deemed important for teacher candidates to know. What is chosen for inclusion as well as what is not chosen for inclusion in curricula are important signifiers of learning expectations. One may argue that the content of the curriculum does not matter as much as developing critical thinking skills. However, I contend that critical thinking skills are important, but not enough. To come to an understanding of complicity in settler colonialism the curriculum must also counter the hegemonic hold that dominant discourses have over what is represented and how it is represented.

This curriculum analysis has its limits in what it can tell us. While I can uncover what is being represented or not being represented about Indigenous people and settler colonialism in the course materials, I will not find out how teacher educators actually take up these representations in their classrooms. For example, they may use a part of the curriculum that reconfirms a focus on Indigenous culture to examine and critique the dominant discourse of multiculturalism. Course instructors may decide to use particular resources for a variety of different reasons, which I cannot know through a curriculum analysis. To gain a more thorough understanding of whether or not dominant discourses are reified or resisted in teacher education classrooms would require additional methods, such as observations and interviews with teacher educators and teacher candidates. However, a curriculum analysis lends itself to a greater understanding of learning expectations and possibilities for the existence of alternative discourses in teacher education.

Required courses

The consecutive secondary teacher-education program at OISE/UT requires all teacher candidates to take three courses: Teacher Education Seminar (TES), Psychological Foundations of Learning and Development (PF), and School and Society (S&S). I have analyzed the curricular materials in each of these three foundations courses. In this section I will describe each of these three courses, all of which are supposed to infuse the principles of equity and social justice and reflect the expectations of the Learner Document.

Teacher Education Seminar (TES)

Out of the three required courses, TES is the only course that is a full year long. The curriculum in TES covers six core themes: the Ontario secondary school program; legal responsibilities, ethics and professionalism; special education; effective learning
environments and classroom management; assessment and evaluation; and diversity, equity & social justice (OISE, 2012a). All TES instructors in the secondary program are offered a template to use for their syllabus which contains the course description, expectations, where to find the course readings, and course evaluations. The instructors then change the syllabus as they wish, but many maintain the same template and keep it generic, choosing to provide a more detailed description of what will take place in the course in another way.  Although there may be as many as 3 different classes and instructors for each TES cohort, the instructors for a single cohort teach the same curriculum.

The course description in the generic syllabus contains an emphasis on the theme of social justice. “As with all courses at OISE, a fundamental theme is that of education for social justice; this theme is addressed in our curriculum, in our pedagogy and in the climate of our classrooms.” The main goals of the course are for teacher candidates to understand the process of becoming a teacher, develop an identity as a teacher, and provide a foundation for continued professional growth. The assignments listed are also generic, but sometimes adjusted by specific course instructors slightly to account for the specific theme of the cohort.

**Psychological Foundations of Learning and Development (PF)**

PF is a semester-long course that focuses on how children and adolescents develop and learn cognitively, emotionally, and physically (OISE, 2012a). PF also focuses on six core themes: teacher expertise, human development, cognitive approaches to learning, motivation, individual diversity, and classroom environment and classroom management (ibid). The same textbook, *Educational Psychology, the 5th Canadian edition*, is used as required reading in every course.

**School and Society (S&S)**

S&S is a semester-long course that aims to introduce students to issues stemming from the “complex relationship between schools and the society in which they are embedded” (OISE, 2012a). All S&S courses are to cover this relationship through philosophical, political, sociological, historical and anthropological lenses, depending upon

---

15 When inquiring over email to specific TES instructors for their course syllabus, those who responded told me that the course syllabus is generic in nature, but the TES Reader Table of Contents and the “Scope and Sequence” would provide more information of relevance for my research.

16 Students in the consecutive secondary program in 2011-2012 were divided into ten different thematic cohorts (OISE, 2012b). Students indicate their cohort of choice during the application process. Students in the same cohort take their required courses together throughout the year.
the area of expertise of individual instructors. Some of the key themes covered in S&S include: “The variety and purposes of schooling; Contemporary goals of education; Student diversity and difference; Democracy, conflict, and resistance in schools; Family and community relationships with schools; How schools are organized; and Teachers' identities” (OISE, 2012a). There is no common course pack or textbook for the various cohorts of S&S. Each individual instructor creates their own curriculum for the course.

There have been efforts in the past to share ideas and resources between these S&S courses. In 2008, Wells studied the School and Society curricula by surveying teacher candidates and conducting interviews with instructors (2008). She wrote a report with the intention of highlighting core curriculum suggestions as well as resource suggestions for these core curriculum components (ibid., draft p. 2). The report highlights the key understandings, conceptual frameworks, teaching strategies, assignments and resources used by S&S instructors. Wells recommended that the resources, assignments, and teaching practices highlighted in the report be accessible to all S&S instructors for voluntary use.

This report also pointed out some of the major systemic issues related to School and Society courses, some of which are important for contextualizing my analysis. One of the major challenges is the tension between theory and practice (Wells, 2008, draft p. 5; see also Gambhir, et al., 2008). The tension refers to the desire of students to gain practical skills for teaching at the expense of focusing on critical social theories. Wells notes that some S&S instructors expected other ITE courses to focus more on practical applications of critical social theories. However, many times what is taught in TES and curriculum courses are practical applications of dominant theories which re-inscribe social inequalities (Wells, 2008, draft p. 7). Additionally the report emphasized the tension between individualized and systemic approaches to issues of schooling and noted that the concept of a “universal student” may be embedded in other ITE courses, such as PF (ibid., p. 8). This concept is in conflict with the focus of School and Society courses on understanding the construction and reproduction of different social identities.

---

Wells describes this tension as being a result of anxious students in a short program who want to know how to teach (2008, p. 5). In Well’s words this is “anti-intellectualism” (ibid, p.6), however I would say that it is also a misunderstanding of theory as it relates to practice, which I know, from personal experience, happens often amongst white working class people.
**Document Analysis and Critical Discourse Analysis**

In this research, I employ a document analysis and more specifically a form of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). Document analysis is defined as the examination and interpretation of data in documents to elicit meanings and develop empirical knowledge (Bowen, 2009, p. 27). Documents can be printed or electronic and the analysis can be of the text or non-text elements in the documents (Mason, 2011, p. 103). With document analysis one could examine the text, pictures, sequence, resources, nature of the document, its intended audience, the author, and the social and political context of the text, as well as other features (ibid.). While engaging in an analysis of many of these features may prove useful for future research, in this study I focused explicitly on the written or oral text in the syllabi and required readings (some of which were videos or websites).

As my objective was not only to understand and interpret what was in these documents, but to do so with a critique of how dominant discourses were either supported or resisted in the text, I employed Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). The main aim of CDA is to understand “the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context” (van Dijk, 2001, p. 352). In my research I have taken a position that the dominant discourse of multiculturalism and cultural inclusion should be problematized in teacher education programs and an examination of settler colonial complicity should be alternatively present. My goal in using CDA is to disrupt and resist dominant ways of representing the relationship between Indigenous people, settlers, and others and to point to the possibilities of alternative discourses.

CDA stems out of critical theory dating back to the neo-Marxist theories of the Frankfurt school, pre-World War II (van Dijk, 2001, p. 352; Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p. 6). Critical theory emphasized the importance of interdisciplinary examinations of society in order to critique and produce political emancipatory action (Wodak & Mayer, 2009, pp. 6 – 7). It emanated from Western Europe and posited that social research should be focused on critiquing and changing society rather than just understanding and explaining it (ibid.).

CDA became a formal methodology in the early 1990s (Wodak & Mayer, 2009, p. 3). CDA theories and methods vary, but are united by several common principles including: that language is a social practice and the context of that language is crucial for understanding, that
research must be oriented towards critiquing and changing society, and that a method of this critique is to expose the oft-hidden beliefs imbedded in hegemony (ibid.). A central concern of CDA is in understanding how power is maintained through discourse (ibid.).

CDA is a western, Euro-centric methodology with a basis in Euro-centric worldviews. As such, I must question whether or not it can be employed in a project that has the political goal of decolonizing (Absolon, 2011). Is a Euro-centric method which employs critique of power structures in society useful for this purpose? Whether or not it is useful, does it contribute to the continued dominance of western knowledge? Through my research, I struggled with these questions in the same way that I struggle to know how best to engage other critical western theoretical frameworks. The dominance of western knowledge leaves me not wanting to contribute to that dominance, but also recognizing that the theories may be useful to my work. The question of how to engage in dominant western theories in the academy without reifying their dominance is one that I have not yet found any definitive answers to and will continue to ask.

In this study I employ CDA in a way similar to how Schick and St. Denis (2003) use CDA to analyze the utterances of their pre-service teachers for underlying ideological assumptions. They sought to uncover the worldview or framework underlying what was being said in response to the content they covered in their anti-racism education course and determined that these utterances fell under three popular ideological assumptions (ibid.). In my study, I first uncovered how information about Indigenous peoples, settlers and colonialism existed in the text and then analyzed this information through an understanding of the dominant discourses surrounding Indigenous peoples and settler colonialism, as outlined in chapter two. I sought to inquire into that which is currently “sayable” and which is not “sayable” in curricular materials (Jäger & Meier, 2009, p. 37) regarding colonialism. That which is sayable is shapes what is considered to be reality (ibid., p. 39), and in this case, shapes what future teachers will bring into their classrooms.

**Data Collection and Analysis**

**Data collection**

A textual analysis and CDA required the collection of syllabi used for TES, PF, and S&S in 2011-2012 and the required resources used in the curriculum. Since syllabi are sometimes seen as the intellectual property of the instructor, sometimes public, sometimes
private, and sometimes seen as the property of the institution for which they are written, I needed to check with the ethics review board about whether or not such a study would require a review. Once I received a message from the ethics review board that my study could be considered exempt from review, I began contacting individual course instructors to ask them if they would be willing to submit their syllabus for this study. Although most of the responses I received were positive in nature, I realized that I would need some help from the ITE consecutive secondary program administrators in order to collect the number of syllabi necessary for an empirical study. Through this process, I also learned that there is a review process for studying the ITE program at OISE and I submitted an information sheet about my study to the Research Advisory Committee (RAC). Once the RAC approved my study, I was able to touch base with the consecutive secondary program administrators about the copies of syllabi that they had on file.

The RAC decided it would be best to make the syllabi anonymous prior to giving them to me and to provide individual course instructors a way to opt out of having their syllabus submitted to my study. I drafted an email, which I sent to the program administrators and they sent out along with their own message explaining the process of exemption and maintaining anonymity. Once the allotted time, by when course instructors were to declare their exemption, had passed, the program administrators made copies of the syllabi they had on file, except for those who had opted out, and remove all identifying information.

In total, from my efforts to collect syllabi directly from teacher-educators over email and from the copies I received from the ITE program administrators, I received 32 course syllabi out of a total of 55 possible for the 2011-2012 year. Although I was able to acquire more than half of the syllabi from the program, they were not evenly distributed between the three courses: 14 were from TES, 5 were from PF, and 13 were from S&S. I will go into detail about the specifics regarding these syllabi for each course in the data analysis section below.

---

18 See Appendix C.
19 The email I sent is attached in Appendix D.
20 See Appendix E.
21 These combined emails are attached in Appendix F.
22 I did not receive the rest of the syllabi for two different reasons: 1. Individual course instructors indicated to either me personally or the program administrators that they did not want their syllabus to be included in my study, and 2. The ITE consecutive secondary program did not have the syllabi on file to be able to send to me.
Once I received the syllabi, I began to collect the required course readings and other materials indicated in the syllabi. I focused only on the required readings because these are the readings that more readily define learning expectations. Optional readings are only read by some students, while the required readings are expected of all students so that they may be able to participate in class discussions and complete assignments. Most of these required readings I acquired through the University of Toronto library or online, and some I needed to request through inter-library loan. In total, I reviewed 195 different resources that were required readings for these three foundational courses.

Data analysis

As I mentioned earlier in this chapter, I focused my analysis of these documents mostly around the actual text. There are many other areas, both internal and external to the documents themselves that could have been analyzed in the same way. These include but are not limited to: document pictures and cartoons, authors’ backgrounds and political beliefs, the context in which the documents were written and the theoretical frameworks and/or practices that informed the documents. I chose to analyze only the actual text (in the majority of cases) because I believe that within these documents, the text of the syllabi and the required readings are the space where discourses are most readily communicated to students. After all, if students themselves are not engaging in a process to find out more about the factors external to the text itself, such as the authors’ backgrounds or the context in which the text was written, these things do not matter so much to their learning as what is actually communicated.

In my analysis of these documents I asked questions to help me discover how Indigenous peoples, settlers, and colonialism existed within the text and what learning expectations about settler colonialism were embedded in these representations. I asked the following questions:

- Were Indigenous peoples mentioned? If so how were they represented? Was it related to culture? Identity? Language? Race?
- Was settler colonialism mentioned? Was it located in North America or elsewhere? Was it located only in history or also in the present?

23 There were some required resources in both S&S and TES that I was unable to acquire and 12 resources written in French that I was unable to analyze because I do not speak French.
• Did the curriculum include an anti-racist framework? If so, how were Indigenous peoples included into that framework? Was colonialism present in this framework?
• Was the concept of self/other binary highlighted and thereby disrupted? Did this happen in relationship to the settler/indigenous binary?
• Did the syllabi and readings include encouragement to critically self-reflect on teacher candidates’ own social positionality? Was this specifically in relationship to settler colonialism?

I created a colour-coding system for one level of identifying this information in the text. The system was as follows:

• Pink = Indigenous people
• Green = colonialism or settler colonialism
• Yellow = racism, broadly defined (but including a power analysis)
• Orange = highlighting or disrupting a self/other binary
• Blue = encouragement of critical self-reflection on social positionality

I initially read through the syllabi with an eye on these questions and used the colour coding to mark the syllabi based on my reading of them. This was the first level of analysis. I then read through all of the required readings that I had collected and took notes in answer to the questions listed above. Once I had notes on all of the required documents, I went through them and colour-coded them as well. For the required readings, I used these colour codings to also signify if the code was one of the main topics of the article or if it was more of a minor part. To recognize the difference, I highlighted the name of the article if it was a main focus and marked a dot beside the name if it was a minor part.

Once I had all my colour codings in place, I could more easily see what was relevant. For example, I could see where colonialism or settler colonialism was a main focus of an article and whether or not the settler self/indigenous other binary was somehow highlighted and disrupted as well. I could see which articles focused on Indigenous people and whether or not they also focused on colonialism or settler colonialism. I could see the number of articles that focused on racism and mentioned Indigenous people without talking about colonialism. These colour codings aided my ability to synthesize the information and see patterns.
As I read the syllabi and articles, I also made notes of other patterns I was noticing that were related to settler colonialism but not a part of my initial questioning. For example, when reading the assigned readings for School and Society, I began to notice that Indigenous peoples were often mentioned as an example of the main topic of the article and that sometimes this was explicitly in the context of the Canadian or U.S. nation state. As another example, I noticed that many of the articles specifically referenced spaces in the U.S., rather than Canada, and that even those articles that did not specifically reference a space were often written by a scholar who was working in an American university at the time of the publication. Additionally, I took note of the documents that were obviously officially government sponsored or affiliated/regulated (i.e. documents from the Ontario Ministry of Education).

My analysis and coding process was the same for all the documents that I read. However, there were other major differences in how I went about this research in each of the three foundations courses. I describe these specificities below.

**School and Society**

According to the Master Timetable for the consecutive Intermediate/Senior program in 2011-2012 there were 19 different School and Society courses. For this study, I was able to collect 13 of the syllabi used in these courses. Out of these 13 syllabi, eight were quite different from each other. The other five were very similar to one or two others, presumably because they were written by the same course instructor (an instructor who taught more than one School and Society course, for example) or because the instructors collaborated on their syllabi. Two of these syllabi were authored by one of the critical Indigenous scholars heavily cited in this thesis. All in all, I accessed, read, and analyzed 97 different resources out of a total of 122 listed as required reading in these 13 syllabi.

**Teacher Education Seminar**

As I mentioned previously in this chapter, the syllabus for TES is based on a generic template, which does not provide any information about the specific readings in each course.

---

24 A few of the similar syllabi contained one or two different required readings.
25 Two of these syllabi that were exactly the same did not contain any resources or timeline of the topics covered. These two syllabi also seemed to be missing a page, as the numbered assignments jumped from #2 to #4. One other syllabus also did not contain a timeline and listed a plethora of resources that were not listed as required. Many of these resources were full-length books. Because I was choosing to focus on the required readings listed, I was only able to analyze the text contained in these three syllabi. This amounted to the course description and assignments listed.
Although I received a total of 14 TES syllabi (out of a total possible 18), they did not provide me with enough information about the TES curriculum to do a thorough analysis. Fortunately, I also received a “Scope and Sequence” from two different cohorts, which contained a timeline of topics covered and assignments due and a list of required readings for the course. From a third cohort I received a list of topics covered and recommended readings. This information covered three out of 14 cohorts. Since each TES class in these cohorts used the same curriculum, the information I received from these three cohorts covered the curriculum used in a total of 6 TES classes (out of a total of 18 possible).

