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Abstract

This Master’s thesis examines how a history teacher subject position emerges from the discursive practices of history teachers teaching about race and racism in Canadian history. It uses semi-structured and focus group interviews, classroom observations, and analysis of documents and cultural-visual material to track the formation of the subject position across a range of discursive and material contexts. Through Foucault’s theories on power/knowledge and governmentality, the researcher identifies how the role of the history teacher subject serves as rationalization to the deployment of history as moral education for students. She illustrates how the history teacher subject produces and mediates knowledge of race and racism in curriculum and manages their own conduct in order to mobilize student affect, while considering how pedagogy inherently fails as a practice of prediction and control. These findings have implications for educators and researchers interested in history education, teacher identity, and teaching about race and racism.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

My project addresses the following central research question: How does a history teacher subject position emerge from the discursive practices of history teachers teaching about race and racism in Canadian history? At the forefront of scholarship on history education in Canada is the question of pedagogical best practices. This scholarship focuses on developing methodological frameworks towards the purpose of enhancing students’ ‘historical thinking’ skills, such as students’ ability to consider the perspectives of actors in particular historical contexts (Seixas, 1999; Seixas, 2006; Sandwell, 2008; Levesque, 2005; Levesque, 2010). In other words, much has been made of teacher practices in educational research towards the fulfillment of an enterprise in effective history teaching. The general consensus has been that rigorous inquiry based on a set of widely applicable principles of disciplinary thinking in history instruction enables teachers and students to more effectively debate ‘controversial’ content (such as the question of whose narratives should be taught in Canadian history) (Seixas, 2009).

However, studies that examine how history education can be anti-oppressive find that pedagogical and curricular foci must explicitly acknowledge the epistemological inequity caused by the domination of Eurocentric, grand narratives in order for history education to have any impact on students’ understanding of oppression and injustice (Tupper & Cappello, 2008; den Heyer & Abbott, 2011). At the same time, studies on Canadian history textbooks used in Ontario classrooms have identified such texts as technologies of colonial power through masking the ways in which white supremacy is fundamental to the formation and organization of the Canadian nation-state. Some of these techniques include disseminating particular government-sanctioned truths about Canada (i.e., as a progressively multicultural, and hence anti-racist state), justifying and portraying as common sense the settler colonial project, and presenting the few historical events involving racialized groups where their presence cannot be ignored (Montgomery, 2005; Montgomery, 2008; Carlton, 2011; Macgillivray, 2011; Coloma, 2012).

I juxtapose these two general schools of thought—the former being what I refer to as the disciplinarian approach to history education and the latter as the critical approach—because these were the perspectives I grappled with as I outlined the parameters of my project and negotiated my own personal investments. I came into this thesis project and my Master’s program more generally with the desire to mobilize my secondary school experiences—most notably in grade
10 history class—towards effecting meaningful change in the ways we taught and learned history. The dearth of representation of groups other than white men and women struck me, a Chinese Canadian woman, as a form of erasure. Such erasure placed the onus on me to assimilate into Canadian society and to relate to such Eurocentric narratives of Canadian history on the basis of “national” pride. I was determined to resist and dismantle the structures within history education that enabled and made sensible such erasures.

As I continued on my graduate journey, however, I constantly struggled with the theories and concepts that I was learning in my classes. The struggles can be described as adhering to a critical approach to power or a poststructural approach to power. I wanted to find a single theoretical approach that would “answer all my questions.” Would that be a top-down view of power in which oppressive forces exerted control over the less powerful, or would that be a diffused view of power in which power circulates through every action and interaction in forceful and resistant ways? In the realm of teaching, especially, which paradigm was more efficient in fulfilling my justice-oriented goals that remained unchanged? This project is the culmination of such struggles and of the goals that I have continued to hold dear. Having gained greater insight into the field of history education, I became interested in how teaching about race and racism becomes meaningful in a subject area that is simultaneously generating innovative teaching methodologies while facing immense criticism from scholars on the complicity to inequity embedded in the curriculum. As a recently certified history teacher, I wanted to interrogate the processes that shape our understandings of what it meant to be a teacher who teaches about race and racism in history, and teaches for social justice more broadly. For example, what are our responsibilities as educators towards social justice on the one hand, and (history) education on the other? Do they always align? What kinds of thinking and doing do we undertake to ensure that such goals did align? How does it all play out in the classroom? On a more personal note, I often asked myself: What kind of history teacher do I want to be? It is within this contentious space that I situate this project.

In order to answer my research question, I centered my inquiry on the Grade 10 Canadian history course, “Canadian History Since World War I”. This is a compulsory course mandated by the Ministry of Education in the province of Ontario, and constitutes one of the primary sites in which teachers and students construct and debate the meaning of Canada as a national polity. It
therefore serves as an ideal locale for empirical study on how history teachers teach about race and racism in Canadian history education. When I reference race and racism, I focused on collectives who historically and continue to endure processes of racialization that position them as Other vis-à-vis the Canadian subject, which signifies the embodiment of Whiteness. For example, at the turn of the twentieth century, the Chinese were constructed as perpetual foreign aliens whose “dirty and dishonest nature” stood in opposition to Canadians and their naturalized positions as rightful citizens of the land and country (dislocating, in effect, First Nations and other indigenous groups) (Stanley, 2011). Such constructed meanings based on characteristics attributed to the Chinese population produced justifications for increasingly rigid exclusionary immigration policies and culminated in the Chinese Immigration Act of 1923, banning Chinese migrants from entering the country (Stanley, 2011).

The selection of the grade 10 course ensured that the project would be situated in an Ontario secondary school that offered the course. In order to locate my teacher participants, I decided on the following participant selection criteria: participants must be (1) working for the school board from which the project received approval, (2) certified to teach in Ontario with at least five years of long-term occasional or permanent teaching experience, (3) teaching “Canadian History Since World War I” in the 2014-2015 school year, and (4) self-identify as teachers who address issues of race and racism in their teaching of history. The teaching experience requirement ensured that participants spoke about and taught from a position of having experienced translating belief into practice in their profession. Their self-identification as teachers who teach about race and racism ensured not only that race and racism were already part of their pedagogical repertoire, but also signified a willingness to identify as teachers that taught such topics. The significance of such a disclosure will become apparent further on in this chapter.