Rather than analysing the TES template syllabus, I analyzed the additional documents I received from these three cohorts. The three cohorts are Teaching and Learning for Change in Urban Schools; School, Community and Global Connections; and The Arts. In chapter 5, I will describe these three cohorts to make an argument as to why I would be just as likely to find information on settler colonialism in these three cohorts as in any of the remaining cohorts. Because I was unable to collect more complete information from the other cohorts on what is presented in TES courses, I am limited in what I can say at the institutional level about TES courses. However, I am still able to make some important observations about what is happening in these three cohorts and suggestions for what could be happening in other cohorts.

In this study, I analyzed the required readings from the Teaching and Learning for Change in Urban Schools and School, Community, and Global Connections cohorts and all of the readings listed in the Arts cohort. All in all, from these three TES cohorts, I analyzed 108 (out of 126 possible) required and recommended readings. Several of the readings were required or recommended for two or even all three of the cohorts studied.

**Psychological Foundations of Learning and Development**

I was only able to collect 5 syllabi (out of 18) for PF because course instructors opted to keep their syllabus out of my study or the consecutive secondary program administrators did not have these on file. However, I had also learned through conversations with ITE program administrators that all PF courses use the same required textbook, Educational Psychology. In a search through the five syllabi that I collected, I noticed that the required text was quite heavily relied on in comparison to the few other resources listed as reference material, optional reading, or as choices for individuals to read and complete an assignment.
Because my analysis of syllabi would be limited to only the 5 I received, and because the required text was common among all 18 PF classes, I chose to focus my analysis for PF on the common textbook.

To conclude, my study of the curriculum in the consecutive secondary ITE program at OISE/UT, is aimed at understanding the learning expectations around settler colonialism for teacher candidates in this one-year program. My understanding of the goals of the program, to prepare teachers to be actors for social justice in school and society, leads me to believe that this study would be of interest to any teacher education program with similar goals. In chapters three and four, I engage in an empirical analysis as well as discussion of my findings from the three foundational courses in the ITE program.
CHAPTER FOUR
Findings: School and Society

Introduction

Kumashiro (2000) provides a framework for understanding four different approaches commonly used in anti-oppressive education, all of which and more, he believes, are necessary for real and lasting change. These four approaches he calls: education for the other, education about the other, education that is critical of privileging and othering, and education that changes students and society (ibid.). In my analysis of the School and Society curriculum, I found this framework of the four approaches helpful to describe what is currently being done in S&S courses. Therefore, I begin this chapter by describing Kumashiro’s four approaches, which Kumashiro (2002) makes clear are often blended and modified, rather than distinctively separate and characterized, as they are described below (p. 31). The value of characterizing them as distinctive strands for this study lies in also being able to connect to the strengths and weaknesses of what is currently happening in the S&S curriculum.

The first approach, education for the other, is that which attempts to reduce the harm caused to those who are ‘othered’ in the education system (2000, p. 29). Oppression is conceptualized as impacting students who are marginalized in the school system, both directly and indirectly, through actions like harassment or inaction to change structures that negatively impact these students (i.e. lack of funding for schools where marginalized students attend), or through negative assumptions and low expectations of marginalized students (2002, p. 33). The pedagogical response to oppression within this approach is for teachers to be aware of and affirm differences in their students, rather than assume that they fall into what is perceived to be normal (ibid., p. 36). Teachers should also focus on teaching to their specific students and understanding their differences. Modifying teaching to include curriculum for individual students based on differences is one strength of this approach. However, the weaknesses of this approach are that teaching to the other focuses on the other as the problem, assumes that one can know and understand the other, and assumes that teachers can adequately address the needs of othered students (ibid., p. 37).

The second approach, education about the other, stems from an understanding that
knowledge about the other is incomplete, distorted and misleading (Kumashiro, 2002, p.40). This approach seeks to correct these inaccuracies through inclusion of more and better information about others in the curriculum (ibid., p. 41). Some strengths of this approach are that it is aimed at all students, not just othered students, which allows all students to gain a better understanding of differences; it may encourage empathy for othered students; and it encourages the normalizing of differences (ibid., p. 42). However, there is also an underlying modernist assumption to this approach that knowledge can be complete (ibid.). This assumption can lead to the essentializing of othered students and to the positioning of the other as expert (ibid.). Kumashiro points out that the value of this second approach is in the way that it works against the historic harm of the other, but he also states, “while such efforts do help the Other, they do not necessarily bring about structural and systemic change, redefine normalcy, and disrupt processes that differentiate the Other from the privileged” (ibid., p. 44).

The third approach, education that is critical of privileging and othering, recognizes that systems of unequal power relations and ideologies are at the core of the oppression others face and highlights how these systems have come to be and continue to exist (Kumashiro, 2000, p. 37). Schools are considered as a vehicle for “reproducing the existing social order” and thus schools need to both critique the existing social order and act against their “own contributions to oppression” (Kumashiro, 2002, p. 45). In a similar vein, researchers and teachers call for an individual examination of positionality within systems of oppression on the part of both teachers and students (ibid., p. 46). Some of the strengths of this approach are that it calls for the development of critical thinking skills and focuses on changing society rather than just the space of the school (ibid., p. 47). The problems lie in that it focuses solely on structures of privilege and oppression, which do not always account for the particularities or variations of experiences depending upon locations and intersections of oppressions (ibid.).

The fourth approach, education that changes students and society, stems from a post-structuralist belief that oppression continues because oppressive discourses are continually reproduced (Kumashiro, 2000, p. 40). This approach addresses some of the holes in the first three approaches, including: “ways in which identities are shifting, ways in which knowledge is partial, and ways in which oppression is citationally produced” (Kumashiro, 2002, p.53).
Researchers and teachers examine resistance to the unlearning process that often takes place within anti-oppression education and the crisis that often occurs for individuals during this process (ibid.). They also examine both what is included in the curriculum and what is excluded and teach students to recognize the partiality of knowledge (ibid.). This fourth approach compliments the other three approaches, however, there are other approaches that should also be explored, particularly ones that do not come from a Eurocentric framework (ibid., p. 69).

I begin my analysis of the School and Society curriculum with a discussion of the curriculum which is for or about the indigenous ‘other’. I then move on to examine the ways that settler colonialism exists in the curriculum and how critical thinking is encouraged – whether or not it is settler colonialism and settler identities in North America. In the final section of this chapter, I describe what I found to be the most prevalent discourse related settler colonialism and Indigeneity in the S&S curriculum - that the nation state is good and necessary vehicle for addressing social inequalities.

**Curriculum For or About the Indigenous Other**

As I highlighted in chapter two, critical Indigenous scholars point to some of the same problems of cultural inclusion as Kumashiro does in the first two approaches - education for and about the other. A focus on the reclamation of Indigenous identities through culture is often seen as a crucial step in reducing educational disparities for Indigenous students, the theory being that they do poorly in school because they were stripped of their Indigenous identities through assimilation policies and practices (Friedel, 2010; St. Denis, 2007). Content on Indigenous history and culture is included for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous teacher candidates and is seen as an important piece of information for non-Indigenous teachers to know so they may reduce cultural discontinuity for Indigenous students and not unknowingly discriminate against them (St. Denis, 2011a). These pedagogies have their strengths in reducing the harm of the other (Kumashiro, 2002, p. 44), but as critical Indigenous scholars and Kumashiro (ibid.) point out, they are not enough. Curriculum for and about the other can be helpful at the same time that it is problematic and incomplete.

In the case of the School and Society curriculum, only two resources focused primarily on education for or about Indigenous students. These articles fortunately did not
include static representations of Indigenous culture and, instead, argued against the use of those representations. For example, in A Missing Link: Between Traditional Aboriginal Education and Western Systems of Education, non-Indigenous author Curwen-Doige points out that the way “Native Awareness” days are practiced in schools by highlighting Indigenous artifacts, dance, and dress, actually emphasize difference and create more distance between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people (2003, p.150). Rather than a focus on cultural inclusion, the curriculum that focused on an indigenous other in School and Society was geared toward the (re)telling of Indigenous people’s stories and incorporating traditional Indigenous ways of knowing into school curriculum. I want to focus a little here on these two pedagogies of education for or about the indigenous other to highlight what I see as positive aspects and potential pitfalls of these approaches.

Indigenous stories

The story that focused on the indigenous other concentrated on the oppression that Indigenous people faced and continue to face, and resistance to that oppression, rather than portraying Indigenous peoples purely as victims. In a chapter titled, My Mother Used to Dance, Indigenous author Valerie Bedassigae Pheasant tells a powerful story of personal resistance to oppression:

I refuse to accept the blame, and feel the guilt and shame this woman, this teacher, is trying to place on me. . . I start towards the door. She yells out at me, “I am not finished yet!” . . . I turn and distinctly reply, “yes, but I am.” My smile grows. (1994, pp. 39-40).

When I read this story, I was drawn to it. It was heartbreaking and liberating at the same time and through it I felt I could identify with the oppression that Bedassigae Pheasant faced. Razack (1998) theorizes my reaction to such stories in Looking White People in the Eye. She asserts that white people who listen to stories of racialized people have a tendency to appropriate pain and fear without needing to explore their own complicity in the oppression (p. 52). This story, being one of oppression, but also of liberation, left me not only appropriating pain but also appropriating a feeling of freedom. As a white settler woman, I am drawn to this type of story because it makes me feel good and in a way it lets me off the hook. However, I also agree with Razack that stories like this can be useful, when used along with an understanding of systems of hierarchal power and an examination of
positions within that hierarchy (1998, p. 49). They may also be effective for understanding the position of the self in relationship to an indigenous other if individual emotional reactions to them are analyzed in the context of social structures, as I have briefly done here (see Boler & Zembylas, 2003).

This story also reminded me of Susan and Michael Dion’s “Braiding Histories” stories. They wanted to (re)tell Indigenous peoples’ stories in a way that both honoured their strength and humanity and engaged teachers and students in a rethinking of their relationship to Indigenous people (Dion, 2009, p.177). However, what Dion found when working with teachers who were using those stories in their classrooms was that they related to the stories through a discursive framework of what is required of teachers (ibid., 83). The stories were at odds with the teachers’ desire to teach well, take care of their students emotionally, and nurture good citizens (ibid., p. 93-99). Teachers wanted their students to demonstrate concrete bits of knowledge from the stories and in so doing ended up focusing largely on culture; even when students tried to focus on the bigger picture, teachers would bring it back to bits of knowledge as recorded in a list form (ibid., p. 116-117). The stories contained difficult information to hear and as such teachers tried to shield their students from negative emotional experiences. They also focused on teaching students to learn from the mistakes of past Canadians, which left the stories disconnected from the present and the students (ibid., p. 97). Because of this dominant discursive framework of teaching and learning and the fact that teachers did not want to make a mistake in teaching about the indigenous other, teachers utilized the stories in a way that held Indigenous peoples to the identity of the “romantic, mythical other”.

The inclusion of Indigenous traditional ways of knowing

The focus on an indigenous other in School and Society curriculum also includes an emphasis for teachers to incorporate Indigenous traditional ways of knowing into the curriculum in order to create culturally appropriate curriculum for Indigenous students. The reason for this incorporation was to enhance Indigenous student’s identity. In A Missing Link, Curwen-Doige states,

The key point is that a culturally appropriate education for Aboriginal students must be holistic and as a teacher of Aboriginal students, I must be willing to engage students at a level of discussion where who they are is more important than the content of a course (2003, p.158, original emphasis).
You may recall from chapter two that critical Indigenous scholars, Friedel and St. Denis, among others, have asserted that a focus on identity formation is not enough to change the structures of power that oppress Indigenous peoples (Friedel, 2010a; St. Denis, 2007). They further argue that such a focus is potentially harmful for some individual students, since it has the tendency to encourage cultural fundamentalism and a hierarchy of authenticity—often creating conflict between Indigenous students. Although Curwen-Doige explains in this article that teachers need to acknowledge that not all Indigenous students will know their cultural heritage and they will hold differing ideas about spirituality (2003, p. 151), the focus on Indigenous traditional knowledges may still lead to essentialism, especially if non-Indigenous teacher candidates are not that familiar with Indigenous knowledges. However, Kumashiro also points out that such lessons on the other could be a catalyst for more learning and have the potential to be disruptive of dominant knowledges as well (2002, p. 43).

Critical Indigenous scholar, Marie Battiste (2002), has also called for integration of Indigenous knowledges into Canadian schools. However, this process is not a simple formula of incorporating Indigenous epistemologies into the already existing curriculum as Curwen-Doige suggests:

The extent to which Aboriginal epistemology is reflected in the curriculum determines the extent to which education can be culturally appropriate for Aboriginal students. The responsibility lies with the classroom teacher to accept and accommodate Aboriginal students in the pedagogy (2003, p. 151).

Rather, the call from critical Indigenous scholars for incorporating Indigenous knowledges into curricula is a complex call for decolonization in the classroom, the entire education system, and society. In *Indigenous Knowledge and Pedagogy in First Nations Education*, Battiste provides educational, legislative, and fiscal recommendations to the Canadian state by way of incorporating Indigenous knowledges (2002). Within the school itself, Battiste recognizes the need for an acknowledgement “that Canadian schools teach a silent curriculum of Eurocentric knowledge by the way teachers behave and the manner in which they transmit information” (2002, p. 30). She further states, “To affect reform, educators need to make a conscious decision to nurture Indigenous knowledge, dignity, identity, and integrity by making a direct change in school philosophy, pedagogy, and practice” (ibid.). Incorporating Indigenous knowledges into curricula in the way that Battiste
describes is no small task and may be incredibly difficult without a change to the philosophical underpinnings of the education system. An alternative suggestion is to start with disrupting Euro-centric knowledges by focusing on how we know what we know (Battiste, 2002; Razack, 1998).

**Curriculum about Colonialism**

Colonization, when it is mentioned, achieves the status of a cultural characteristic, pregiven and involving only Aboriginal people, not white colonizers. We may know how colonization changed Aboriginal people, but do we know how it changed and continues to change, white people? (Razack, 1998, p. 19).

Now I turn to take a closer look at how the big picture of colonialism exists in the School and Society curriculum. Often when speaking of colonialism, we focus on colonialism of the past, colonialism as it existed elsewhere, or the impacts of colonization on the indigenous other. As I defined in chapter one, settler colonialism is ongoing and active in the present as well as has implications from the past. In my analysis of the curriculum, I sought out representations of the contemporary colonial settler, here on Turtle Island. I questioned whether the descriptions of colonialism could help non-Indigenous teacher candidates to understand their own complicity in colonialism. Could teacher candidates relate to what was represented or was it represented in a way that hid its relevance to them and ignored the fact that Canada is a settler colonial state?

As I read through the curriculum, I was reminded of my own education about colonialism. In public high school history and geography classes, I learned a little about the colonization of India and the Gandhian non-violent resistance movement. At the small private college I attended in the U.S., I began to learn a little about the colonization of Africa and how the imposition of boundaries played a role in contemporary armed conflicts. Colonization was always talked about as existing elsewhere, never here, never in North America. It was not until several years later, and outside of formal schooling, that I learned that colonialism in North America was also about me and that I play a role in it. I was interested to find out if teacher candidates at OISE were given a different picture of colonialism, one that included or perhaps even emphasized a focus on Canada and their relationship to the system.
The S&S curriculum contained seven resources that had a strong focus on colonialism. In this section, I primarily discuss three of these resources: *Learning to Plunder: Global Education, Global Inequality, and the Global City* by Stuart Tannock, *Learning to Divide the World: Education at Empire’s End* by John Willinsky, and *Pedagogies for Decolonizing* by Judy Iseke-Barnes. A few other resources touched colonialism as well, but their main focus was on other aspects of racism, globalization, or the education system. Using these three resources as examples, I discuss how they focus on settler colonialism in the past and/or present and here or elsewhere.

**Colonialism: Past and/or present? Here or elsewhere?**

The School and Society curriculum contained many references to Canada’s colonial education through descriptions of residential schools. For example, in a chapter titled *Why do we have public schools?*, Ken Osborne discusses residential schools to illustrate of how schools are used as a form of social control.

The clearest example of it in Canada is the way in which schools were set up for First Nations children with the intent of destroying their culture, right down to its roots in language and heritage, and assimilating them into white society (Osborne, 1999 p. 8).

The general framework of these references are that residential schools are a part of Canada’s colonial education legacy and that this legacy had a grave impact on Indigenous peoples. Without further elaboration, colonialism then is presented as something that has current implications from the past, but has no other relationship to the present.