I engaged the participation of three teachers that matched my participant criteria. They all worked at the same school in a school board located in southern Ontario. The school was in a low-income neighbourhood and served primarily racialized students. Black and South Asian students made up the majority of the student body. My three participants, Peace, Betty, and Mr. L (all pseudonyms), identified racially as black, white, and East Asian respectively. In terms of gender, they identified as male, female, and male respectively. They had between six to sixteen...
years of teaching experience and were all teaching “Canadian History Since World War I” during the fall semester of 2014-2015. The sole exception was Peace, who was teaching credit recovery. Students in his classes were “recovering” credits to courses that they had failed in prior years. This meant that students in one classroom could be completing many different subject areas. Since he had taught as a history teacher for many years prior to teaching credit recovery, and since he had several students “recovering” their grade 10 Canadian history credit, I decided to include Peace as a participant. This meant that there were limitations to his participation in the project, especially in classroom observations, as he did not actually teach lessons on race and racism to a full class of students.

Using semi-structured interviews, focus group interview, classroom observations, and document and visual-cultural material analysis, I aimed to map the discursive and material formation of what I called the history teacher subject position. I invited teacher participants to speak to me and to each other on their beliefs, teaching philosophies, and past experiences on teaching about race and racism in a subject area like History. I observed the execution of lessons on historical topics of race and racism that they identified for me. I also asked them to submit their teaching resources and materials to me for analysis upon the completion of data collection. I sought to answer my research question through these methods by making visible the sense-making processes and material practices undertaken by participants that brought meaning to and shaped what it meant to teach about race and racism. I argue that by identifying as such a teacher, participants were embodying the history teacher subject into existence.

My research shows how the mobilization of the imperatives to teaching history on race and racism as moral education provides the impetus for the construct of the history teacher subject. I outline three modes of intelligibility operationalized by teachers within the understanding that such imperatives are necessary as a pedagogical model in order to engineer students’ anti-racist mindset and future capacity for action. The three modes of intelligibility make the history teacher subject intelligible as an identity to be taken up. The first mode of intelligibility imbues history education with a moral purpose by teaching the harmful effects of racism in the past to prevent their recurrence in the future. I use the term “moral” to refer very specifically to a particular framework of right and wrong that often works to depoliticize discussions about racism. Grounded in this mode of intelligibility, evidenced by the data I
present in Chapter 5, is the ways in which morality discourse works in history education to universalize and individualize our responsibilities in “righting” the wrongs of the (racist) past. Morality discourse is what enables the history teacher subject to deliver a moral lesson predicated on universalizing principles of “goodness” in response to racism. By using “moral” to refer to the history teacher subject’s approach to the use of education to shape students’ characters, I aim to make visible the fixed moral arguments deployed by the history teacher subject in their pedagogical approaches to their lessons on race and racism.

Having provided the impetus for teaching about race and racism through the first mode of intelligibility, the second mode extends the authority that morality discourse provides by laying claim to the knowledge of students’ moral characters and the methodologies necessary to transform them into self-motivated agents of change. The third mode, by defining the capacity of history education to address race and racism in the course, also relies on morality discourse to shape how and why race and racism are represented in particular ways in the classroom. These modes of intelligibility reflect participants’ discursive conceptualizations of teaching about race and racism that center tragedy as the defining characteristic of an effective lesson on race and racism through participants’ constant juxtaposition of the Holocaust to the Japanese Canadian internment and Africville as tragic historical narratives on racism. This can be clearly seen in the presentation of the lessons on the Holocaust that employ what I call the “spectacularization of death”—the use of a range of mediums to pedagogically represent the scope and magnitude of death. As well, participants generate pedagogical approaches aimed to make racism relatable and palatable to students based on their understanding of what constitutes effective practice, such as engaging students’ empathy or keeping their interests using entertaining resources. As these practices become normalized as sensible to teaching about race and racism, they help to mark as commonsense teachers’ embodiment of the history teacher subject.

I then examine the history teacher subject through a two-tiered analysis using Foucault’s theories on power/knowledge and governmentality. The history teacher subject occupies the nexus of power/knowledge through production and mediation of knowledges on histories of race and racism in ways that generate particular moral lessons that aim to fulfill the intended educational outcomes of teaching history as morality—hence the history teacher subject as a “moral gatekeeper.” By comparing the lessons taught by participants on the Holocaust, Japanese
Canadian internment, and demolition of Africville, it becomes possible to see how the pedagogical shaping of knowledge constructs very particular ways for students to understand the consequences of racism and their responsibilities as Canadian citizens and moral beings.

Alongside such productions and mediations of knowledge, the history teacher subject direct their own conduct in the formation of the ideal student and classroom for learning about race and racism through the management of student affect. The assumption that affect is an inescapable part of teaching and learning about race and racism justifies the operationalization of affect in pedagogical practice. In other words, the history teacher subject must ensure that students’ affect are at their most optimal state to enable proper learning of race and racism to occur. For example, students must demonstrate the “correct” types of emotions in learning about the brutalization and violence of the Holocaust while remaining passive to the negative influence of “hiphop” culture in the lessons on Africville to prevent “inappropriate” behaviour. Affect is thus akin to student understanding, in that teachers can in equal measure predict, plan, and execute pedagogy that generates both in their most optimal and desired outcomes.

Ultimately, “finding” the history teacher subject in the discursive practices of my participants led to destabilizing the assumptions that underlie the viability of the subject position. In what I have described above, the subject position constitutes an ideal that is predicated on the belief that pedagogy can be deployed with predictable and controllable results. Only in the belief that the history teacher subject can produce righteous and moral students through pedagogy does the history teacher subject gain legitimacy and intelligibility. In this sense, morality discourse provides the necessity for teaching about race and racism in history education, while at the same time providing the moral lessons that ensure the success of such forms of teaching in transforming the world. The moral lessons, such as righting the wrongs of the past through acknowledgement and apology, are always already known to the history teacher subject.

In contrast, the subject position—that of the history teacher that knows what students need and how lessons will end—is always unstable and unviable precisely because of what I call “pedagogical misfires.” The production of knowledge and the management of student affect can only occur if it is possible for teachers’ pedagogy to reflect their every intention. Yet, the very nature of pedagogy as a “mode of address” (Ellsworth, 1997), as “aimed” towards students, always misfire because teachers cannot know where and how to aim when teaching about race.
and racism. Once the predictability and controllability of pedagogy are taken away, upon what foundation can the history teacher subject exist? I suggest that the certainty with which we embrace pedagogy for emancipation must be reconceptualized to equally embrace the failures of pedagogy. I believe that such an approach would be an ethical one, as it acknowledges the partiality of knowledge and engages teachers and students in an examination of what is not known (Kumashiro, 2009). By embracing failures, the foundation upon which morality discourse guides the execution of teaching about race and racism in history education is no longer stable. Teachers can no longer trust the successful adoption by students of the intended moral lessons in their teaching. To teach about race and racism in ways that center ethics is to continually question, examine, and unlearn our own certainty towards knowledge as infallible.