In *Learning to Divide the World*, Willinsky relegates colonialism to the past in a similar way. He starts out chapter four with a claim that “the empire” collapsed partially because of colonial schooling. “For educators, one encouraging theme of this aspect of imperialism’s legacy is that although colonial education was dedicated to extending the regulation and the usefulness of the colonized, it also. . . contributed to the empire’s undoing” (Willinsky, 1998, p. 89). One may argue here that Willinsky is speaking primarily of the British Empire and asserts that the British Empire has, in fact, fallen. However, his

---

26 Willinsky goes on later in the chapter to assert that he is not crediting colonial education for *all* the achievements of great thinkers and activists like Mandela, Fanon, and Said, to end colonialism, but just pointing to the fact that “education remains an unpredictable force” (Willinsky, 1998, p. 93). Willinsky seems to be claiming here that colonial education could be responsible for ‘producing’ acts of resistance. I find this assertion reflective, however, of the desire of the colonizer to claim successes of the colonized. It is the need for resistance that produces resistance, not the oppressive entity itself.
focus on post-colonial schooling “aimed at recovering from the colonial era of schooling” (ibid., p. 90) lends itself to anti-colonial critique. What about settler colonialism’s enduring presence in Canada? In his generalization of colonization and broad focus on the British Empire, Willinsky essentially disavows current political claims of sovereignty. As Dion (2007) points out, it is important to “recognize difference and the singularity of experiences” regarding colonialism (p. 338). When colonialism is only presented as existing in history, this lends itself to being taken up as a past mistake to learn from (Dion, 2009, p. 97), rather than a chance to understand how we are implicated in both past legacies and ongoing colonialism. This false sense of disconnection must be troubled if non-Indigenous teacher candidates are to understand themselves as complicit.

Iseke-Barnes (2008) brings together the past and present in *Pedagogies for Decolonizing*. Iseke-Barnes describes her own decolonizing pedagogies with teacher candidates and graduate students. Her pedagogies focus on uncovering the strategies of colonization: how it functioned at the time of contact and continues to function today. She states, “A step in the process of defeating colonial power is to recognize this power, how it is structured and integrated into the system, and begin to disrupt it through the knowledge of how the system works” (Iseke-Barnes, 2008, p.123). Iseke-Barnes instructs students to imagine one society based on separation, hierarchy, and competition and another society based on connection, equal value, and cooperation (ibid., pp. 126-127). She then asks her students to think about the strategies that would be used for the first society to conquer the second (ibid.). Students first think about these societies generally, but when asked to investigate why they know so much about colonization, they realize it is because:

> [T]hey live in Canada, a state that continues to colonize Indigenous peoples, and . . . their understandings are informed by their understandings of how the British government and later the Canadian government dealt with and continues to deal with Indigenous peoples (p. 131).

The present system of colonialism is later emphasized in her pedagogy through reading the works of indigenous authors. Students in her courses come to know the ongoing colonial strategies of “dispossession of land, controlling access to land and food, private ownership of land and controlling the economy” (ibid., p.140). Through her description of the pedagogy,
one can get a sense of both how colonialism is structured and how teacher candidates might get at these same ideas in their secondary education classrooms.

Tannock (2010) also highlights some of the current practices of colonization as utilized by the mining industry in Learning to Plunder. This article focuses on the mining industry’s interventions in educational spaces in Toronto to serve their interests and undermine the critics of their global mining projects. As an example, Tannock describes the diamond mining industry’s exploits of northern Ontario and the Northwest Territories. He describes how, in an exhibit at the Royal Ontario Museum in 2008, the history and current context of diamond mining was presented as if Indigenous people did not exist (Tannock, 2010: 91-92).

The socially, culturally and environmentally destructive legacies of previous mining booms in Canada’s North had no place in the story told here (citing Coumans, 2002. Viewers of the ‘crystal clear’ video and visitors to the Nature of Diamonds exhibition were thus left with little ability to understand why conflicts are already breaking out between First Nations communities and the diamond mining industry in the north of Ontario (ibid., p. 92, citing MiningWatch Canada, 2006a; Wawatay News, 2009).

Here the mining industry is implicated in land and resource grabs, both in Canada and elsewhere in the world, but this focus on the corporate mining industry does not implicate non-Indigenous people who are not directly involved in the industry. Part of colonialism’s present is represented here as corporate globalization and, as such, remains separate from non-Indigenous teacher candidates.

**Critical Thinking: On Settler Colonialism and Settler Identity?**

While the S&S curriculum made strong attempts to develop critical thinking skills in teacher candidates, it refrained from emphasizing critical thinking specifically on settler colonialism. The curriculum focused largely on critical thinking on systems of oppression, constructed identities, and positionalities within those systems in general, with a particularly large focus on racism. Almost one-third of the reviewed articles focused specifically on racism, while the other two-thirds of the articles reviewed covered a variety of topics, including: the social history of education, gender biases, heterosexism, disabilities, education in a global society, classism, religious diversity and more. Out of the articles that focused primarily on racism, only approximately one-third mention Indigenous peoples as a racialized group. Indigenous inclusions into racial analyzes, without foregrounding
Indigenous sovereignty, has its limits for getting at an understanding settler colonialism, as I have discussed in chapters one and two of this thesis. Only a few articles, which I highlight in the section on disrupting the self/other binary below, combined an emphasis on critical thinking with a focus on settler colonialism. I want to be clear here that I am not arguing against the inclusion of Indigenous peoples into an anti-racist framework. What I am arguing for, instead, is the inclusion of the specific logics and identity constructions related to colonialism when racism is the focus.

The S&S curriculum included, to a large extent, a focus on critical thinking in the form of teachers-to-be coming to an understanding of their positionality in relationship to systems of oppression, and disrupting a self/other binary. Neither of these foci, however, pointed strongly to settler colonialism or understanding settler identity. In this section I describe these two foci in the S&S curriculum to examine both what exists and what is missing from this critical pedagogy.

**Critical self reflection on positionality**

There is a heavy emphasis on teachers-to-be coming to an understanding of their social positioning through critical self-reflection in S&S courses. This should not come as a surprise to administrators, instructors, or students in the program, since the goal is explicit in the Learner Document: “Graduates of OISE’s Bachelor of Education. . . will begin to demonstrate the capacities to: Understand the ways in which teachers’ beliefs, social identity, visions, strengths, personal biases and assumptions influence their practice” (OISE, Dec. 2011b, see Appendix B). This goal is well established also in the course descriptions and was reflected in the assignments, as well as in the course readings.

Three of the syllabi contained a cartoon and quotes at the beginning of the syllabus that reflected this focus well. For example, this quote by Adrienne Rich, “Until we can understand the assumptions in which we are drenched, we cannot know ourselves,” speaks to the necessity of critical self-reflection to emerge from our own assumptions. The cartoon was a progressive scene of a fish gradually coming out of water, with the fish exclaiming in the final frame, “I’m living in WATER!!” Another syllabus course description cites bell hooks’ concept of self-actualization in Teaching to Transgress and states, “Effective schools should be sites of linguistic, political and cultural negotiation which encourage teachers to situate and scrutinize the borders of their own ideological discourses.”
Several assignments were autobiographical in nature and encouraged critical self-reflection on positionality. One final assignment required students to respond to the questions, “What have you learned and unlearned through this course? What facilitated these processes of learning and unlearning...? How have these processes impacted you?” (emphasis added). Another assignment asked students to collect “cultural artifacts” to help them reflect on their “relationship with diverse populations (including Indigenous peoples, diasporic, working classes, and poor, LGBTQ, religious, and disabled communities)...” The goal of this assignment was to shift the focus from these diverse populations to the self, asking teacher candidates to “think critically about the tendency to not know, name, understand, or otherwise mark settler, white, class-based, heterosexual, religious, and abilities-based privilege.” Still another personal reflective journal assignment asked students to write a weekly response to the readings and “engage in reflective analysis of [these] response[s]... probe why you agree or disagree” (author’s emphasis). One particular suggestion for these journal responses was to answer the question, “How does my own social identity shape my responses to these readings?”

In terms of required readings, four of the articles focused primarily on critical self-reflection on social positionality, while 14 others emphasized it at some point within the main focus of the article – primarily within the context of anti-racism education. For example, in a short article titled, *Stop and Think: Addressing Social Injustices through Critical Reflection*, racialized, female teacher, Sherry Ramrattan Smith, powerfully argues,

> A teacher’s ability to turn a critical lens inward is part of the work of critical reflection. Teachers who embark on critical reflection often find they become more aware of themselves and the ways in which they influence how and what they teach. This deep understanding can provide an informed foundation for tackling social injustices (2006, p. 48).

The emphasis on critical self-reflection on positionality as it relates broadly to systems of oppression is evident in the curriculum. However, this does not directly translate into critical self-reflection on positionality as it relates to colonialism. One assignment mentioned above asks students to “think critically about the tendency not to... mark settler... privilege” as a choice amongst several other choices. The weekly journal assignment also gives teacher candidates the choice whether or not to reflect on the one reading related to settler colonialism listed in this syllabus. Teacher candidates are given a choice whether or
not to examine their positionality in relationship to colonialism. In my personal experience, as I discussed in chapter one, my own critical self-reflection on my whiteness and other social systems of privilege and oppression did not automatically translate to an understanding of settlerness. Since national discourses such as multiculturalism are a dominant and invisible norm (Simpson, et al., 2011), unless they are explicated and critiqued through the curriculum, they will remain the invisible norm. Perhaps, instead of a fish coming out of water, the image in the cartoon should be a person emerging from the nation and declaring “I’ve settled on Indigenous land!” (although it may not make a recognizable point the way the fish out of water does). What is needed is to highlight the often invisible dominant histories and ideologies connected to settlerness.

*Curriculum that disrupts the settler self/indigenous other binary*

Similar to curriculum that promotes critical self-reflection, the curriculum in S&S that disrupts a self/other binary in general is quite prevalent. Although only two syllabi contained a focus on disrupting such a binary in their course descriptions and only one assignment was aimed at this disruption, a total of 22, or slightly less than a quarter, of the required readings contained some way of highlighting and disrupting a self/other binary. This happened primarily in the context of racism and heterosexism. Only five of these required readings focused specifically on a white/indigenous or settler/indigenous binary. These articles are: *Pedagogies for Decolonizing* (Iseke-Barnes, 2008), *Changing the Subject in Teacher Education: Indigenous, Diasporic, and Settler Colonial Relations* (Cannon, forthcoming(a)), *The Limits of Cross Cultural Dialogue: Pedagogy, Desire and Absolution in the Classroom* (Jones, 1999), *Troubling National Discourses in Anti-Racist Curricular Planning* (Schick & St. Denis, 2005), and *Aboriginal Education and Anti-Racist Education: Building Alliances Across Cultural and Racial Identity* (St. Denis, 2007). These five articles engage in disrupting the settler self/indigenous other binary in quite different ways, all of which involve naming invisible norms, debunking the myth of universal truths, and/or interrogating emotional reactions to the unmasking of dominance.

One of the ways to begin this examination of identities is through interrogating how identities themselves come to be. The dominant understanding of identities is that they are a combination of biology and personal choice. To debunk such myths it is helpful to name the fact that identities are socially produced through historical and place-based social relations of
power. In *Aboriginal Education and Anti-Racist Education*, St. Denis quotes Stuart Hall’s description of cultural identities to introduce readers to the idea that identities are socially constructed:

> Cultural identity is not something that already exists, transcending place, time, history and culture. Cultural identities come from somewhere and have histories. But, like everything that is historical, they undergo constant transformation. Far from being eternally fixed in some essentialized past, they are subject to continuous 'play' of history, culture and power. (2007, p. 1070 quoting Hall, 1990, p. 225, italics added by St. Denis)

This naming process may happen in other articles at other points in the semester, so that the disruption of a settler self/indigenous other binary can start with an examination of the racialization processes for Indigenous peoples and construction of whiteness/settlement instead. I discussed the racialization processes of the Indian Act and residential schools in chapter two. In *Aboriginal Education and Anti-Racist Education*, St. Denis also briefly describes the racialization of Indigenous peoples through the fur trade (2007). In *Pedagogies for Decolonizing*, Iseke-Barnes refers to the “legislation of identities” (2008). She discusses her pedagogical processes, which I described in detail above, of helping students come to understand colonial strategies, such as determining Indian status and regulating the spaces of reserves. The students also examine decolonizing strategies and actions taken by artists and activists (ibid.). “These disruptive strategies of artists and activists affirm that true identities are under the control of Indigenous peoples, and they disrupt the taken-for-granted control that exists in the Indian Act” (ibid., p. 134). Iseke-Barnes also describes engaging her students in disrupting dominant discourses. “In our discussions we are also attentive to taken-for-granted assumptions that students bring to this class, their unlearning of dominant understandings of relations that sustain colonization, and then uncover and discuss opportunities to disrupt colonization and engage in decolonizing” (ibid., p. 132).

In *Troubling National Discourses*, Schick and St. Denis highlight the dominant national discourses that they examine in anti-racism courses with teacher candidates (2005). Canada as tolerant of differences and as an innocent and compassionate global entity are two such discourses. They state, “[e]xamining how particular heroic stories gained their purchase is a central feature of anti-oppressive thinking and teaching” (ibid., p. 3). Through an examination of these dominant discourses, they begin to unmask the discursive practices that
undergird and remake settler dominance. Cannon’s *Changing the Subject in Teacher Education*, also engages a focus on the construction of settler dominance (forthcoming(a)). He states, “Change must start by troubling – and by teaching others to trouble – the interpersonal and institutional normalcy of things – the tendency to not name, know, or otherwise mark settler privilege” (ibid., draft p. 20).

Alison Jones, in *The Limits of Cross Cultural Dialogue*, describes another situation where settler dominance is remade – through intercultural dialogue in a classroom setting. She examines the reactions of white settlers in New Zealand when they are told they will not dialogue with Indigenous Maoris and Pacific Islanders in class. Her analysis unmasks the way that white settlers desire the voice of the other to absolve them of their complicity. This article examines white moral goodness (Applebaum, 2010) through a process of white students being denied the opportunity to demonstrate their goodness to racialized others. Jones points out:

> These ambivalent feelings are not uncommon for “white” activists engaged in race struggles, and they are often a source of uncertainty and dilemma for those of us who, while wanting genuine cross cultural collaboration, suspect uneasily that those impossible desires may inevitably express aspects of the colonizing tendencies we oppose (Jones, 1999, p. 303).

**Upholding the Sacrosanctity of the Nation State**

The predominant message in the S&S curriculum related to settler colonialism was that of the nation state as good and as the primary vehicle for anti-oppression work. It is this reiteration, both explicitly and implicitly, that continues the historic process of educating students for national citizenship (Schick, 1998) and upholds white supremacy’s pillar of colonialism/genocide (Smith, 2006). Without troubling the dominant discourse of Canada as good, we cannot hope to dismantle white supremacy (ibid). In this section, I describe the nation state in relationship to the education system and argue that framework of the nation state as good and as the vehicle for anti-oppression work, fall short of providing a space for teacher candidates to think about settler colonialism and their own complicity in that system.

To begin this critique, I start with a brief discussion about the way that the education system is embedded in the nation state and the apparent contradictions between the public education system and decolonization. Public education came into existence in Canada around the turn of the 20th century, as a way to train workers during the industrial revolution, to groom citizens for nationhood, and because of a belief in education as a civic right (Osborne,
1999, pp. 3-7). Historically, public schools have had a strong underlying goal of preparing students to participate in a democratic nation state (Kumashiro, 2000; Osborne, 1999; Popkewitz, 1998; Schick, 2000) and this is still a main function of the Canadian public education system today (Dion, 2009). Given that continued Canadian sovereignty (in its current form) requires an indigenous other (Smith, 2010; Thobani, 2007), can we expect the education system that was created within the nation state to educate students for decolonization? Or, for that matter, can the education system be a space where hegemony of all forms is questioned, critiqued, and potentially disrupted when hegemony serves the nation state?

Most of us who work in the field of anti-oppression education within formal educational spaces believe it is possible to use the space of public schooling to disrupt hegemony. van Dijk (2002), in his chapter on Discourse and Racism, speaks to the possibilities in educational spaces.

Arguably, after the mass media, educational discourse is most influential in society, especially when it comes to the communication of beliefs that are not usually conveyed in everyday conversation or the media. All (sic) children, adolescents, and young adults, are daily confronted for many hours with lessons and textbooks — the only books that are obligatory reading in our culture. That is, there is no comparable institution and discourse that is as massively inculcated as that of school (p. 154).

Although public school teachers are bound by certain expectations to comply with the requirements and norms of the education system, they also have some freedom to decide some of the curriculum and pedagogy for their classrooms. It is these possibilities that lead anti-racist, anti-colonial, social justice educators to do the work that we do to counter the dominant discourses that children and youth receive elsewhere in society and educate for social change.