My project conceives of teaching about race and racism as a problematic rather than as the perfect solution. Such an approach interrogates, rather than celebrates, the various ways in which “inclusion” further enables the contradictory and oftentimes racist conceptualization and narrativization of racialized bodies in Canadian history. Such findings, as summarized above, forces educators and researchers to conceive of teaching about race and racism not as a key to fixing racial injustice in school systems and beyond, but as complex activations of various discourses with no fixed outcomes.

Equally, my arguments here disrupt both the disciplinary and critical approaches to history education as I describe above and in more detail in Chapter 3. Through this project, I raise attention to the fact that it is impossible to deploy pedagogy in politically neutral ways, let alone to teach history using disciplinary-based methodologies that bring little criticality to and explicit engagement of issues of race and racism. The history teacher subject is steeped in the moral imperatives of history education that remain either unacknowledged or perceived as just another controversial topic in disciplinarian approaches, to which methodological frameworks such as the Benchmarks of Historical Thinking can further elucidate (Seixas, 2009). Without continually questioning what history pedagogy contributes and perpetuates in the teaching of history, the potential for using history education to enact resistance against racial injustice remains unexplored.

Likewise, while the critical approach to history education is quick to condemn the oppressive ways in which history has been conceived in educational contexts (with good reason),
less has been done to explore practicing teachers’ desires and beliefs in the moral imperatives of history education to resist injustice. Lund (2006) also identifies the lack of scholarly focus on how teachers teach for social justice in Canadian schools. In other words, we lack understanding in the ways that teachers conceptualize and implement such pedagogical forms in the classroom. By engaging with history teachers’ beliefs and knowledge of pedagogy and anti-racist education in the Canadian context, I make visible the patterns of thought that enable history teachers to do what they do in the classroom. This project serves as a reminder to those working within the critical approach that history teachers’ relationship to the subject area they teach does not only encompass the perpetuation of colonial, racist, and Eurocentric historical narratives, although that certainly can be the case. Teachers can also be mobilized by the belief that history education serves as an ideal site to center justice, and researchers should explore such beliefs further in action-oriented ways.

**Thesis Overview**

Central to my project is the formation of the history teacher subject, and how teaching about race and racism both imbues such a figure with meaning and sustains its existence. In order to map the formation of the history teacher subject and how power circulates in the processes undertaken to sustain its existence, I turned to Foucault. His approach to critique shaped the goal of this project in terms of its approach to analysis. Foucault’s (1981) centering of the intellectual’s role in “making it so that what is taken for granted is no longer taken for granted” (p. 172), enabled me to direct my project towards questioning what is often perceived as normal rather than to developing new normalizing forms in pedagogical practices on race and racism. I was not interested in prescribing “correct” ways to teach about race and racism in order to encourage other teachers to take up the same pedagogical models. I wanted to study what was already being conceptualized and implemented in the classroom by teachers and interrogate the assumptions held about the efficacy of pedagogy to fulfilling such critical goals as dismantling racist structures in our education system. Furthermore, his work on subject formation within power relations informed the approach I took to map how participants constructed an ideal history teacher self through their work on teaching race and racism. It was necessary to follow such constructions through a range of discursive practices invoked and implemented by participants in order to trace the workings of power relations that made the history teacher subject viable. The
viability of the subject position points to the ways in which participants created and made sensible the adoption of such a figure in their professional and moral work. Finally, his theories on power/knowledge and governmentality enabled me to think through the workings of power in the realms of the discursive and material. These theories made clear that discursivity and materiality are not separate domains, but operate co-dependently. Chapter 2 expounds on this theoretical framework.

Such a framework departs from the literature on history education and teacher identity in the context of race and racism in education, where the teacher self is central to effective teaching that dismantles racist thinking and structures. For example, markers of identity are interpreted as being indicative of particular life experiences, leading to the implementation of pedagogical practices that align with or are antithetical to anti-racist principles. I review this literature in Chapter 3, focusing on how scholarship on teacher identity have shaped our understanding of the teacher as an authentic self that continually develops through reflection and practice. I also describe the developments made in the study of Canadian history education, and how such developments have shaped the field in two distinct directions. One direction, that I deem the disciplinarian approach, focuses on elevating the status of history education in the Canadian public education curriculum through teaching disciplinary-based skills. The other direction, referred to as the critical approach, criticizes the disciplinarian tradition as overly prescriptive and examines history education through a critical lens that foregrounds such historical injustices as genocide, colonialism, and slavery in Canada’s history. I highlight the implications and effects of these two directions in Chapter 3.

My methodological framework derived heavily from the insights I gained through the work of Foucault and other poststructural scholars. Their scholarship on the processes of subjectification and subject formation (Britzman, 1995; Talburt, 2000; St. Pierre, 2013) forced me to consider the role of the subject for this project, and the extent to which the authority of the unified self holds. Chapter 4 describes in more detail the framing principle of decentering the self in this project. The research methods undertaken for this project helped to map the kinds of discursive and material “events” that Foucault (1976) refers to in his examination of power relations. In order to justify the use of each research method, Chapter 4 provides the rationale
and poststructural frame through which I approached each method. It also includes the analytical steps I took.

During the process of data analysis, I used Attride-Stirling’s (2001) approach to thematic analysis as a guide to build thematic networks from my data. Her conceptualization of how to organize three levels of themes—Basic, Organizing, and Global—gave me the flexibility to “play” with the data on a variety of levels. At each stage in the formation of a higher level of organization, themes drawn across participants and types of data (such as interview transcripts, observation notes, and assessment tools used in the classroom) could be grouped together, as well as repeated in several different networks. Given the breadth of data collected for this Master’s thesis, it was necessary to use an analytical approach that could incorporate and organize themes within and across participants. I explain the efficacy of the thematic networks and my execution of thematic analysis for this project in Chapter 4.

To demonstrate how my project adopts a poststructural framework oriented towards critical goals, I presented my data in two distinct ways. For the first section of Chapter 5, I use a case study approach to introduce readers to each of my participants using a critical paradigmatic lens. This means that I engaged participants’ life experiences and beliefs, as disclosed to me by their own admission during the semi-structured interviews, to paint a picture of whom they were as individuals. I connected their identity as racialized individuals to their teaching philosophies. This was only possible by operating under the assumption that I could fully represent an individual through language and that the origins of pedagogy derive from teachers’ identities and processes of self-reflection. By constructing such case studies, I aimed to illustrate how such an approach led me to predictable conclusions that characterized each of my participants as a certain ‘type’ of anti-racist educator, situated along a continuum of most progressive to least. I was unsatisfied with such conclusions because they reinforced humanist assumptions on the self as origin. Such conclusions restricted the extent to which I could mobilize my findings because it relegated the “mistakes” of pedagogy to the individual’s shortcomings on the basis of their personal experiences and life histories. To speak against what I had concluded through the critical perspective, I decided to shift away from the self as the central focus of the data. Instead, I engaged the data through its form. In each subsequent section in Chapter 5, I locate patterns of engagement with discourses and material practices that were relevant to teaching about race and
racism across the participants. In doing so, the history teacher subject began to take shape through this process. I began to see how participants operationalized various techniques of power, such as the modes of intelligibility, to justify and make sense of what they believed and what they did in the classroom. These modes subsequently enable me to make intelligible the history teacher subject with the discourse of morality.

Once I laid the groundwork to map the ways in which the history teacher subject became meaningful to my participants, to myself, and to the institutional context in which we were all situated, I focused on two overarching patterns that came out of the data. In Chapter 6, I use Foucault’s theory on power/knowledge to first consider how the history teacher subject took on the responsibility of the moral gatekeeper of the classroom, mediating and producing the many pathways to learning about race and racism based on developing students’ moral characters and capacities to become agents of change. I illustrated this by examining how the lessons on race and racism that I observed differed in historical detail and scope in its representation through different instructional strategies. This represented the discursive practices that shape ways of learning about race and racism, which produce as effects the absence of other ways of knowing about race and racism in Canadian history.

I then use Foucault’s theory on governmentality consider how the history teacher subject conducts its own conduct based on elevated “truths” of what constitutes best practices in teaching about race and racism. I considered how common understandings of what were effective teaching and learning, as well as the environments and behavioural expectations required, generated fields of actions that were possible, sensible, and necessary. I used examples of moments in the lessons where particular instructional techniques were used specifically to incite affective responses from students towards the material on race and racism. These responses were evidence of the successful fulfilment of pedagogical goals that framed teaching race and racism as necessary. By crying during a film, for example, students were demonstrating their capacity to be empathetic to victims of racism. At the same time, instructional techniques were also used to prevent unwanted affective responses from students that were seen to be potentially disruptive and antithetical to what it meant to learn about race and racism. Engaging in such material practices enabled an understanding of the history teacher subject as conducting
students’ conduct and being conducted by such through seemingly logical turns in thinking about what makes sense in teaching.

In the last section in Chapter 6, I took a step back from my analysis and began to question my own assumptions about pedagogy. In both conclusions drawn above—that of the role of teachers teaching about race and racism as moral gatekeeper and conductor of their own and students’ behaviour—I operated under the belief that the pedagogical modes employed by teachers must naturally result in tangible impact upon students in the way that it was directed. In order to disrupt these assumptions further, I employed Ellsworth’s (1997) use of modes of address as analytical tool to examine the expectations we place on pedagogy and what happens when such expectations fail us completely.

I conclude the thesis in Chapter 7 with two reflective assessments. First, I considered what implications this project has on our understanding of history education and teacher identity. Second, I discussed the limitations of this project and how the findings of this project can be further extended in future research.
Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework

In this chapter, I provide an overview of my theoretical framework. First, I describe how Foucault’s approach to critique shaped the impetus for this project, one that extends beyond generating prescriptive solutions to teaching about race and racism. Second, I explain how I drew insight from Foucault’s theories on power relations and the subject, power/knowledge, and governmentality. Foucault’s approach to the subject operating within innumerable power relations was useful in my conceptualization of the history teacher subject. Drawing from power/knowledge and governmentality helped to shape my understanding of how pedagogy becomes techniques of power through the processes of knowledge production and material practices that constitute what we believe teaching to be.

A Foucauldian Analysis and Critique

A Foucauldian analysis centered my focus on the workings of knowledge and power to constitute what we come to accept as self-evident. Popkewitz and Brennan (1997) note, “Foucault…shifted the focus of inquiry from the intentions of people to the changing principles through which knowledge itself is structured” (p. 296). This is in line with his theory of power, which contends that power is both diffuse and productive. Power and its effects “circulate through institutional practices and the discourses of daily life” (Popkewitz & Brennan, 1997, p. 304). By focusing on power effects as opposed to power as an oppressive force wielded by privileged individuals and institutions, Foucault’s work prevented my inquiry from becoming mired in conflict with any specific individual or group. It also prevented attribution of my findings to the intentional actions of those who benefit from racial oppression. My aim is not to discredit my participants’ efforts or to malign their characters. Rather, the benefit of Foucault’s framework is that I problematize teaching about race and racism on the basis of its discursive effects in the production of the history teacher subject. I am more interested in how teaching for race and racism becomes meaningful as a subject position than providing a judgment of participants’ effectiveness as a social justice educator.

As Foucault (1976) metaphorically put it in “Truth or Power,” “we need…a political philosophy that isn’t erected around the problem of sovereignty or, therefore, around the problems of law and prohibition. We need to cut off the king’s head” (p. 309). This is directly
counter to the notion that explicit prohibition from teaching more critical notions of race and racism by school administration, or the personal beliefs of teachers, are the causes for the lack of critical activism and pedagogy in schools (Lund, 2006). It challenges a perspective of power in the humanist tradition that imagines power as a top-down force where those with more power oppress those with less. Rather, by examining how power operates in productive ways through discourse, my inquiry asks how history teachers operationalize various techniques of power across discursive and material contexts to produce the history teacher subject—making certain ways of teaching about race and racism feel sensible and empowering. Hook (2001) makes clear that “[t]o critically engage with discourse one does not need implicitly interpretative approaches, one needs, by contrast, to map discourse, to trace its outline and its relations of force across a variety of discursive forms and objects” (p. 36).