The nation state as good is sometimes an explicit idea, but more often an invisible norm in educational discourses. An explicit focus is exemplified through one of the assigned articles in S&S titled, Diversity, Group Identity, and Citizenship Education in a Global Age, in which James Banks calls for reforming citizenship education to allow students to develop or maintain connections to their home cultures, communities, to transnational communities, and to the “nation state in which they are legal citizens” (2008, p. 134). When the nation state is not directly mentioned, it is noticeable through underlying ideologies of
multiculturalism or discussions centred on inclusion. When inclusion, rather than change, disruption, or dismantling is the primary goal, there is an underlying assumption that what we want to include into is good. The nation state also exists in these discourses as good through the absence of critique because it is the dominant discourse.

In the S&S curriculum, where discussion of privilege and oppression is also predominant, the nation state is considered the vehicle for such change whether it is explicitly mentioned or not. It is troubling when Indigenous peoples are placed uncritically in that vehicle in an effort to address the oppression they face. This is done when Indigenous peoples are used as an example as a group experiencing oppression. More than one-third of the resources I reviewed in this analysis did just that. Articles about the history of education in Canada, “at-riskness”, multi-cultural and multi-lingual classrooms, the achievement gap, streaming, class-based oppression, and racism all cited Indigenous people as being impacted by the respective topic. The resources that covered the history of education in Canada cited residential schools and assimilationist policies as playing a role in the current marginalization of Indigenous students and people. Other readings cited the high percentages of “at-risk” or streamed Indigenous students into non-university tracks, or talked about the way that Indigenous students’ cultures and languages are marginalized in Canadian schools. Some of the resources, which focused on classism or racism in education and broader society, cited Indigenous people as a group that has been severely impacted by these systems. Although it would be far more troubling if they were not mentioned at all within these articles, the missing pieces related to ongoing colonialism leave the readers with the understanding that equality within Canada is the solution.

When the nation state is assumed to be what we are fighting within towards a better society, it is difficult to know where claims of Indigenous sovereignty fit, and when Indigenous peoples are included within that fight as an example, without critiquing the nation state formation or governance, Indigenous Nationhood is swept under the rug. The fact is that Indigenous sovereignty is a pre-contact right and reality (St. Denis, 2011b). Canadians are limited in this understanding because of a refusal to recognize Indigenous history (ibid.). Educational discourses which include Indigenous peoples into the nation state framework without emphasizing the right of sovereignty are, unintentionally or unknowingly perhaps, doing what Smith (2010) referred to as “assuming the givenness of the white supremacist,
settler state” (p. 12). While strategies to address injustices within the nation state are needed, we must remember to centre an analysis of settler colonialism in these struggles in order to fight all the logics of white supremacy (ibid., p. 11).

There are some notable exceptions to this unquestioning inclusion into the nation state framework in the S&S curriculum. Dei (1994) indicates the contradictory nature of the state and Indigenous peoples in one of the required readings, *Reflections of an Anti-Racist Pedagogue*. He states, “These issues fall under the broad rubric of examining the extent to which Native educational problems are the product of the often contradictory and conflictual relationships of First Nations with the Canadian state” (p. 304). This contradictory nature of the relationship, Dei asserts, is a result of the refusal of Canada to recognize Indigenous philosophies and realities (ibid.). Another example is in *Educational Responses to Poverty*, where author, Ben Levin, points out that some First Nations bands have taken back control of education for their children and youth and this has had positive results (1995, p. 220-221).

The articles listed above, which disrupt a settler self/indigenous other binary, also challenge an inclusion into the nation state. However, the vast majority of required readings in S&S do not centre settler colonialism or Indigenous sovereignty, and in the absence of this, Canadian national dominant discourses are reified.

**Conclusion**

Simply put, settler colonialism does not figure very prominently in S&S curricula. The predominant message about settler colonialism is in its absence and in the notion that Canada is good, a message which existed both explicitly and implicitly in the curricula. Without a critique of the nation state, dominant national discourses of Canada as tolerant and inclusive (Thobani, 2007) are likely to leave one with the impression that settler colonialism no longer exists because it has been replaced by a benevolent, multicultural Canada. Additionally, while the emphasis on racism and critical thinking are encouraging signs that the space of School and Society contains possibilities for disruptive pedagogies, both curricula shied away from an explicit focus on colonialism and settler identity.
CHAPTER FIVE
Findings: Teacher Education Seminar and Psychological Foundations of Learning and Development

Introduction
In the ITE secondary consecutive program at OISE/UT, School and Society is where I found the most content which is likely to disrupt a settler/indigenous binary and encourage critical self reflection on one’s social position within colonialism. In S&S this is primarily being done through a disruption of a white/people of colour binary, where Indigenous peoples are included as a racialized group within an anti-racist and nationalist framework. Not much is being done to centre Indigenous sovereignty or settler colonialism in this anti-racist and other anti-oppression curricula.

From an institutional perspective, I know less about the Teacher Education Seminar and Psychological Foundations of Learning and Development courses in terms of their syllabi, as I discussed in chapter three. However, in the case of TES, I have analyzed here the curricular materials from three of the thematic cohorts and for PF I have analyzed the main text used in all of the PF secondary courses. This chapter is divided into three separate sections, which cover the Teacher Education Seminar, Psychological Foundations, and a common theme running through the two courses of the “good teacher” identity.

In the TES section of this chapter, I make an argument for the possibility of these three cohorts representing other TES curriculum as well, while at the same time recognizing that my study cannot be conclusive because of the limits of my data collection. I start my analysis with a description of what I found in these three cohort syllabi and required readings about settler colonialism and disrupting the settler/indigenous binary construction. I then narrow in on the “Aboriginal Education” sections in two of the syllabi to discuss how settler colonialism exists specifically in these sections. I conclude the TES section of this chapter with some suggestions for what I might expect to see in another cohort syllabus, which was not represented in this study.

In the PF section of this chapter, I examine Educational Psychology, the 5th Canadian Edition, for its discourses related to settler colonialism and a settler/indigenous binary. In
my analysis I discuss how settler colonialism exists in the text and how constructed identities of white/settler/teacher superiority and Indigenous/student inferiority are reified through the text. At the end of this section I also briefly explicate what Battiste refers to as the “cognitive imperialism” of this text, which I define below.

A common underlying theme of teacher education curriculum in general is that of exploring what it means to be a good teacher. In the final section of this chapter, I review the raced, classed, and gendered identity traits of teachers and how they are remade through discourses and teacher practices. I then examine how the TES and PF curricula operate to confirm these teacher identities.

**Teacher Education Seminar**

The three cohorts in this study are *Teaching and Learning for Change in Urban Schools (Urban Education); School, Community and Global Connections (Global Education)*; and *The Arts*. These three cohorts, based on their descriptions, are just as likely, if not more likely, to contain content on settler colonialism and disrupt the settler/indigenous binary than the 11 other cohorts not in this study.

The Urban Education cohort prepares teachers to work in diverse urban environments through content which is grounded in a specific urban communities and focuses on understanding and challenging the barriers to “access, opportunities, and outcomes in order to promote student success” (OISE, 2012b). This cohort partners with multiple racially and socio-economically diverse schools in Toronto, which helps to highlight a primary learning expectation for this cohort – “the way that racial and socio-economic inequality shape and are shaped by schools” (ibid.). Considering that Toronto is home to approximately 80,000 Indigenous peoples (Ontario Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs, 2012), it is likely that this cohort would focus some on what it means to be a non-Indigenous teacher of Indigenous students and how systems of racial and socio-economic privilege and oppression impact Indigenous students.

The Global Education cohort focuses on the relationships of school, community, and global forces (OISE, 2012b). It “seeks to bridge the divide between global perceptions and realities to promote social justice, conflict resolution, and transformational change at the local, national, and global levels” (ibid.). In view of the fact that globalization is often conceived of as a new form of imperialism (Dei, 2006), colonialism could easily take up
some space in the Global Education cohort curriculum. A focus on the interconnections between local, national, and global, readily lends itself to an examination of colonization and its impacts in Canada as well as elsewhere around the world.

The Arts cohort is designed specifically for those teacher candidates interested in drama, music, dance, or visual arts and who want to gain an understanding of what it means to be an “arts educator and educate using the arts” (OISE, 2012b). The possibilities for subverting dominant discourses through the arts are immense. Indigenous artists like Kent Monkman are known for such subversions of dominant colonial discourses. Margot Francis’, a white scholar, focuses on the way that Canadian iconic images support the settler/Indigenous binary and highlights the works of artists who give these old symbols new, subversive meanings in her recent book, Creative Subversion: Whiteness and Indigeneity in the National Imaginary (2011). Some critical Indigenous scholars contend that using Indigenous artists’ works in their teacher education courses has been a good resource for helping their non-Indigenous students to come to an understanding of themselves in relationship to Indigenous peoples and to know how to become allies (see Dion, 2009; Iseke-Barnes, 2008). For these reasons, it seems likely that The Arts cohort would be a space where alternative discourses surrounding settler colonialism are explored.

The cohorts not included in this study are: French as a Second Language and International Languages, Education and Work, Peel and Dufferin Peel Partnerships, Multilingual and Multicultural Classrooms, Emily Carr Secondary School/York Region, Social Justice in Catholic Education, and 5 different Regional Cohorts (OISE, 2012b). None of the cohorts specifically mention colonialism or Indigenous students. However, a few of the Regional cohorts list a focus on race and diversity. For example, the Toronto South Regional cohort, which is based in the heart of downtown Toronto, states,

Particular thematic attention is given to overall “student success” including issues surrounding ELL (English Language Learners), students in the mainstream classroom, classroom management, differentiated instruction, teaching in integrated inclusive classrooms where there are diverse learners, and the role that factors such as class, immigration, race, language and culture play in student achievement (ibid.)

The Social Justice in Catholic Education cohort emphasizes Catholic social justice teachings, covering issues such as “human rights, peace, globalization, and poverty” (ibid.), although it is unclear if the history of the Catholic church’s involvement in colonialism and residential
schools is included in these foci. While these cohorts may be just as likely as the three included in this study to include content on settler colonialism, they are not likely to be more focused on this content than Urban Education, Global Education, and The Arts.

**Settler Colonialism in the TES Curricula?**

It is interesting to compare the findings in these three cohorts of TES with my findings from S&S. Whereas settler colonialism in Canada was represented in six of the 97 S&S required readings analyzed, in these three cohorts of TES, only two articles (out of 108) discussed settler colonialism here in Canada and only one of these two articles disrupted a white/indigenous binary. These articles are, *Global Awareness and Perspectives in Global Education* by L. Burnouf (2004) and *Mapping the Global Dimensions of Citizenship Education in Canada* by M. Evans, et al. (2009). The overall presence of anti-racist content was much less in TES than in S&S as well, with only four articles disrupting a white/people of colour binary (there were 14 articles which did so in the S&S curriculum). Overall there was less content which could help address the complicity and responsibility of non-Indigenous teacher candidates in colonialism.

What I found to be far more prominent in these three TES cohorts were government or school board-authored documents. 31 of the readings analyzed were authored within an Ontario government institution or local school boards and several more referenced these government documents. According to the generic syllabus for TES, inclusion of government authored policy documents fits under the program theme of the “Ontario Secondary School” and the way that they are included in the curriculum is through an “analysis” of them. In the global education cohort, many of these policies were presented by students in small groups for an assignment called, “Policy & Practice Presentations: Local and Global considerations” and students were to analyze the policy documents through the lens of “teaching for a global perspective.” The Urban Education cohort expected something similar – small group presentations about “key features of select programs or policies” analyzed through a lens of teaching and learning in urban schools, although it is less clear from the Urban Education curriculum documents which policies they cover.

What is perhaps the most interesting about these policy documents or reports is the way that they talk about the Indigenous Other, if they do at all. The documents which address racism most often include Indigenous peoples as a racialized group. A consequence
of this inclusion into racism is that Indigenous peoples cannot be imagined as sovereign nations; colonialism drops out of the picture. For example, the TDSB’s *Achievement Gap Task Force Draft Report* names the various groups of students who make up the majority of early school leavers as racialized “students of Aboriginal, Black (African heritage), Hispanic, Portuguese, Middle Eastern background” (TDSB, 2010, p. 3). The report focuses on the ways to address education gaps through culturally responsive teaching and addressing racism, among other methods (ibid.). One interesting exception to this was in the TDSB’s *Equity Foundation Statement* (2000), where “Aboriginal” is identified as a group impacted by inequity, but separate from other “racial, ethnocultural, and faith communities” which are also impacted by inequity in the school system (TDSB, 2000). Why were Indigenous groups separated from other racialized groups in this document? Is it to signify that they are impacted differently because of colonialism? The *Equity Foundation Statement* does not clarify the reasoning for separating Indigenous peoples in this way. However, what is known is that this statement went through several months of discussion, community consultations, and various iterations.\(^\text{27}\) The change in language used by the TDSB between these two reports is likely to be chalked up to the lack of care taken in consulting the *Equity Foundation Statement* during the writing of the *Achievement Gap Task Force Report* and lack of interest of some of the writers in “Aboriginal issues”, rather than an official policy change.\(^\text{28}\) However, the blank inclusion of Indigenous peoples as another racialized group leaves absent an understanding of colonialism, as was described in chapter two and argued in chapter four (see Smith, 2010).

Other government documents do not address racism at all, but instead talk about assessment, ELL students, and early school leavers and include Indigenous peoples as an oppressed group within the context of the main topic. For example, in a document called, *Growing Success: Assessment, Evaluation, and Reporting in Ontario Schools*, the authors state that assessment, evaluation and reporting should, “support all students, especially those with special education needs, those who are learning the language of instruction. . . and those who are First Nation, Métis, or Inuit” (OME, 2010, p. 6). Such inclusions are automatic inclusions into a nation state framework. As I argued in chapter four, the nation state is the

\(^{27}\) Personal conversation with former TDSB board member, Tim McCaskell.

\(^{28}\) Also from a personal conversation with Tim McCaskell.
unexamined norm of educational institution documents. Although it is important to discuss the ways that Indigenous students are included or excluded in the Canadian education system, simple inclusions have the effect of reifying dominant discourses which deny Indigenous nationhood. In such official documents, Canada is the norm and inclusion is the solution to oppression.

The documents on character education and environmental education also include Indigenous peoples into the Canadian nation state, but rather than doing so as a racialized group, they do so with respect to Indigenous traditional knowledges. These documents both refer to the 2007 *Ontario First Nation, Métis, and Inuit Education Policy Framework* and make a connection between “Aboriginal original teachings” and character development or environmental education (OME, 2008; OME, 2009). These documents are engaged with Indigeneity in what Dion (2009) refers to as respectful admiration. Such respectful admiration fits within the dominant discourse of multiculturalism, which maintains a construction of Indigenous ‘others’ and the dominance of a settler self (ibid.). Indigenous ways of knowing are romanticized and appropriated in the context of appreciating differences, while the structures of racism and colonialism remain unexamined.

I believe that some of these documents could be useful to understand the current climate of working for equality and justice through the Ontario education system. However, I question the ability of teacher candidates to analyze these documents through a lens of settler colonialism if they have not had the opportunity to learn about constructions of superiority and inferiority within systemic colonialism. When government documents are so heavily relied upon in TES courses and they only focus on an indigenous other, where is there an opportunity to focus on one’s own positionality within colonialism? Since Canadian sovereignty is dependent upon the suppression of Indigenous peoples (Thobani, 2007), the government has a vested interest in focusing only on an Indigenous other and their inclusion into the nation state framework. Taking into consideration Patrick Wolfe’s (2006) analysis of the genocide of settler colonialism and Andrea Smith’s (2006 & 2010) assertion that white supremacy’s logic of colonialism/genocide means that “racial progress for Native peoples are also markers of genocide” (p. 6), such inclusions seem strategic in the maintenance of power for the Canadian state over Indigenous nations. If teacher candidates are to be able to analyze government documents through the lens of settler colonialism, there must be some focus on
settler colonialism and an understanding of the interests of the Canadian state in maintaining power over Indigenous peoples. The curriculum for TES in these three cohorts falls far short of this.

**Settler Colonialism in the “Aboriginal Education” Components?**

The Urban Education and Global Education cohorts both contained a week that specifically listed the topic of “Aboriginal Education.” St. Denis has indicated that “[i]ncreasingly, educators are seeing the call for anti-racist education to become a part of what constitutes Aboriginal education” (2007, p. 1070). I wanted to take a closer look at the curriculum specifically on “Aboriginal Education” in these two cohorts to see if they do, in fact, move beyond cultural inclusion to address power dynamics through anti-racist and anti-colonial curriculum.