Foucault’s theory of power is not bound to the textual or linguistic level of meaning. Likewise, teaching does not merely involve production and reproduction of language between teachers and students. Foucault (1976) advises:

It’s not a matter of locating everything on one level, that of the event, but realizing that there are actually a whole order of levels of different types of events differing in amplitude, chronological breadth, and capacity to produce effects. The problem is at once to distinguish among events, to differentiate the networks and levels to which they belong, and to reconstitute the lines along which they are connected and engender one another. (p. 304)

It is precisely the attention given to multiple sites where power operates through a range of modalities that a Foucauldian analysis holds its greatest utility. My use of interviews, observation, and document analysis as research methods was to ensure that my analysis not only examined knowledge production along particular relations of power, but also looked to the material forms of practices that derive from and may also engender such knowledge. I aimed to engage in critique in the way that Foucault defines the term. He (1981) notes in “So is it important to think?”:

[A critique] consists in seeing on what type of assumptions, of familiar notions, of established, unexamined ways of thinking the accepted practices are based...
consists in uncovering that thought and trying to change it: showing that things are not as obvious as people believe, making it so that what is taken for granted is no longer taken for granted. To do criticism is to make harder those acts which are now too easy. (p. 172)

The politics of my project were, in the diagnostic sense, to examine how certain discourses become sensible and meaningful when teachers must construct race and racism as ‘teachable’ topics in the secondary classroom. Doing so, as Foucault notes above, forces a reconceptualization of knowing, doing, and thinking in the realm of teaching about race and racism.

**Power Relations and the Subject**

Foucault locates the economy of power relations at the point where different forms of power and different forms of resistance meet, where it is at its most visible. He (1982) describes it as “using this resistance as a chemical catalyst so as to bring to light power relations, locate their position, find out their point of application and the methods used” (p. 128). Through the “antagonism of strategies,” such as the use of pedagogy in education to fight racism, power relations become especially pronounced in their operations (Foucault, 1982, p. 128). Asking how Canadian history teachers teach about race and racism positions this project precisely at the centre of antagonistic strategies that uses education to attempt to dismantle and deconstruct the ways in which racism permeates society at multiple levels. Foucault (1982) sees power as a fundamental component of subject formation:

This form of power that applies itself to immediate everyday life categorizes the individual, marks him by his own individuality, attaches him to his own identity, imposes a law of truth on him that he must recognize and others have to recognize in him. It is a form of power that makes individuals subjects. There are two meanings of the word ‘subject’: subject to someone else by control and dependence, and tied to his own identity by a conscience or self-knowledge. Both meanings suggest a form of power that subjugates and makes subject to. (p. 130)

If power shapes the ways that people become and bring meaning to certain identities, then to trace the operations of power must likewise include an analysis of the formation of the subject.
Teaching about race and racism involves the movement of power relations through a plethora of sites both within and outside the classroom, and in these circulations of power lays the process of becoming.

Teachers are often seen as the intermediaries between students and knowledge. They are people who have undergone years of education, training, professional development, and self-regulation to be able to “do” and “feel” what signifies an effective educator. They are situated within educational institutions that are themselves formed and shaped by power relations. Foucault (1982) describes:

Take, for example, an educational institution: the disposal of its space, the meticulous regulations that govern its internal life, the different activities that are organized there, the diverse persons who live there or meet one another, each with his own function, his well-defined character—all these things constitute a block of capacity-communication—power. Activity to ensure learning and the acquisition of aptitudes or types of behaviour works via a whole ensemble of regulated communications (lessons, questions and answers, orders, exhortations, coded signs of obedience, differential marks of the ‘value’ of each person and of the levels of knowledge) and by means of a whole series of power processes (enclosure, surveillance, reward and punishment, the pyramidal hierarchy). (p. 136)

Foucault’s work lays clear the intricacies of power that circulate within and throughout the most minute of activities and interactions within an educational institution. Teachers, situated within such institutions, exist as part of the network of power relations that enable them to do what they do in the classroom. In designing this project, I considered what it meant to take up the task of teaching race and racism within a context of such regulatory and power-driven processes. The ways in which power relations shape such acts of “doing” as sites of becoming, however, directed the theoretical focus of this project to the teacher herself. In turn, I became interested in how such regulatory and power-driven mechanisms shaped teaching about race and racism, and in turn how teaching about race and racism in such a context shaped and brought meaning to “being” a teacher teaching history.
Important for me to bear in mind is that the operations of power relations play out through the capacity of people to take on this identity of history teacher in order to teach race and racism. Power is “a set of actions on possible actions; it incites, it induces, it seduces, it makes easier or more difficult; it releases or contrives, makes more probable or less; in the extreme, it constrains or forbids absolutely, but it is always a way of acting upon one or more acting subjects by virtue of their acting or being capable of action” (Foucault, 1982, p. 138). My desire to decenter the subject cannot subsequently remove all degrees of freedom from the individuals who chose to participate in this project. What makes power so insidious is the way that it assumes as prerequisite our freedom as individuals. It requires that “individual or collective subjects…are faced with a field of possibilities in which several kinds of conduct, several ways of reacting and modes of behaviour are available” (Foucault, 1982, p. 139). Therefore, my analysis of the history teacher subject formation as presented in this thesis cannot suggest that such participants’ take on the history teacher subject position in the same ways past the publishing of this thesis. It suggests instead that the formations described here appear normal, self-evident, and sensible, insofar as subjects exert their own decision-making in conducting themselves in particular ways to teach race and racism as a certain kind of history teacher.

**Power/Knowledge**

Powerknowledge as an analytical frame relies on Foucault’s theorization of the productive nature of power. As he explains, “What makes power hold good, what makes it accepted, is simply the fact that it doesn’t only weigh on us as a force that says no, but that it traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms knowledge, produces discourse” (Foucault, 1977, p. 307). Power does not only oppress and withhold; it enables and produces possibilities. The power/knowledge nexus describes the production of knowledge that aligns with such power relations. For example, in the CHC2D/P curriculum document, there are far more topics about racialized communities enduring discrimination as objects of study than there are topics about whiteness as a rationalizing principle that enabled European immigrants and their descendants to constitute themselves as the quintessential Canadian (Mills, 2003). The curriculum, with its institutional authority, legitimizes productions of knowledge on racism that categorizes its effects as a concern of only racialized bodies. Meanwhile, white bodies continue to occupy the normative position in curriculum, as if racism just happened to happen to those perceived as non-
white. In this way, the epistemological foundations of the curriculum can be seen to reiterate the discursive frames of racism in how we come to know what we know.

There is no knowledge that is constituted outside of power relations that operate through every layer of social relations. Mills (2003) explains, “knowledge is not dispassionate but rather an integral part of struggles over power…in producing knowledge, one is also making a claim for power” (p. 69). For this project, power/knowledge disrupts the assumption of objectivity that “fact” and “truth” play in the teaching of race and racism. Often espoused by participants, facts are pieces of information that students are required to know by the end of the course. Rather than question the legitimacy of this claim, power/knowledge enabled me to ask instead “‘what material conditions of thought’…led to certain facts being known rather than others” (Mills, 2003, p. 68). As my previous curriculum example illustrates, our understanding of racism rests almost solely on the experiences endured by racialized bodies and never on how racism and colonialism require the deployment of white supremacist ideologies that create hierarchies out of the “races.”

It is therefore not enough to simply position the production of knowledge as occupying a specific role and function in the mechanics of truth production—in other words, only on the level of the discursive. It is vital that “the material conditions of possibility…the multiple institutional supports and various social structures and practices underlying the production of truth” are examined (Hook, 2001, p. 8). Methodologically, invoking power/knowledge acknowledges that where there is power, there is knowledge. Just as power runs through multiple sites, so too does knowledge manifest in different forms. Hook (2001) explains:

Rather than assume a shared likeness then, or suppose that each component of the analysis will be of the same type, the [researcher] must be prepared to search for similar functions across a variety of different forms (language, practices, material reality, institutions, subjectivity). (p. 24)

Such an analysis thus enables me to question how it is that only particular knowledges about race and racism are affirmed and represented in the classroom, and what strategies and practices validate legitimize and authorize such knowledge. An examination of how the production of knowledge always already foregrounds power relations, then, focuses on the proliferation and
exclusion of knowledges rather than the wielding of power by individuals towards shutting down
dialogue and activism.

**Governmentality**

Governmentality as the ‘conduct of conduct’ “presupposes the primary freedom of those who are
governed entailed in the capacities of acting and thinking. It also, furthermore, presupposes this
freedom and these capacities on the part of those who govern” (Dean, 1999, p. 15-16). Earlier, I
noted that power works only on those whose freedom is presupposed. We choose to do what we
“know” to be best. The relation between power/knowledge and governmentality is also rooted in
the assumption of freethinking subjects—it is not to say that subjects are brainwashed into acting
in certain ways with little sense of self-autonomy. However, it is in the processes of thinking and
selecting possible courses of action that power/knowledge shapes those very options.

Governance is enacted through particular conceptualizations, measurements, organizations, and
categorizations within institutions, “each with its own techniques of power-knowledge”
(Popkewitz & Brennan, 1997, p. 307). Thus the notion that governance is self-evident in society
is itself a part of how power/knowledge operates.

Teaching as a set of material practices inevitably invokes the question of governance.
Foucault (1982) describes government as ways to “structure the possible field of actions of
others” (p. 138). Teachers and students in the classroom mutually govern each other precisely by
constituting the possible actions of the other through their own actions (Dean, 1999). After all,
teachers and students are expected to act in certain ways in the classroom space. For example, a
student acting unruly necessitates an action from the teacher; yet the specific actions of the
students will provide for the teacher a number of actions that are possible in order to quell such
 disorderly behaviour. At the same time, it may be that the students’ actions are a response to the
Teacher’s teaching approach. Both, however, also operate under discourses of schooling that
construct idealized notions of what a teacher and student should do in order to create an
environment optimal for teaching and learning.

This constitutes a set of practices, Foucault (1991) explains in “Questions of Method,” as
“places where what is said and what is done, rules imposed and reasons given, the planned and
the taken-for-granted meet and interconnect” (p. 248). Part of an analytics of government would
Involving examining the conditions that make such regimes of practices possible and opens up the discursive spaces for problematization (Dean, 1999). Just like how the examination of discourse leads Hook (2001) to construct a critique that undermines the tactics that knowledges employ in the quest for truth-status, Dean (1999) points out that an analytics of government is not to assume that these practices are inevitable or easier. Rather, an analytics of government makes possible a rethinking of these practices in ways that makes it possible for us to “accept a sense of responsibility for the consequences and effects of thinking and acting in certain ways” (Dean, 1999, p. 36). Without prescribing recommendations that promise liberation upon the enactment of such solutions, Foucault (1981) encourages the intellectual’s role to be one that demonstrates “how far the liberation of thought can go toward making these transformations urgent enough for people to want to carry them out, and sufficiently difficult to carry out for them to be deeply inscribed in reality” (p. 172). I choose to interpret “the intellectual” to be the researcher and educator, a nexus of identities that I willingly occupy.

In Summary

Foucault’s approach to critique fully aligned with my desire not to present the findings of this project in such a way that prescribed emancipatory pedagogies. I used his work in my theoretical framework with the hope that it unsettled what we often take for granted when teaching about race and racism—that teaching about racism brings about eventual liberation from racism, for example. His location of the formation of the subject within power relations helped shape my conceptualization of how my participants used various techniques of power to imbue the history teacher subject with meaning and purpose. Using power/knowledge and governmentality as part of my theoretical framework helped to clarify the ways in which knowledge and practice become operationalized along relations of power. Ultimately, the subject, power, knowledge, and practice cannot be seen as singular sites of analysis. When analyzed through such multi-layered lenses, teaching becomes full of possibilities in its very uncertainty.
Chapter 3: Literature Review

In this chapter, I provide overviews of the scholarly fields relevant to my project and the institutional and curricular contexts within which my teacher participants practice as educators. Firstly, I situate my project within the scholarship on history education and teacher identity and highlight the areas to which my project contributes further insights. My inquiry delegates as premise that race and racism are taught and discussed in Canadian history classrooms, and examines how the teaching of such topics both shape and are shaped by the history teacher subject as a discursive construct that constitutes an “identity” that can be taken up. By reviewing the literature on history education, I considered why race and racism should be taught by examining how different scholars have approached such a task both methodologically and theoretically. The literature on teacher identity, in the context of race and racism, enabled me to gain a greater understanding of how research focuses on the effects and impact of teacher identity in a wide range of contexts relevant to teaching for social justice.

I then turn to the curriculum document for the Canadian and World Studies Program, produced by the Ontario Ministry of Education (2013). I provide an overview of the history program as described in the curriculum document, and the specific context of the grade 10 Canadian history courses on which this project is based. I review how the curriculum addresses and interprets the historical topics examined in this study—the Holocaust, the Japanese Canadian internment, and Africville—as well as by other scholars, in order to provide the reader with the curricular context from which the participants of this project are teaching.