In Global Education, “Aboriginal Education” is combined with “Equity” under the title of “Education for all: Equity and Aboriginal education”. It is important to note that this is not the only week in the syllabus that focuses on equity, but it is the only one with a specific “Aboriginal Education” focus. There are five required course readings for this week including: an article titled, *Affirmation, Solidarity and Critique: Moving Beyond Tolerance in Education* by Sonia Nieto; two Equity policies; and two Aboriginal Education policies. In the Urban Education cohort “Aboriginal Education” exists on its own under the title “Aboriginal Education: Beyond Frozen Images” and includes a presentation by the Toronto District School Board’s Aboriginal Education Centre. There are two articles listed for this day – one is required and one is optional reading. The required reading is *Closing the Gap for Aboriginal Students* by Emily Faries and the optional reading is *Aboriginal education and anti-racist education: Building alliances across cultural and racial identity* by Verna St. Denis. I start here with an analysis of the policy documents and move on to the required articles before finally touching on the optional reading.

The Equity Policies examined under the topic heading “Aboriginal Education” are *Ontario’s Equity and Inclusive Education Strategy* and the *TDSB’s Equity Foundation Statement*. The former is a call and a requirement of school boards across the province to develop or revise policies on equity and inclusive education and begin implementing them by September 2010, and the later is the TDSB’s declaration of a commitment to and plans for ensuring equity within the education system.
Ontario’s Equity and Inclusive Education Strategy mentions Indigenous people as a racialized group in the context of discussing the previous version of the policy which was titled, Development and Implementation of School Board Policies on Anti-racism and Ethnocultural Equity and written in 1993 during the NDP government. The 1993 policy “reflected a commitment to eliminating racism in schools and in society at large by changing both individual behaviour and institutional policies and practices” (OME 2009b, p.10). It specifically called all school boards to develop race relations policies, but when the government repealed the policy in 1995, at the time when the Conservatives came to political power, most school boards abandoned these efforts (Dei, 2003). While the new 2009 policy continues to mention racism and includes Indigenous peoples in its examples, the main focus is on cultural diversity and inclusion rather than an explicit focus on anti-racism (Friedel, 2010a, p. 16-17). For example, in a section on inclusive curriculum and assessment practices, the guide describes Ontario’s curriculum policy:

The ministry’s curriculum policy supports respect for and acceptance of diversity in Ontario’s schools. Through the curriculum review process, curriculum is continually revised to maintain and increase its relevance to the changing needs and lives of students. Recent revisions include the addition of sections on antidiscrimination education and Aboriginal perspectives and how they relate to the particular subject or discipline (OME, 2009b, p. 20-21).

This inclusion of Indigenous perspectives, without troubling the “cognitive imperialism” of Euro-centric curricula, is firmly ensconced in the dominant discourse of cultural discontinuity (Friedel, 2010; St. Denis, 2011). Furthermore, adding “Indigenous perspectives” to the curriculum in this way tends to essentialize Indigenous peoples and create hierarchies of authenticity (St. Denis, 2007; Friedel, 2010).

The TDSB’s Equity Foundation Statement was developed as a result of the 1993 Ontario Anti-racism and Ethnocultural Equity policy, and is likely to be one of the few clear lasting effects of this policy (Dei, 2003). This TDSB policy refers to the creation of equal opportunities within the TDSB and takes a stronger stance on anti-racism work than Ontario’s 2009 policy. The statement makes clear that it is important to understand the factors outside of the TDSB that contribute to inequity and refers to racism as a main problem. The document is focused primarily on the school system and discusses inclusion as a main strategy to address racism. For example, in the staff development section there is an emphasis on “training teaching and support staff in antiracist education methodologies to
enable them to deliver an inclusive curriculum” (2000, p. 7). Although inclusion of Indigenous perspectives is important to counter the long-standing dominance of Euro-centric knowledges, it is not enough to address structures of power.

The two Aboriginal Education policy documents are the *Ontario First Nation, Métis, and Inuit Education Policy Framework* and the accompanying *Aboriginal Education in Ontario Resource Guide*. The latter is a short pamphlet, which has information from the policy framework and some additional information about the resources (both financial and material), including Indigenous languages offerings. Since there is a lot of overlap in the content of these two documents so I do not separate them in my analysis here.

In chapter one, I highlighted the 2007 *Ontario First Nation, Métis, and Inuit Education Policy Framework* as the most recent educational policy effort for the inclusion of Indigenous cultures, histories, and perspectives into the Ontario curriculum. The strategies of the policy focus on raising awareness among teachers about Indigenous learning styles and changing the curriculum to reflect First Nations, Métis, and Inuit cultures, histories, and perspectives (ibid., p. 6). The policy briefly mentions the need for educators to understand the mistrust Aboriginal people have of the school system as a result of residential schools (ibid.). However, this statement does not reflect on residential schools as a racialization or colonizing process or go into any detail about the purpose or destructive nature of them. Instead, it focuses on the development of positive cultural identities among Aboriginal students (ibid., p. 8). This policy is largely reflective of a theory of cultural discontinuity within which one of the main solutions is to incorporate more Indigenous culture and perspectives into the school (Friedel, 2010a). The OME seems to recognize that it is important for non-Indigenous students to have an understanding of Indigenous history and culture, but this is motivated by a desire to educate non-Indigenous students and teachers not to discriminate against Indigenous students, rather than understand the role they play in upholding structures of power. What lies behind this approach is the idea that Indigenous peoples are pre-modern or culturally different, rather than racialized and colonized.

As I have identified in other areas of the TES curriculum, the use of government-related statements and policies to discuss “Aboriginal Education” exists within a theoretical framework of multiculturalism; a framework which is intended to mask structures of power (Simpson, et al., 2011; St. Denis, 2011b). As such, these Equity and Aboriginal Education
policies do not encourage critical reflection on the structures of dominance that have created and maintain educational disparities for Indigenous students. Furthermore, the focus is exclusively on an indigenous other, which affirms the dominant understanding that non-Indigenous peoples have nothing to do with colonialism (Cannon, forthcoming(a)).

I turn now to take a closer look at the articles included in “Aboriginal Education”. The purpose of the article by Sonia Nieto is to “challenge readers to move beyond tolerance in both conceptualization and implementation” (2002, p.18). The article is written from a nationalist perspective, in which the goal is to make a “new definition of ‘American’” (ibid., p. 28). It is noteworthy that this article discusses the American, rather than the Canadian context.

Although the article mentions elements of racialization for some groups in America, (i.e. African slavery and the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882) it does not highlight the racialization processes of Indigenous peoples or the construction of white/settler identities through histories of colonization. In fact, “American Indians” are mentioned three times in the article: referring to the lack of American Indian authors in school curriculum; referring to the racial identity of some of the students in a school; and discussing the inclusion of American Indian storytelling used in schools to highlight “individual and collective responsibility” (Nieto, 2002, p. 25). Nieto does not go on to explain what she means by “individual and collective responsibility”. The problem of Indigenous inclusion into a “new definition of American”, as is done through this article, has been discussed as a primary problem throughout this thesis. Here again, the nation state framework is used to distract from Indigenous claims of sovereignty (St. Denis, 2011b). The use of the term “American Indian,” is itself a sign of uncritical inclusion into the nation state.

In her research symposium paper titled, Closing the Gap for Aboriginal Students, Faries emphasizes the need to teach Indigenous history, culture, and worldviews in schools specifically for Indigenous students (2009). She highlights the fact that Indigenous peoples have had extremely destructive experiences with Canadian education – from the assimilation policies of residential schools to the integration policies of current schooling – and, as a result, have apathy for Canadian schooling. Faries calls for curriculum and resources to include Indigenous traditional cultures as a way to revive Indigenous identities.
While Faries describes the attempts to eradicate Indigenous knowledge and cultures beginning with European contact and the intent behind residential schools to “destroy culture and language,” it is interesting that these segments of the paper are largely written in the passive voice and do not point very harshly to the colonizing nation as the perpetrators of such violence (2009, p. 1). Faries highlights the racialization of Indigenous peoples, but does not engage with the construction of colonial dominance through these racialization processes. Additionally, the call for inclusion of Indigenous traditional cultures for the purpose of identity reclamation is a call which critical Indigenous scholars have critiqued as problematic (Friedel, 2010, St. Denis, 2007).

The optional reading is *Aboriginal education and anti-racist education: Building alliances across cultural and racial identity* by Verna St. Denis. This is one of the articles I have cited for the theoretical framework of this thesis and one of the articles in the S&S curriculum which disrupted the settler self/indigenous other binary. In this article, St. Denis argues for the inclusion of critical anti-racist education in Aboriginal Education so as to interrogate the racialization processes and construction of whiteness. She describes some of the racialization processes, discusses how a focus on culture can essentialize Indigenous identities, and explains why cultural revitalization will not end injustice towards Indigenous peoples. She is calling specifically to teacher educators to take up anti-racist education in “Aboriginal Education” primarily for the benefit of Indigenous teacher candidates.

While the six required readings under the heading of Aboriginal Education focus almost entirely on inclusion of Indigenous history, culture, and worldviews and largely, with some exception in the Faries article, on Indigenous inclusion into the nation state, the seventh, optional, reading is a promising start for disrupting the settler/indigenous binary construction. Using the Faries article and the St. Denis article together would create a space for discussion about Indigenous cultural inclusion. Unfortunately, since the St. Denis article was an ‘optional’ read, there is not likely to be much discussion around it during class time and without it, the curriculum’s strong focus on culture reifies the dominant discourse of cultural inclusion and multiculturalism. Even with the St. Denis article, the primary focus is on Indigenous peoples, and non-Indigenous teacher candidates may be unable to understand what they have to do with colonialism.
Extending My Analysis

In the Urban Education, Global Education and the Arts cohorts, very little content exists on the big picture of settler colonialism and disrupting the settler/indigenous binary. While it is difficult to make conclusions about the other TES cohorts, there are distinct possibilities within these other cohorts for a disruption of dominant ways of representing settler colonialism. All teacher candidates should have the opportunity to understand their relationship to settler colonialism and some of the curriculum highlighted throughout this thesis would contribute to such an understanding. Here, I want to briefly extend my analysis to the Social Justice in Catholic Education cohort, as an example of what I would hope to find in another cohort.

The Social Justice in Catholic Education cohort has an obvious responsibility to help their teacher candidates to come to an understanding of complicity and responsibility in light of the Catholic Church’s involvement in residential schools and the reconciliation process now taking place. The Jesuits were among the first to set up residential schools in Canada (Haig-Brown, 1988). The Catholic Church, among other churches, was responsible for operating residential schools with the backing of the colonial and later the Canadian government (Fournier & Crey, 2011; Haig-Brown, 1998). Although some other churches have apologized, the Catholic Church as a whole has not. In 2009, the Vatican issued a statement saying the pope expressed his sorrow for the anguish caused by residential schools at the hands of some members of the church (Hanson, 2009, emphasis added). The Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops has denied responsibility for the Catholic Churches’ role in residential schools, stating:

The Catholic community in Canada has a decentralized structure. Each Diocesan Bishop is autonomous in his diocese and, although relating to the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops, is not accountable to it. Approximately 16 out of 70 Catholic dioceses in Canada were associated with the former Indian Residential Schools, in addition to about three dozen Catholic religious communities. Each diocese and religious community is corporately and legally responsible for its own actions. The Catholic Church as a whole in Canada was not associated with the Residential Schools, nor was the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops (Catholic Statement of Regret on the Former Residential Schools, n.d., para. 1 &2).

29 The Anglican, Presbyterian, and United Church, as well as some Catholic orders have apologized for their role in residential schools (see Hanson, 2009 & Catholic Statement of Regret on the Former Residential Schools, n.d.).
Considering the Catholic Church’s individualized understanding of their involvement in residential schools and their unwillingness to take responsibility, it is important for teachers in Catholic schools to develop an understanding of their complicity in residential schools but also other aspects of colonialism past and present. Teacher-educators of the Catholic cohort could enter into this examination through a discussion of the Catholic Church’s involvement in residential schools and their impacts. Celia Haig-Brown’s *Resistance and Renewal* (1988) and Suzanne Fournier and Ernie Cresy’s ‘*Killing the Indian in the Child*: Four Centuries of Church-Run Schools’ (2011) are two resources to help frame such discussions. The discussion should not end with residential schools or the reconciliation process, but must necessarily help teacher candidates understand their role as Canadians in maintaining a settler self/indigenous other binary.

**Psychological Foundations of Learning and Development**

The common textbook used in the Psychological Foundations of Learning and Development course is titled: *Educational Psychology*, and was originally written by Anita Woolfolk Hoy for use in the United States and was adapted for use in Canada in 2000 by Anita Woolfolk, Phillip H. Winne, and Nancy E. Perry. The textbook I analyze is the 5th Canadian edition, copyrighted in 2012. It is almost 600 pages long and is divided into 14 chapters containing information on various psychological theories of learning and development and the way that these theories relate to classroom learning. It also contains pictures, cartoons, paintings, tables, graphs, and resources. In this analysis, I focus primarily again on the actual text – what is being communicated through words – to determine whether or not what is communicated is disrupting or reifying the norm of settler colonialism. I begin my analysis here by outlining the way that settler colonialism is addressed in the text.

**The Language of Pioneering**

Uncovering representations of settler colonialism in *Educational Psychology* requires a careful look at the language used. Instead of the terms “settler” or “colonial”, the term “pioneer” is used to describe actions of the Europeans who came to Turtle Island in the first half of the 1800s. For example, in a section in chapter one, which attempts to define “good teaching”, Ken, a grade six teacher in Richmond, BC, is described as having his class play simulation games of trappers and pioneers moving west (Hoy, 2012, p. 6). According to the Oxford English dictionary, a pioneer is a person who is among the first to explore and settle
in a new area. Using the term “pioneer” reifies the national mythologies of an empty land prior to the arrival of settlers. Ken is inviting his students to role-play the European version of the history of colonization – the one that is embedded in dominant discourse. An Indigenous version of this history would be told quite differently – likely with violence, resistance to violence, dispossession and death. Benign role-playing of pioneers and trappers completely erases the violence of colonization and normalizes the taking of land and resources. Such discursive moves nurture the historical amnesia of post-contact history where the land was “forcibly emptied of buffalo and people” (Dion, 2009, p. 38) and allow for a continuation of the dominant discourse of the land as primarily empty and open for peaceful settlement rather than violently colonized. This is the extent to which colonialism is referenced explicitly in the *Educational Psychology* textbook. However, as Schick and St. Denis (2005), have stated:

> Curriculum is one of the significant discourses through which white privilege and "difference" are normalized. The construction of whiteness depends on a contradictory process familiar in Canadian society: whiteness seems to be invisible even while being the necessary standard against which otherness is marked (p. 298).

It is to this invisible norm and otherness that I turn next in this analysis.

**Settler Self/ Indigenous Other Binary**

Since settler colonialism is not explicitly named in this text, I needed to adjust my focus to discussions of difference in relationship to race and colonization in order to discover who the settler is and who is Indigenous in the text. In chapter one I found a primary discussion of difference, which provides insight into the settler/indigenous binary. In this discussion, the authors cite demographic statistics about Canadian classrooms and then state, “[e]ven though students in classrooms are increasingly diverse in race, ethnicity, language, and economic level, the teaching force remains very homogenous” (Hoy, 2012, p. 3). What do the authors mean by “homogenous” in this sentence? We can determine the meaning through the relationship; teachers are located in opposition to a diverse student body. Diversity is named or marked, while the homogeneity of the teaching force does not need to be named - it is the invisible norm. One meaning we can infer from this sentence is that the racial identity of pre-service teachers is white. In fact, approximately two-thirds of the
applicant pool for the OISE ITE program for 2011-2012 claimed white/Caucasian as their racial identity.³⁰

It is clear that this textbook was created for white teacher candidates, and that according to the authors, “diversity” is embodied in the students that they will teach. Therefore, it is through a relationship of teacher/student that the settler self/indigenous other exists in this text. In order for the settler, teacher, self to know themselves as dominant, they need an Indigenous, student, other. To examine the relationship of teachers to their Indigenous students and discover whether or not this construction of superior/inferior is disrupted through the text, I analyze two excerpts: a description of an “outstanding” teacher and a description of residential schools. This analysis leads to a greater understanding of the ontological underpinnings of the text.

One space where teachers are described in relationship to their students is in the section on “good teaching” in chapter one, where Ken’s pedagogy and practice was described. Another teacher in this section is Anne, a grade one teacher in Mississauga, Ontario, who has 22 children in her classroom, half of whom “speak English as a second language” (Hoy, 2012, p. 6). Anne encourages her students to speak English at school and their first language at home. She makes modifications to her curriculum to make sure that all of her students can participate in all the activities of the classroom. She also “makes a point of learning as much as she can about her students’ linguistic and cultural heritages” because she sees the importance of understanding how their languages and cultures influence their learning (ibid.). She believes that such understanding will allow her and other teachers not to “misinterpret children’s motivation and behaviour” (ibid.).

Anne’s attempts to get-to-know her students linguistic and cultural heritages exist within the framework of multiculturalism stemming out of anthropological frameworks of cultural discontinuity and incommensurability (St. Denis, 2011a). She seems to believe that bridging the culture and language gap between the school and home will help her students to be successful in school. Her efforts not to “misinterpret children’s motivation and behaviour” are only necessary because there is an invisible dominant norm which defines what is

³⁰ The OISE ITE program collects demographic statistics from applicants to help determine if there are biases or barriers for marginalized groups in the application process. These are not used to determine acceptance into the program or published. I garnered this general understanding of the racial identity of the applicant pool through a conversation with Kathy Broad, Academic Director of the ITE program at OISE.
appropriate and what is not in the space of the classroom. The actions of her students, which fall outside the dominant norm, must be understood by her so she does not discriminate against them. All this may sound fine within the context of the classroom, in which students must participate in a certain way to be successful. When viewed through a dominant lens, Anne is seen as inclusive and tolerant of her students because she wants them to be successful. However, if we understand the way that white settler dominant values equal success in her classroom and beyond, we can see that Anne is firmly entrenched in maintaining those structures through a multicultural acceptance of differences. Anne’s culture and behaviour falls within the dominant norm, while her students’ English Language Learner (ELL) status especially marks them as inferior. It is through this ‘othering’ of her students that Anne’s culture and behaviour remains the norm.

The small section about residential schools is located in chapter five, Culture and Diversity, under a section heading called, The Legacy of Discrimination. This section is included as a way to describe a space and time of “low-expectations” and “biases” against “ethnic-minority” students (Hoy, 2012, p. 171). It begins with a short story about segregated schooling in the U.S. in the 1950s and then turns to residential schools in Canada. Woolfolk, Winne, and Perry state, “In Canada, residential schools were built for First Nations children, who were then educated off reserve” (ibid., emphasis added). The authors go on to quote Instructional strategies for students with special needs, by Crealock and Bachor:

[The schools] were funded by the federal government who inspected the curriculum, and operated by the Christian churches who provided administrators, teachers, and additional funds . . . . The residential schools were not successful academically, vocationally, or socially, but they persisted into the 1960s . . . In 1961, scholars at the University of British Columbia reported to the government . . . that the schools represented a severe discontinuity in experience for the native youth. Nearly all dropped out before grade 12, few went to university, and many suffered social and emotional difficulties. (ibid., quoting Crealock & Bachor, 1995, p. 518)

This is the only space in this textbook which provides information about residential schools and it is significant both for what it says, but perhaps even more for what it does not say. The focus in this text is almost entirely on the Indigenous other. In the first sentence, the passive voice is used along with the preposition “for”. Combined, these two moves make residential schools seem benign, perhaps even as being built out of benevolence and kindness for Indigenous peoples. The authors leave out the fact that residential schools were built by
settlers and funded by the colonizing governments, all done within a context of understanding the European self as superior and Indigenous peoples as inferior (Fournier & Crey, 2011; Haig-Brown, 1988). Although the construction of inferiority and thereby superiority is not mentioned, the blame for the “failure” of residential schools is placed on Indigenous students. “Native youth” were the ones who dropped out, didn’t go to university, and suffered social and emotional difficulties. Additionally, the cultural incommensurability hypothesis shows up again here to suggest that the problem is with real and natural difference between Indigenous and European cultures, rather than power inequalities and the construction of difference as inferior and superior.

Where is the settler in this text? What role did Canada play in residential schools? How does the colonization process inherent in residential schools continue in schooling and larger society today? The little mention that the federal government and churches receive in the quoted text leave the reader with the understanding that the government was benevolent, or at the very least, benign. It is surprising, given the recent apology for residential schools, that a text like this could exist in a 2012 textbook which seeks to educate future teachers. The section does not mention the physical, sexual, and verbal abuses perpetrated by settlers at these schools, or even that the schools were products of an assimilation project (let alone cultural genocide). Although Stephen Harper’s apology to First Nations peoples on behalf of all Canadians for residential schools in 2008 did not mention colonization, he did acknowledge the fact that residential schools were a means of assimilation. Here, the authors remove the colonizing task of cultural, linguistic, and numeric genocide from the readers’ minds. Iseke-Barnes (2008) cites Calliou’s work in identifying discursive moves to remove the goal of genocide from discussions of residential schools. “Calliou documents the practice of using biased language to sanitize discussions of residential schools in order to present the effects as being about ineffective and underfunded education rather than an intentional genocide of indigenous peoples” (Iseke-Barnes, 2008, p. 142-143).

As I mentioned in chapter two, white settler teachers can reify their dominant identities through metaphorical journeys, such as reading about racialized ‘others’. The textbook, Educational Psychology, provides many spaces for these dominant identities to be re-confirmed through stories of student ‘others’. The two examples provided here are just two of many spaces where the white, settler, teacher, learns about the racialized, student,
other and how to teach them. These stories of difference, are seen through the lens of dominant discourses, unless those discourses are examined. The textbook lacks a clear analysis of structures of oppression and tends to have more of an individualistic worldview. For example, after describing the demographics of students in Canadian classrooms, the authors’ state, “These statistics are dramatic, but a bit impersonal. As a teacher, counsellor, recreational worker, speech therapist, or family member, you will encounter real children. You will meet many individual children in this book too” (Hoy, 2012, p. 3, emphasis added).

The statistics, which set out the consequences for various groups impacted by structures of oppression, are labelled as dramatic and impersonal, while the children they will encounter in the text and in classrooms are real and individual. The focus on individualism is a part of Canadian dominant discourse of meritocracy – anyone can make it if they try hard enough (Schick & St. Denis, 2003). This individualism leads to conceptions that white, settler, teachers can help their individual, racialized, other, students to succeed (ibid). While I do not want to take away from the importance of an individual emphasis on education for all students, I want to trouble the notion that what is needed is only a focus on individual education, rather than structures of power and inequality.

**Cognitive Imperialism**

I want to touch briefly here on what Battiste refers to as “cognitive imperialism”, or the claim of Euro-centric knowledge production as superior (Dion, 2009, p. 66). Although Euro-centric scholars in Canada and elsewhere are just now becoming more interested in Indigenous knowledge, educators and the education system continue to function in a Euro-centric framework, which marginalizes Indigenous knowledges (Battiste, 2002). Highlighting the cognitive imperialism of Euro-centric knowledge is an important part of understanding the system of colonialism and the part that teacher candidates play in it. Battiste writes,

In the context of the Education Reform Initiative, the most important educational reform is to acknowledge that Canadian schools teach a silent curriculum of Eurocentric knowledge by the way teachers behave and the manner in which they transmit information. To affect reform, educators need to make a conscious decision to nurture Indigenous knowledge, dignity, identity, and integrity by making a direct change in school philosophy, pedagogy, and practice (2002, p. 30).
Other research has taken place on Euro-centric dominance in theories of psychological development, and although I think it important to uncover how the theories presented in this textbook are tied to racial and colonial systems of superiority, it is beyond the scope of this thesis to engage with each individual theorist and their theories. Instead, in this section I discuss the way that the textbook itself is presented as the norm rather than as stemming from the subjectivity of the authors and their social locations, or the subjectivities of the theorists and their social locations, which are deeply imbedded in the hegemony of western knowledge production.

I begin this analysis with the way the authors of Educational Psychology construct themselves as experts in the field. In the very beginning, they locate themselves in the text by stating:

> [a]s you read Educational Psychology, you will notice that the authors are referred to by name when they share their personal experiences. Anita Woolfolk, Phil Winne, and Nancy Perry have been studying, researching, and practicing the strategies, methods and theories discussed in this text for many years. We hope you enjoy our stories and use them to gain insights into your own experiences (Hoy, 2012, p. xxi).

As in the paragraph about residential schools in the previous section, this paragraph is important both for what it says and for what it does not say. While the authors write about their professional expertise, they do not write about the way that their socially constructed identities have impacted that “expertise.” Our social identities are intricately connected to the way we produce knowledge and what knowledge we produce (Absolon, 2011). As William Pinar points out about curriculum debates, “. . . in addition to being debates about what knowledge is of most worth, [they are also] debates about who we perceive ourselves to be and how we will represent that identity, including what remains as ‘left over,’ as ‘difference” (1993, p. 60). The identity of the author is imbedded in the text itself, whether written in or not. If it is written in, it is easier for the readers to read, understand, and compare to their own forming identities and experiences. If it is not written with words it is invisible, but still relays a meaningful message. Often the message is that what is written is the normative centre, and what others should strive to achieve or be. This is one of the first indications in this text that the authors’ believe in one of the dominant ideologies in Euro-centric knowledge production – that knowledge can be objective and neutral.
Much later in the textbook, in a paragraph about social class, the authors refer to university professors as “members of professions that are reasonably high in terms of social status, but provide little wealth or power” (Hoy, 2012, p.165). Since all three of these authors are university professors, this statement locates the authors as people who are not wealthy and do not have much power. It is indicative of the way that the authors separate their work from the structures of power in which they are imbedded. They do not recognize the power they already have in being able to write and have their book published. They also do not recognize the power this text has to shape educational discourses and impact teaching and learning across Canada. Additionally, the way that they located themselves as experts in the first instance, and then denied their power in the second, highlights their perceived “objectivity”.

Mohanram’s analysis of anthropologist, Levi Straus’ *The Savage Mind*, is useful in understanding how “experts” came to be in Western society. She points out that Straus’ notions of the ‘engineer’ and the ‘bricoleur’ “function within a discourse of development rather than one of difference” (1999, p. 9), meaning that the engineer and his tools had developed beyond that of the bricoleur and his tools. The engineer is one who knows the environment from an urban location, who uses modern science to analyze and abstract while the bricoleur knows the environment because of his close proximity to it and ability to categorize it through his intuition (ibid, p.7-9).

The bricoleur is able to make connections between the resemblances and make meanings materialize from possibilities. The engineer is seen as a more advanced model in that he forces the materialization of meanings from concepts which do not resemble each other in the first place (ibid, p. 9).

Straus’ description and Mohanram’s analysis of the engineer and the bricoleur makes clear that western knowledge production valued the separation of the researcher from that being researched. Those who engaged in such research from afar were deemed developmentally superior and as experts.

Canadian universities continue to function in the European model. They are operated and inhabited by a majority of white settlers and continue to value the use and production of

---
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knowledge that reflects white European values. In the space of the university, rationality, objectivity, logic, and neutrality are commonly valued above emotionality and political expressions (Schick, 2002, p.109-110). Those who abide by the values of the institution are accepted and rewarded for their values. As I argued in chapter three, the curriculum in university spaces is dominantly regarded as objective and neutral. Breaking down that understanding requires being explicit about the fact that the knowledge produced is, in fact, related to the values, beliefs, and social identities of the authors and theorists.

One might argue that attempts are made in this text to debunk the myth of objectivity and make it clear that the authors and the theorists are providing information that is subjective, or located with the individual. For example, throughout the text the authors refer to themselves as ‘we’. In the beginning of chapter one they say, “Welcome to one of our favourite topics - educational psychology . . . We believe this is the most important course you will take to prepare for your future as an educator . . .” (Hoy, 2012, p. 2). Additionally, when discussing certain theories they often use the phrase “according to” and then the theorist’s name. For example, “According to Piaget (1954), certain ways of thinking that are quite simple for an adult. . . are not so simple for a child” (ibid., p.31). This way of incorporating themselves into the text both personalizes and individualizes their presence and in effect ignores the way their social positioning impacts their stated “expertise.” They also present many theories and then offer arguments against those theories to provide a range of viewpoints to the reader. Through this multiple theories technique, they claim objective neutrality, when in fact, what they are presenting as a range of theories all stem from western knowledge production. It is this supposedly objective and neutral stance that is all too prevalent in the Educational Psychology textbook. This stance contributes to the way that teachers are separated from students as discussed in the previous section and to the way that a degree of “normality” is communicated as truth.

An understanding of what is “normal” may, in fact, be a primary goal of the PF course. One of the course syllabi that I received communicated this objective in this way,

Generally speaking, educational psychology is a study of human development which has been mapped into stages and markers, so that at each period in life, professionals can observe and assess what is normal and what is not normal behaviour for that age level.
While I agree that there is a degree of importance to understanding what is considered normal in any particular society in order to teach students in a way that helps them to navigate this system and be successful in it, teacher candidates also need to critique an understanding of normality through a lens of social structures (Ladson-Billings, 2008). When what is considered normal is not critiqued in this way then what is communicated through texts such as this is that “normal” equals absolute truth. Anyone who falls outside of the established norm is then deemed inferior.

**TES and PF – What “Good Teaching” Has to do With It**

A core theme in both PF and TES is the development of “good” or “expert” teachers. This theme is not only specific to TES and PF, but is an underlying logic of teacher education pedagogies more generally. Schick (1998), Popkewitz (1998), and Dion (2009) all identify aspects of teacher identity that inform and are informed by definitions of good teaching. These identity traits are raced, gendered, and classed, (Schick, 1998), organized through discourses, and established through a set of practices (Schick, 1998; Dion, 2009; Popkewitz, 1998). I begin this section with a review of the connections between these teacher traits, discourses, and practices and then examine the ways in which the curriculum of TES and PF operated to reconfirm such teacher identities.

The dominant teacher traits identified by teachers themselves and society are: caring, nurturing, tolerant, patient, selfless, and compassionate, as well as knowledgeable (Schick, 1998). During Schick’s PhD research with white teacher candidates in Canada, she asked them to describe both their own qualities and the qualities of a good teacher and found that the two lists overlapped (1998, p. 192). White teacher candidates described themselves as “nurturing and supportive” and good teachers as “organized, patient, and caring” (ibid., p.194). They also described their choice to enter into the teaching profession as “natural.” Schick contends that this choice is only natural, however, if “one considers the class, ethnic origins, race, gender, sexuality, education levels and several other social relations in which subjects find themselves” (ibid., p. 335). She goes on to explain,

Subjects perform their teacher identity by depicting themselves as part of the absent white centre and as part of domination. In their allegiance to white values, their claim on whiteness, and their interest in reproducing it, subjects are able to perform their suitability as teachers (ibid.).
Historically, the role of the teacher in Canada has been socially reserved for and taken up by white, working class women (Schick, 1998 & 2000). Working class women entered into teaching positions because the teaching profession was one step up into a professional position, but still an acceptable position in working class communities because of the emphasis on saving, caring, and helping (ibid). White women were also able to break free from some patriarchal oppression through earning a living, while not straying too far from what was expected of them as women (ibid.). Yet once they entered into the teaching profession white women found themselves in an unacceptable position, as viewed through the lens of patriarchy, and, in attempts to regain respect, supported the domination of white men and ideologies of nationalism based on patriarchy (ibid.).

The defined traits of teachers are also national character traits (Schick, 1998, p. 129) and teachers perform these traits in colonial encounters with their students. In early colonial education, the mission was to produce “subjects” who could share in the “imperial mission” (Schick, 1998, pp. 142-143). Today, colonialism in education has shifted to a less overt form. As I discussed in chapter two, in the ‘helping’ professions such as teaching, white people engage in encounters which remake their settler identities. It is through this raced understanding of “pastoral power” that they engage with the notion that they can save ‘othered’ children through supporting their growth and learning (Schick, 1998; quoting Foucault and Dehli, 1993). The very notion that racialized children are in need of saving and that white teachers are responsible for saving them is embedded in racial/colonial and class-based ideologies.

These ideologies inform what is considered reasonable in teaching and learning processes, which Popkewitz (1998, p. 5) and Dion (2009, p. 82) refer to as “expert systems of knowledge”. These systems of knowledge organize teacher’s roles and practices into those which attempt to bring students into the dominant norms, save students from their problems (Popkewitz, 1998), “meet the needs of their students”, “recognize injustice”, and “nurture the development of good citizens” (Dion, 2009, p. 82). Classroom management is also regarded as necessary for “good” teaching (Popkewitz, 1998). Dion (2009) describes some of the specific performances that the teachers she worked with engaged in towards maintaining their identity as a “good” teacher. These included: making sure the content was relevant to student lives and engaging for students, staying within the expectations of defined
curriculum, developing student skills, caring for students’ emotions, maintaining order, and nurturing citizenship (p. 93). All of these roles and practices work together to reinforce the definition of what it means to be a good teacher. Refusing to perform some of these roles has consequences for teachers in that teachers lose access to power (Schick, 1998).

Teacher candidates’ desire for certainty through knowledge is also important to discuss here, as the teacher identity relies heavily on attempts to solidify that identity through accumulation of knowledge. Schick (1998) puts it this way: “The norm of teaching is to know: to make knowledge unproblematic; to present knowledge as knowable, to present knowledge as if were knowable” (p. 150). Since certainty of teacher knowledge requires control over student knowledge, the desire for knowledge also requires a desire for control or management of the classroom. Teacher identities are reconfirmed as “good” in the role of the knowledge-holder and controller or manager of the classroom space (ibid.). Thus, teacher education programs attempt to reduce uncertainties through their curricula.