History Education Scholarship: Disciplinary and Critical Approaches

Two major research trends have emerged in the field of Canadian history education over the last two decades, and they have had significant impacts on the ways that scholars perceive how race and racism should be taught in history education. The first of the two trends are what den Heyer (2011) characterizes as a “disciplinarian approach to history education,” in which historical consciousness denotes an awareness of and desire for historical knowledge, advanced by historical thinking, which describes a structured set of thinking skills that reflect the principles of the academic field of history and enable students to perform effective historical analysis (p. 191). The second trend is what I characterize as a critical approach to history education, in which
social justice constitutes an integral part of the study and teaching of history. I reflect on the ways in which both trends have shaped the field in order to consider how Canadian history education scholars have approached the question of why and how race and racism should be taught in history. To this contentious site, my project contributes history teachers’ own perceptions of how history as a discipline and a school subject area generate highly effective pedagogical opportunities to address race and racism.

The disciplinarian approach to history education emerged from teams of historians, educators, and educational researchers that aimed to reform the teaching of Canadian history in K-12 education on the national level in the form of a national organization, federal grants, and an internationally convened symposium in Canada. The nineties saw increasingly conflicted debates over “which story to tell, with which moral” (Seixas, 2002, p. 3), a highly contentious juncture of which was the publication of Jack Granatstein’s (1998) Who Killed Canadian History? This book “accused social and cultural historians of undoing the coherence of the national narrative…[and] advocates of multiculturalism of fomenting a culture of complaint,” among other criticisms (Seixas, 2009, p. 26). In other words, the conversations centered on the cultural, social, and political value placed on different versions of history. While such debates heightened the historical consciousness of various groups across Canada, some on the basis of group-based investments in particular historical narratives and others on the basis of patriotic sentiment, the teams of educators and scholars saw education as a means of teaching students why such debates were happening and how to engage. Sandwell (2005) expresses similar concerns over history education over teachers’ and students’ tendencies towards positivist notions of history as “authoritarian, factual statements” and advocates for a “humanist tradition of knowledge as a construction, not a discovery” (p. 10). She believes that “students remain deeply attached to the belief that history is, quite simply, not about the process of interpretation, but about facts, information and absolute knowledge” (2005, p. 12). The failure to teach students how to interpret historical evidence to construct narratives, rather than a singular story of ‘what happened,’ led to major mobilizations in the field by a variety of stakeholders in history education. As a result, the literature, of the disciplinarian orientation, centers skills- and assessment-based teaching methodologies that reflect the analytical and methodological principles of the field of history.
Seixas (2002), who occupied a prominent role in developing the framework on the teaching of historical thinking skills, considers the purpose of history education and the need for it to extend beyond a debate of values or transference of facts:

That is, a) students should gain facility with understanding the variety, the difference, the strangeness of life in the past, the interplay of continuity and change, the multiple causes and consequences of events and trends, the role of individuals, collectivities and states, and so on. But b) they should also understand the processes of knowledge-making, the construction of a historical narrative or argument, the uses of evidence, and the nature of conflicting historical accounts. (p. 7-8)

Seixas (2006) clarifies skills that students should be able to demonstrate by the end of a history course through the Benchmarks of Historical Thinking. This framework also “aims to define historical thinking for the purposes of shaping history assessment” (Seixas, 2006, p. 1). These skills include establishing historical significance, using primary source evidence, identifying continuity and change, analyzing cause and consequence, taking on historical perspectives, and understanding the moral dimension of historical interpretations (Seixas, 2006). Ultimately, such a framework promises a more systematic way of teaching history premised on instilling in students the skills necessary to consider the past through reasoned and balanced judgment of the magnitude of information and perspectives available.

According to Seixas (2009), studying how race and racism manifest in Canadian history is precisely why historical thinking is an effective framework for teachers and students. Focusing on students’ progression in their development of historical thinking skills “offers a possibility of circumventing the question that one is bound to confront…The question, ‘which story should we tell in our history texts and classes?’” (p. 30) The value of the framework, he posits, is that they provide a language for teachers and students to debate such questions while “sidestep[ping] the controversies about whose history and what history” (2009, p. 30). The goal of history education, then, is to best prepare students to participate in such debates. Sandwell (2005) advocates similarly, that critical inquiry—students’ ability to use the benchmark skills, for example—“is exactly the kind of complicated and compassionate process of understanding and kind of knowledge that we need to understand our contemporary, democratic and pluralistic world” (p. 14). Race and racism are thus part of larger debates surrounding issues of representation and the
validation of cultural knowledges. By engaging students in enhancing their historical thinking, they may more effectively draw their own conclusions on any topic that relate to race and racism if they so happen to encounter them in classrooms and beyond. This is, however, where I locate the shortcomings of an emphasis on discipline-specific skills development such as the benchmarks.

While I recognize the value of ensuring that students practice making reasoned judgment based on the understanding that knowledge is a construction and that the validity of historical narratives should be assessed systematically, this approach relegates race and racism as one of many historical topics that remain the jurisdiction of the state to which the educational institution belongs. How race and racism are addressed in curriculum bears no consequence to the application of the historical thinking skills. Yet, embedded in the historical thinking skills is an assumption of the absence of power relations. For example, using evidence to support reasoned historical judgments requires students to “find, select, interpret, and contextualize” primary sources (Seixas, 2006, p. 3). It does not require students to interrogate how the legitimization of what constitutes evidence is shaped by past and contemporary cultural and political values. Our understanding and belief in the written form as the more “reliable” form of transmission from the past to the present not only enables us to develop the historical thinking skills to interpret newspapers, journal diaries, and political documents, it also serves to limit the spaces in which indigenous oral records can participate in our historical inquiries. It undermines the sensibility of going to greater lengths to make such evidence available to students in their historical analyses. As a methodological framework, the claims of the wide applicability of the benchmarks to any historical context and inquiry suggests that race and racism are like any other historical topic and requires no engagement with other considerations beyond the principles of historical thinking.