Teacher education curricula tend to maintain a focus on the roles and responsibilities and practical teaching skills of “good” teachers. This emphasis is apparent in the PF and TES course descriptions. The PF course description states that one of the six core themes for that course is “teacher expertise”, while another is “classroom environment and classroom management” (OISE, 2012a). The TES course syllabus lays out the goal of “developing a personal identity as a teacher: identifying personal style/strengths. . . finding an initial personal identity in the school”, and also identifies “understanding classroom management” as a key expectation.

Course readings for TES also focused quite heavily on identifying what it means to be a good teacher through articles on classroom management, the standards of secondary schools, professionalism, and through directly defining “good” teaching. One example of a “good” teacher was given in an article titled, Can Star Teachers Create Learning Communities? (Haberman, 2004). According to the author, the qualities of star teachers are:

[T]heir persistence, their physical and emotional stamina, their caring relationships with students, their commitment to acknowledging and appreciating student effort, their willingness to admit mistakes, their focus on deep learning, their commitment to inclusion, and their organization skills. They also protect student learning, translate theory and research into practice, cope with the bureaucracy, create student ownership, engage parents and caregivers as partners in student learning, and support accountability for at-risk students (ibid., p. 53).
This description can be picked apart for the various ways that it upholds the normative teacher identity. A star teacher being one who can admit their mistakes, for example, still maintains that the teacher is the knowledge holder in the classroom. Mistakes are made in a moment, then can be admitted to, but maintaining oneself as a teacher and a learner (i.e. in the Freirean model) requires entering into the space with an acknowledgement that knowledge is never complete and everyone can both teach and learn.

The *Educational Psychology* textbook also lays out what it means to be a “good” teacher in chapter one. According to Woolfolk, Winne, and Perry, a “good” teacher is someone who is both knowledgeable and inventive; has plans for managing classrooms, but can be flexible and adaptive; and knows their particular students and the “patterns common to particular ages, culture, social class, geography, and gender” (Hoy, 2012, p. 7-8). In this description, the authors’ describe “good” teachers as knowledge holders as well. It is this certainty of knowledge, especially about their students’ “ages, culture, social class, geography, and gender” that Kumashiro (2002), Friedel (2010a), and St. Denis (2007) warn can be essentializing.

This focus on “good” teaching creates a certain framework for the curriculum in both TES and PF that sets out to define what “good” teaching is and communicate that to teacher candidates. While it is understandable that teacher candidates would want to focus on the characteristics and practical skills that would help them excel in their chosen profession, the construction of the identity of a “good” teacher must also be problematized within the context of dominant social structures. Certainly, the amount of work it would take to become a ‘good’ teacher in the descriptions above would require more time and energy than some people are able or willing to give. However, the descriptions seem to perfectly fit the selfless, white, working class female whose primary focus is in caring for her students.

Framing the curriculum around finding an answer to what is ‘good’ teaching and forming a teacher identity, can easily reify dominant racial/colonial norms. This is evident in *Educational Psychology*, when Ken, who is defined as an “outstanding teacher”, has his students role-play trappers and pioneers in the 1800s (Hoy, 2012, p. 6). Through this description the reader is likely to understand that a good teacher is one who reifies the dominant mythologies of colonization.
Conclusion

Although my analysis of the TES and PF curriculum is inconclusive, through my engagement with the three cohort syllabi in TES it is clear that very little is happening in TES to engage with an understanding of settler colonialism and in the PF curriculum discourses of settler colonialism are reified rather than disrupted. Instead of focusing on settler colonialism or settler identity, these two courses focused on an indigenous other and how to correct the inequalities experienced by Indigenous students. The underlying emphasis on developing good teachers in both courses sets up the curriculum for reconfirming teacher identities that participate in racial/colonial oppression.
CHAPTER SIX
Conclusion: Towards a Curriculum of Settler Responsibility

The Necessity of Settlers Understanding their Complicity

In this thesis, I have argued that non-Indigenous teachers need to understand their complicity in colonialism so they can form ally relationships with Indigenous peoples in their struggle for justice, whatever form that struggle takes. As the Indigenous activist quoted in chapter one said, “they have to listen, take direction, and stick around” (Cannon & Sunseri, 2011, p. 271, first quoted in Amadhy’s 2008, *Listen, Take Direction, and Stick Around*). However, these ally relationships will necessarily require more than talk and joint action in struggle. They will require settlers to also unlearn internalized colonial superiority and dominance (decolonize their minds), relinquish some (or all) of the privileges they received through colonization (or recognize that these will be taken from them), and learn how to live differently in relationship to the earth and others.

As a result of colonization, white settlers have internalized superiority and dominance, which needs to be unlearned in order to engage in respectful relationships of equality. While such an unlearning process will be ongoing for individuals, it can be helped through political moves to respect original nation-to-nation treaty agreements (Cannon & Sunseri, 2011). One of these treaties, the Two-Row-Wampum, or Guswentah, is an original treaty which was formalized through the exchange of a wampum belt between the Haudenosaunee and the British Crown (ibid). The wampum belt carries the symbols of the river of life and two separate boats, one symbolizing the Haudenosaunee and the other the British Crown (ibid.). The treaty speaks of two separate entities, each with their own forms of governance, which engage in shared responsibility and mutual respect for one another (ibid.). Neither of these entities controls the other, but instead engage in peaceful, respectful, friendship (ibid).

A part of respectful engagement is sharing the land and resources and respecting the earth’s resources as well. It is not up to white settlers to decide how these resources will be shared. Our role is to work for the return of stolen land and resources to Indigenous peoples. Settlers should be prepared to leave the land, because we have taken what is not ours and we have brutally imposed our ways of being on others in the process. We need to ask where we
fit into Turtle Island, rather than the other way around (Cannon, forthcoming (a), draft, p. 13, quoting Simon, 2010).

It is not likely that we will be asked to leave completely, because as Alfred states, “Irredentism has never been the vision of our [Indigenous] peoples” (2005, p. 153). Instead, Alfred proposes that we relinquish enough land and resources for Indigenous nations to be self-sufficient and engage with the land respectfully (ibid.). I use the word ‘relinquish’ here hesitantly because ‘voluntarily giving back’ is not exactly what I mean. What Alfred is speaking of is not just a giving back as a result of white guilt or white moral goodness. Within such actions power is still located in the hands of the white settler. Instead, Alfred calls for restitution, which he defines as:

a broad goal, [which] involves demanding the return of what was stolen, accepting reparations (either land, material, or monetary recompense) for what cannot be returned, and forging a new socio-political relationship based on the Settler state’s admission of wrongdoing and acceptance of the responsibility and obligation to engage Onkwehonwe peoples in a restitution-reconciliation peace-building process (2005, p. 154).

The process for settlers is:

a ritual of disclosure and confession in which there is acknowledgement and acceptance of one’s harmful actions and a genuine demonstration of sorrow and regret, constituted in reality by putting forward a promise to never again do harm and by redirecting one’s actions to benefit the one who has been wronged (ibid., p. 153).

It is through this demand and ritual of disclosure that the relinquishing will happen in a way that exists outside of power inequalities.

These are the material aspects of decolonization that are necessary in a world where resources are not scarce, but also not limitless. Resultantly, the way we (settlers) use resources needs to change. Decolonization requires respect for the earth’s resources in order to maintain balance. Rather than consuming as if resources are unlimited, we will need to adjust to more modest resource use and find ways of living with the earth so that natural resources are regenerative. This adjustment will likely require white settlers to live differently – more communally rather than individually – sharing resources rather than each person consuming their own.
These steps need to be taken side-by-side with reconciliation and restorative justice processes. The Canadian government’s apology for residential schools and the truth and reconciliation commission are important pieces, but do not stand much of a chance for creating real and lasting change without the other pieces mentioned above. Alfred (2005) argues that under the present circumstances, where Canadians are ignorant of their historical role in colonization and present relationships with Indigenous peoples, real reconciliation is not possible. He contends that such a process will allow Canadians to simply “congratulate themselves for their forbearance and understanding once Onkwehonwe. . . are reconciled with imperialism” (ibid., p. 183). Thielen-Wilson convincingly argues in her recent doctoral dissertation, *White Terror, Canada’s Indian Residential Schools and the Colonial Present*, that the apology serves to mask and reproduce contemporary colonial violence rather than move towards real reconciliation and reparations (2012). Cannon and Sunseri (2011) note that it is impossible to engage in a restorative justice project when Indigenous communities do not have the political power to “make those who have committed crimes responsible to both their communities and to their victims” (p. 268). Thus, an understanding of settler complicity, where Canadians understand their role in maintaining ongoing colonialism in Canada, must come before apologies and reconciliation. It is this understanding that will help settlers to work with Indigenous peoples in their demands for restitution.

**What Are the Learning Expectations about Settler Colonialism in the ITE Program?**

In my thesis I sought to discover the learning expectations for teacher candidates in the OISE ITE program regarding settler colonialism. I am only able to draw empirical conclusions here from the School and Society curriculum, since I was unable to acquire the majority of syllabi for Psychological Foundations of Learning and Development and the Teacher Education Seminar. Since S&S is the most likely place to find information about settler colonialism, out of the three foundations courses, my findings here are significant. The following are what I discovered to be the learning expectations embedded in S&S curricula in the secondary consecutive program at OISE/UT.

Teacher candidates will learn:

- that teachers should understand the structures of racism and classism which make it difficult for Indigenous students to be successful in school and in Canada,
• that teachers should understand their social positioning in general and how it relates to the social positioning of their students,
• that teachers should understand the way that superiority and inferiority is constructed – especially within the binaries of white/people of colour and straight/GLBTQ, and, perhaps most importantly,
• that the school system and the nation state are the vehicles through which equality can be achieved.

Whereas the dominant framework in society in general is that of cultural inclusion (multiculturalism), in S&S courses the predominant way of representing Indigenous peoples and settler colonialism is through a discussion of structures of privilege and oppression within the nation state. Curriculum regarding anti-racism and especially whiteness studies focuses quite a bit on understanding teacher identity in relationship to racism, but this does not necessarily translate to an understanding of positionality as it relates to colonialism. Learning that the school and nation state are the vehicles through which equality can be achieved does not allow room for questioning the legitimacy of those structures as they relate to Indigenous peoples in the first place.

While the last expectation outlined above was also embedded in the TES and PF curricula that I studied, other expectations in these two courses were slightly different. In TES and PF, teachers seemed to be expected to also know:

• that Indigenous students are in need of help to achieve success in Canadian public schools and beyond, and
• that this help can be provided through inclusion of Indigenous knowledges, histories, and cultures into the curriculum, and through efforts by teachers to get-to-know Indigenous cultures and traditions.

TES and PF seem to be engaging much more in the dominant discourse of cultural inclusion as a means to educate Indigenous students and correct inequalities. The main focus in the curriculum was on an indigenous other, while very little attention was given to settler colonialism or the settler self.
**Towards a Curriculum of Settler Responsibility**

I have argued that what is needed in teacher education programs is a curriculum of settler complicity and responsibility and described some of the potential components of such a curriculum throughout this thesis. I also provided examples of what has been tried in teacher education curriculum and pedagogy to get at these understandings. The components of a curriculum towards settler responsibility that I have highlighted in this thesis can be summarized as follows: a focus on the power structures of racism and colonialism; information about the big picture of colonialism; a focus on how identities of superiority and inferiority are constructed through the lens of race and the nation; an encouragement to examine how teacher candidates are personally implicated in colonialism; an interrogation of the emotional responses and stances that white settlers engage in when confronted with their complicity; an interrogation of knowledge production through an anti-colonial lens; and a centring of the land and political sovereignty of Indigenous peoples.

Thielen-Wilson takes some important steps towards pedagogy of settler complicity and responsibility in her recent PhD thesis. She recommends a “Fanonian inspired critical pedagogy of recognition targeted to settler colonizers” which is grounded in a challenge to the idea that settlers rightfully belong in Canada (2012, p. 311). Such a pedagogy targets collective settler identity through three interrelated questions: “How did we get here? What violence allows us to stay? When will we be leaving?” (ibid., p. 313, author’s emphasis). This third question is key to challenging the legitimacy of the Canadian state and getting at an internalized understanding of what it means to be complicit. Thielen-Wilson refers to it as “a shift in consciousness required for genuine decolonization” (ibid., p. 312).

My articulation of potential components for a curriculum aimed at settler responsibility is not to suggest that such a focus will be easy. There are many challenges to creating such a curriculum and pedagogy, which I have also discussed at various points in this thesis. The dominant discourse of multiculturalism creates significant challenges to the use of anti-colonial pedagogy because of the way that this discourse shuts out other discursive possibilities. The myth of multiculturalism regulates conversation about Canada to that which fits within the discourse – as good, tolerant, and inclusive of cultural differences. Conversation about Canada as anything other than benevolent is resisted or denied.
The constructed identities of teacher candidates as caring, nurturing, tolerant, patient, selfless, and compassionate (Schick, 1998) makes it difficult to engage teacher candidates in critical pedagogy where they need to examine how they remake their identities of superiority through colonial encounters within the field of teaching. As with the denial of the nation as anything other than good, teacher candidates constructed in this image will also engage in tactics of denial to maintain a sense of themselves as good and innocent. Teacher candidates are likely to engage in a process of reliance on their intentions to be a good person to secure their innocence (Applebaum, 2010; Schick & St. Denis, 2003).

Deeply internalized white settler superiority and the extreme dehumanization of Indigenous peoples is challenging in its psychology and possibilities for physical violence or verbal abuse. When chances are given for discussions of racism and colonialism, internalized bigotry is sure to surface. Internalized settler superiority can result in extreme forms of dehumanization of Indigenous peoples. Creating spaces in teacher education classrooms which are safe for Indigenous peoples and people of colour will likely be extremely challenging when engaging with internalized settler superiority in white teacher candidates.

Additionally, the pedagogical challenges experienced with white complicity pedagogy are likely to be relevant within anti-colonial pedagogy as well. Some of these challenges include emotions, such as guilt and anger, and strategies such as distancing or denial. Also, the structures of teacher education programs, such as the fact that they are short and busy programs and that they are focused primarily on providing teachers with knowledge and skills for teaching in the classroom, provide significant challenges towards implementation of anti-colonial pedagogies.

Although engaging in a curriculum or pedagogy of settler colonial responsibility will not be easy, I hope to have demonstrated in this thesis that it is also possible. Critical Indigenous scholars and their allies have been using curriculum which gets at an understanding of settler complicity and responsibility in their teacher education courses and have seen some successes. The resources I name and describe in this thesis could be useful tools for this work.

Another potential tool to enhance a curriculum of settler complicity is the Deepening Knowledge Project at OISE/UT. This project is in its beginning stages and it seeks to “infuse Aboriginal peoples' histories, knowledges and pedagogies into all levels of education in
Canada” (OISE, Dec. 2011a). A website has been created to house resources for teachers and teacher-educators on Indigenous knowledges and pedagogies and includes lesson plans for teaching these concepts. There are also efforts to reach out to teacher educators and teacher candidates with these resources. I am not familiar enough with the project to know its full scope and purpose. However, I find hope in the development and suggest (assuming that it is not already being done) that future development of the *Deepening Knowledge Project* be to include more resources and lesson plans that engage with the concepts outlined above.

The compact nature of the ITE program has been an obstacle to inclusion of more content on settler colonialism. However, as ITE programs in Ontario change from one to two years, there are possibilities that should be considered. One possibility is to require an Anti-colonial studies course for all teacher candidates, similar to the way that Native Studies is required at the University of Regina and University of Saskatchewan.\(^{32}\) Such a course could focus on the roles and responsibilities of non-Indigenous teacher candidates in decolonization.

In conclusion, I end with a quote from Taiaiake Alfred in *Wasáxe: indigenous pathways of action and freedom*, whose words so clearly speak to me about the purpose and challenges of a curriculum of settler colonial responsibility. The role of Indigenous peoples as instigators of change, the deeply internalized understanding that is necessary for real change, the challenging nature of this process, and the humanity of building real relationships based on equality is encompassed in these lines. In them I hear possibilities for healing that give me hope.

> *Real change will happen only when settlers are forced into a reckoning of who they are, what they have done, and what they have inherited; then they will be unable to function as colonials and begin instead to engage other peoples as respectful human beings.* (2005, p. 184)

---

32 This information is from a review of websites and conversations with administrators for the Métis Education Study. The university of Regina also requires all their teacher candidates with a social studies teachable to take three courses in native studies, prior to taking their social studies curriculum course.
Postscript
Questions for Further Research

This thesis has been about identifying dominant discourses and alternatives in the OISE/ITE teacher education program. However, it is also relevant for teacher-education programs elsewhere in Canada and potentially the U.S. It raises questions about the extent to which teacher education programs are centring Indigenous nationhood and settler colonialism in their social justice curriculum. There are many possibilities for future research stemming from this study. To conclude I want to highlight a few of these possibilities.

The School and Society curriculum in the OISE ITE program contains some elements of a curriculum aimed at settler colonial responsibility. However, these aspects of the curriculum are few and the challenges are many. As I mentioned in chapter three, other teacher education programs in Ontario, which have more Indigenous students enrolled or are located geographically close to reserve communities may have more content related to colonialism. Additionally, much could be learned from other social-justice focused teacher education programs outside of Ontario as well. Are teacher education programs elsewhere implementing a curriculum aimed at settler complicity and responsibility? If so, how? What can we learn from the ways that others are engaging with an anti-colonial curriculum?

From my analysis of the ITE curriculum, I concluded that teacher candidates are expected to learn about racism and their position in it and how identities are constructed through it. They are also expected to learn that the nation state is the vehicle through which inequalities need to be fought against. What is not known from this study is what students actually learn regarding settler colonialism. Do the learning expectations defined above translate into real learning for teacher candidates? What are teacher candidates actually learning about their complicity in colonialism through teacher education programs? What prior knowledge do they need to bring into teacher education courses in order for learning about settler complicity to happen there?

Throughout this thesis I have highlighted some of the many challenges of implementing anti-racist and anti-colonial pedagogy with privileged learners. These range from emotional reactions, to a reliance on national ideologies, to the deep internalization
of superiority and resultant dehumanization as it relates to colonialism. Teacher educators have researched and written about the many challenges involved in implementing a curriculum of white complicity in teacher education programs. However, something can also be learned from non-Indigenous people who have been able to engage with their complicity and have become active in anti-colonial movements. More research is needed to uncover the educational experiences that contribute to non-Indigenous people becoming active in anti-colonial movements, so as to contribute to pedagogical changes in formal educational spaces.

Many of the resources I reviewed for this study were based-in or focused on the U.S. Approximately one-third of the resources used in the three TES cohorts were U.S.-focused. Considering my assertion in chapter one that there is not as much explicit discourse around Indigenous peoples in the U.S., a study of the impact of using U.S. resources in Canada could provide some insights into the ways that dominant discourses related to settler colonialism are reified or challenged through such exchange. How does the heavy use of U.S. curricular materials impact the way settler colonialism is communicated?

In chapter three, I discussed some of the systemic issues that Margaret Wells highlighted in her study, related to S&S curriculum. She pointed to a disconnect between theory and practice for teacher candidates. In my analysis of the TES curriculum, I noticed that some of the curricular resources used enhanced this disconnect by stating that teachers learn by doing rather than in their teacher education courses. This disconnect seems to me to be a major issue in helping teacher candidates understand their own complicity and deserves further research.
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Appendices

Appendix A

TRANSFORMING INSTITUTIONAL VALUES: REVISITED
Robette Ann Dias, Crossroads Anti-Racism Organizing and Training
(9May 2006 – Please do not use without permission / 708.503.0804)

AS AN EMERGING ANTIRACIST/ANTIOPPRESSIVE INSTITUTION. Crossroads has been working to establish and articulate the principled place on which we stand. This process allows us to define emerging antiracist Transforming Values we introduced nearly two years ago. It also provides the opportunity to reflect on and identify the ‘traditional’ white institutional values we all struggle to shed – especially when remembering that the all-too-familiar values were established when institutions were legally mandated to be racially segregated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values shaping white institutions &amp; creating discomfort/ dysfunction, a by-product of the embedded oppression and misuse of power.</th>
<th>Transforming Values, often in conflict with traditional white institutional values; cultivate terrain for anti-racist accountability to germinate.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Either/Or Thinking: Right/wrong, black/white, male/ female, etc. Forces out diversity; complies with rigid ways of being. Power consolidated &amp; maintained with select few ‘right, good, white, male’ against which all else is measured. Creates myth that it is efficient for everyone to be the same.</td>
<td>Both/And thinking with a bias toward action: Acknowledges that multiple realities/myriad ways to ‘do’ institutional life exist. Purpose: work through differences to find solutions that move toward antiracist goals. Bias toward action means not allowing conflict to paralyze us into indecision and immobility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarcity Worldview: Budgets reflect finite resources &amp; become excuse for limiting activities. Creates environment rife with ‘knee-jerk’ reaction of ‘No – we don’t have enough money for that.’ ‘No’ becomes automatic answer to innovation, anti-oppression and liberation. Cannot be mission-focused when default setting is ‘No’.</td>
<td>Abundant worldview that uses resources responsibly: If we operate from premise of ‘We have an abundance of power, how do we want to use that power?’ then questions about resources begin to shift. What we understand to be resources begins to change, and how we use resources is transformed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secrecy Mode: Information is power; when it is distributed on a “needs-to-know” basis, power is also unequally distributed. Secrecy controls power; it is almost always destructive – leads to dishonesty and triangulation. Secrecy destroys trust. Confidentiality gets confused with secrecy; ‘confidential’ decisions are often in reality carried out in secret as a way to maintain the power status quo.</td>
<td>Transparent communication &amp; decision making that guards personal integrity: Inclusive processes take longer to come to consensus, but once a decision is made, implementation is quicker. Confidentiality (not secrecy) is important to transparent communication, allowing individuals to make mistakes and recover from them without being scapegoated or demonized by the institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Action: Isolates and sets people up to compete with one another. Compartimentalized activities increase competition, creating a redundancy of activities – similar functions cannot be combined/shared. When focusing internally on competing for resources, mission and relationships with the world outside the institution are lost. Individual achievement nurtured by white culture undermines ability to work for a larger whole.</td>
<td>Cooperation &amp; Collaboration that nurture individual creativity: Maintaining a spirit of cooperation &amp; collaboration bound by a collective perspective/commitment to the analysis of racism allows institutions to stand in the midst of diversity with integrity and respect. Individual creativity happens in the parameters of an accountable, responsible relationship with the rest of the community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IN SUMMARY

THE POWER ANALYSIS OF RACISM MAKES CLEAR the fundamental dynamic of institutional racism: that institutions are not, and have never been, accountable to People of Color. What is needed are new values that are outward oriented with an overarching bias toward effectiveness. The need for these values begins to emerge when institutions reach a critical mass of members who are claiming an anti-racist identity where there is a growing awareness of the need to be accountable to anti-racist People of Color. Transforming Values create an institutional environment that makes accountability to People of Color and other socially oppressed groups possible.

*www.crossroadsantiracism.org/newsletters/Eg952006_Newsletter_Website.pdf*
Appendix B

Learner Document

Initial Teacher Education, Bachelor of Education/Diploma in Technological Education Consecutive Program,
Master of Teaching Program and The University of Toronto Concurrent Program

LEARNER DOCUMENT

Graduates of OISE’s Bachelor of Education/Diploma in Technological Education Consecutive Program, Master of Teaching Program and The University of Toronto Concurrent Teacher Education Program will begin to demonstrate:

Knowledge of the Learner
- the capacities to:
  ● Understand how individuals and groups learn in order to ensure that teaching begins with the learner in mind.
  ● Understand both learning and human development progressions.
  ● Understand that teaching is more than a methodology. It includes an understanding of teaching redefined as responsibility for student learning.

Teacher Identity
- the capacities to:
  ● Understand the ways in which teachers’ beliefs, social identity, visions, strengths, personal biases and assumptions influence their practice.
  ● Develop a personal philosophy of education that embodies principles of equity, diversity, inclusion, social justice and environmental justice.
  ● Commit to ongoing professional learning.
  ● Develop as a critical and reflective teacher with an inquiry habit of mind that is grounded in research and evidence-based practice.
  ● Understand the value and necessity of perseverance and self-assessment in the development of teaching excellence.
  ● Recognize their potential as collaborators, mentors, and leaders within a variety of professional contexts.
  ● Exercise informed professional and ethical judgment.

Transformative Purposes of Education
- the capacities to:
  ● Understand the transformative impact of education.
  ● Understand the roles teachers, learners, families, communities, schools and systems play in this transformative process.

Subject Matter and Pedagogical Content Knowledge
- the capacities to:
  ● Know the theory, history, methods, intellectual content, enduring understandings and practices of an academic discipline/domain, and understand the interconnectedness across them.
  ● Make informed pedagogical decisions with the goal of success for all students based on knowledge of the learner, context, curriculum, and assessment.
  ● Understand that curriculum planning and delivery are embedded in political, social, cultural and environmental contexts.
  ● Recognize the potential value added and influence of information communication technologies to support teaching and learning and make informed pedagogical decisions regarding when and how the use of technology can have the greatest impact upon learning.

Learning and Teaching in Social Contexts
- the capacities to:
  ● Understand that learning and teaching are socially constructed processes and what is valued is socially determined.
  ● Understand how systematic/institutional practices dis/advantage social groups/learners and ways that they can work with others to counter inequalities.
  ● Understand themselves as change agents and community members committed to act in socially just and environmentally responsible ways.
  ● Participate meaningfully and actively in professional learning communities.
  ● Collaborate effectively with a range of educational partners including families, community, professional resources, etc.
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Email response from the Ethics Review Board

Suzanne,

Thank you for your phone call and e-mail.

The Canadian federal research ethics guidelines, the Tri-council policy statement: Ethical conduct for research involving humans, 2nd Edition (TCPS-2), Article 2.1 Application states, “In some cases, research may involve interaction with individuals who are not themselves the focus of the research in order to obtain information. For example, one may collect information from authorized personnel to release information or data in the ordinary course of their employment about organizations, policies, procedures, professional practices or statistical reports. Such individuals are not considered participants for the purposes of this Policy.”

http://www.pre.ethics.gc.ca/eng/policy-politique/initiatives/tcps2-epct2/chapter2-chapitre2/#toc02-1a

In this sense, your proposal to approach instructors regarding document analysis of their course syllabi and curriculum materials may be understood as exempt from research ethics review.

Please let me know if you have any further questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Dean
--
Dean Sharpe, Ph.D.
Research Ethics Board Manager--Social Sciences and Humanities
Office of Research Ethics, University of Toronto
McMurrich Building, Second Floor
12 Queen's Park Crescent West
Toronto, ON, M5S 1S8
Tel. 416-978-5585
Fax. 416-946-5763

http://www.research.utoronto.ca/for-researchers-administrators/ethics/
Appendix D

Email to individual professors for their course syllabi

Dear xxxxx,

My name is Susanne Waldorf and I am an MA student in SESE. I am writing today to request a copy of your XXXX course syllabus for the research I am conducting for my MA thesis.

My supervisor is Dr. Martin Cannon and my research centers on how ITE students are introduced to the ideas of complicity in settler colonialism and responsibility for this injustice through the ITE curriculum. Using a form of Critical Discourse Analysis, I am seeking to explore representations of these ideas in course syllabi and some of the articles, textbooks, or books used in the three required teacher education courses in 2011-2012. The theoretical framework of my study is the research that indigenous scholars and their allies have been doing in teacher education around dominant discourses and the alternative discourses they consider important to include in teacher education curriculum regarding colonialism and indigeneity.

Recognizing the power of dominant discourses and hegemonic structures that make it difficult for all of us to engage in alternative discourses, I aim to ask the following questions:

• Does the curriculum include a description of settler identity and responsibility? If so, what is it?
• Is the historic or present day relationship between settlers and Indigenous people represented? If so, how?
• How does the curriculum encourage critical self-reflection about settler colonialism?

And, if these concepts are absent...

• What meaning lies in their absence?

I seek to interrogate representations of dominant and alternative discourses, rather than individual teacher-educator practices. The syllabi will be regarded with anonymity. I expect that the course syllabi will help me determine which articles, textbooks, or other texts would be most relevant to this study. I also imagine they may tell me something about the way that critical self-reflection is encouraged through your courses.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me. I look forward to hearing from you.

Thank you,

Susanne Waldorf
susannewaldorf@gmail.com
Appendix E

RAC Research Information Sheet for Research Conducted in the OISE/ITE Program

Form A: Applying to do research in/on the BEd/ITE Program Form

i) Name of PI and email address: Susanne Waldorf (susannewaldorf@gmail.com) Date: April 15, 2012

ii) Name of doctoral supervisor and Departmental affiliation (if applicable): Martin Cannon, SESE (MA Supervisor)

iii) Names of research team (if applicable): None.

iv) Brief description of study:

This study assumes that all teacher candidates should be aware of their positionality in relationship colonialism and the benefits of Canadian citizenship. I aim to address the question of whether or not teacher-education programs are providing their students opportunities to critically engage with and reflect on their own positionality in a system of colonialism. A larger study of teacher education programs is beyond the scope of this MA thesis. However, using the Initial Teacher Education (ITE) program at OISE as a case sample, I aim to analyze the curriculum for its representations of settler colonialism. In so doing, I seek to raise important questions regarding whether or not dominant discourses are being reified or alternative discourses introduced into the ITE program at OISE in particular and teacher education programs in general.

Through a discursive analysis of the curriculum, I will seek alternative representations to the dominant historic and cultural representations of the Indigenous ‘Other’. Recognizing the power of dominant discourses and hegemonic structures that make it difficult to engage in alternative discourses, I aim to ask the following questions:

- Does the curriculum include a description of settler identity and responsibility? If so, what is it?
- Is the historic or present day relationship between settlers and Indigenous people represented? If so, how?
- How does the curriculum encourage critical self-reflection about settler colonialism?

And, if these concepts are absent . . .

- What meaning lies in their absence?

I will use a form of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to analyze a majority of the ITE program’s Intermediate/Senior education syllabi for the three required teacher education courses. I will also use CDA to analyze a few of the texts that most closely engage with “Aboriginal education” or settler colonialism.
While I can uncover what is being represented or not being represented about settler colonialism in the course materials, I will not find out how teacher educators actually take up these representations in their courses. However, I believe a textual analysis lends itself to a greater understanding of the possibilities for the existence of alternative and marginalized discourses in teacher education and the formulation of questions for further research.

v) Brief description of the participants: None.

vi) What are your ‘assistance’ expectations of the ITE program (e.g., listserv, SUPO, staff)? I require assistance in acquiring copies of ITE program course syllabi (Intermediate/Senior) for the 2011-2012 year. If this assistance is not available, I can email individual professors to ask for their syllabi.

vii) Timeline of the study and when you intend to collect data: I aim to collect my data as soon as possible and conduct a critical discourse analysis over the course of the next 3 months. I aim to submit my completed thesis to the School of Graduate Studies by September 15, 2012.

viii) Please confirm that this is not a conflict of interest (e.g., relationship to participants): I have no participants or relationships with course instructors who are supplying their syllabus for this study.

ix) Indicate your willingness to share the results of your study, once completed: I will gladly provide a copy of my Master’s thesis to anyone in ITE.

* Please note: You will need to submit your application for ethical review to the University of Toronto (visit the U of T Ethics website to obtain the appropriate materials for your application at www.library.utoronto.ca/rir/ethics_hshome.html).

Once these first two steps are complete, please:

x) Provide the ITE Research coordinator with University of Toronto Ethics Review approval code:

xi) Contact the ADO, TE to work out the start-up and logistical details.
Appendix F

Email to course instructors through the ITE administration

Greetings TES, School and Society and Psych Foundations instructors,

We have had a request from an M.A. Candidate to examine course syllabi for our courses for her thesis research. Her letter is attached below for your reference. Please respond to Joanne Lawson by May 15 if you would like your syllabus to be excluded from her research. Please note that all identifying information will be removed from each syllabus.

Thank you so much for considering this request.

All the best,

Usha

Usha James
Director (Acting), Secondary Initial Teacher Education
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
University of Toronto

Dear ITE professors for 2011-2012,

My name is Susanne Waldorf and I am an MA student in SESE. I am writing today to inform you about my MA thesis research, for which I am requesting a copy of the ITE course syllabi from this program year. I will receive the syllabi from the ITE program directly with all identifying information removed.

My supervisor is Dr. Martin Cannon and my research centres on whether or not teacher candidates are provided the opportunity through the curriculum to reflect on their own positionality in relationship to settler colonialism. Using the ITE program at OISE as a case sample, I aim to analyze the curriculum in the three required courses for its representations of settler colonialism. In so doing, I seek to raise questions regarding whether or not dominant discourses are reified or alternative discourses are introduced.

Through a discursive analysis of the curriculum, I am seeking alternative representations to the dominant historic and cultural representations of the Indigenous ‘Other’, as well as representations of settler privilege and encouragement to critically reflect on positionality within colonialism. I aim to ask the following questions:

- Does the curriculum include a description of settler identity and responsibility? If so, what is it?
- Is the historic or present day relationship between settlers and Indigenous people represented? If so, how?
- How does the curriculum encourage critical self-reflection about settler colonialism?

And, if these concepts are absent . . .
- What meaning lies in their absence?

I seek to interrogate dominant and alternative discourses, rather than individual teacher-educator practices. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at susannewaldorf@gmail.com.

Thank you,

Susanne Waldorf