Disciplinary-based models of teaching are not without its critics. den Heyer (2011) provides such a critique:

It is as if the historical procedures identified as relevant for student study have been extracted in labs from historians who lack hopes, fantasies, or racialized, gendered, classed, and desiring bodies and who also lack political intelligence. Given this level of abstraction, students have little opportunity to consider the complex reasons behind the distribution of some but not other histories. (p. 157-158)
His criticism is centered on the ways in which the implementation of instruction on historical thinking skills ignore how productions of historical narratives always occur within dynamic classroom contexts that include students of diverse perspectives, life experiences, and identities (2011). He proposes a methodological framework that takes into account an “ethic of truths” in which students engage in historical work that centers ethics and “positions knowledge and ways of knowing from or about the past as a warrant for claims centrally concerned with questions of justice grounded in particular situations” (den Heyer, 2011, p. 168). Such a pedagogical design aims to create an educational model in history that neither “merely transmit[s] information…or technique,” but embraces how an ethics focus can make the performance of intellectual skills a more meaningful, context-rich practice (den Heyer, 2011, p. 168). In contrast to the benchmarks, he posits that no framework can circumvent the historical contexts of the topic under study or the contexts of the classroom, and suggests historical inquiry for the sake of justice rather than for intellectual practice.

The critical approach, of which den Heyer’s criticism belongs, has made more explicit the roles played by race and racism in the teaching of history. Much has been done on teachers and teaching practices that actively maintain the logics of coloniality and racism embedded in the history curriculum. Dion (2007) and Scott (2013) demonstrate how white history teachers teaching Canadian history and social studies, despite professional development and provincially mandated policies, continue to stereotype, homogenize, or exclude First Nations, Inuit, and Métis perspectives from the classroom. den Heyer and Abbott’s (2011) study examines how teacher candidates in a class on history instruction experience difficulty when asked to produce historical narratives that actively resist grand narratives that define “a story of Canada …premised on an inevitable evolution of the nation-state from East to West through peaceful (even if occasionally bumpy) progress,” relegating those not white, heterosexual, and male to the peripheries of the narrative (p. 614). These studies identify the limitations of debating history education by focusing on such binaries as fact transference versus skills development or content (the controversies over ‘whose stories) versus pedagogy (seeing the ‘how’ of teaching as being more important than the ‘what’ in classrooms). None of the foci engage directly with knowledge production that is already premised on colonial and racist logic, such as what constitute acceptability and rationality in historiography.
Concurrent to problematizations of teacher practices and resources implemented in history education, scholars of the critical approach also innovate models and frameworks of teaching that work to unsettle relations of power in what and how we teach history. Marker (2011) generatively conceptualizes the inclusion of four themes relevant to indigenous forms of history into current history education frameworks that could “inspire students to imagine alternative ways to structure the societies of the future…” (p. 111) His proposal is similar to den Heyer’s in the conceptualization of studying history as a way to reimagine ethical futures (2011). Marker (2011) emphasizes, for example, “A history of Canada as a nation-state is a colonizing way of thinking about people, relationships, and land…for Aboriginal groups such as the Coast Salish, whose traditional territory was divided by the border between Canada and the United States” (p. 110). He imagines history education as a “decolonizing approach to understanding the past,” which recognizes and decenters Eurocentric, colonial epistemologies and ontologies as the rational, sensible approach to teaching and learning history. Similarly, Tupper and Cappello (2008) and Cutrara (2010) have advocated for alternative approaches to history teaching that directly acknowledge how power shapes the way knowledge and knowledge systems are constructed in history education. Tupper and Cappello (2008), using critical race theory, see treaty education as an effective means through which teachers and students can develop a new lens that enables interrogation and disruption of normative constructions of place, land, and time in the context of a settler-colonial state currently on occupied Indigenous lands. Cutrara (2010) developed a pedagogical framework in which students are guided to deconstruct and reclaim the absences in the grand narrative of Canadian history through systematic examinations of the gaps in history that would otherwise be invisible.

In my view, the critical approach to history education primarily aims to center justice. Scholars of this orientation interrogate the premise of history education and all its component parts as upholding a rational enterprise predicated on the evaluation of evidence. There is, for example, substantial scholarship that disavows the effectiveness of Canadian history textbooks in K-12 classrooms. Tupper (2002), Montgomery (2005, 2008), Carlton (2011), Macgillivray (2011), and Coloma (2012) have expounded on the ways in which textbooks present sanitized narratives of Canadian history through discourses of celebratory progressivism and multiculturalism versus those of colonialism, racism, and genocide. Stanley (2006) makes visible the saliency of grand narratives in the teaching of history by questioning public memory as a
mode through which Canadians “remember” their past. He notes how numerous sites of public memory, including museums, government-funded media forums, and monuments, legitimizes some bodies as belonging in the Canadian polity while simultaneously ensuring the perpetual foreignness of other bodies (Stanley, 2006). Highlighting how systems of racial exclusions shaped Canadian geographic and socio-political landscapes and enable history to become skewed towards dominant voices, he advocates for an anti-racist approach to historiography and history education that purposefully elevates marginalized forms and sources of historical evidence (Stanley, 2006; 2011). These studies problematize the epistemological foundations of history education by questioning and unsettling the assumptions made about the nature of knowledge. They extend beyond the notion that knowledge is constructed and examine how processes of knowledge construction can maintain power relations.

It is clear to me how each approach have engaged with different sets of priorities in their conceptualizations of how race and racism should be taught in history education. The disciplinarian approach emerged out of the necessity to satisfy numerous stakeholders of various political orientations in the history education enterprise—educators, scholars, federal and provincial government representatives in education—and to reinvigorate the intellectual and academic merits of a robust history program in public schools. Race and racism can be assessed systematically through a set of historical thinking skills that enable students to judge the validity of evidence and of multiple perspectives, of which race and racism are composed. The reason race and racism should be taught is the same reason that any other histories should be taught—because historical evidence exists that point towards racial injustice having occurred in Canadian history. On the other hand, the critical approach emerged from the work of both scholars and activists in Canada that see education as a site of oppression that maintains the colonizing and racist systems that continue to underserve students of various groupings on the basis of race, gender, and class (and others). They also see the possibilities of education as a site of liberation wherein lies the potential to dismantle such systems. Acknowledging and engaging with how race and racism have shaped our histories and how it continues to shape our present and future are, therefore, imperatives to critical scholars in history education.

I outlined these two trends in order to situate my project within this academic landscape. My own politics and positionality as researcher align primarily with the critical approach to
history education. My project draws insight from these studies in how they foreground and explicitly name colonialism, racism, genocide, and slavery as histories that must be acknowledged and interrogated not only as narratives but also as shaping our epistemologies. At the same time, the priorities of the disciplinarian approach are very immediate for teachers—for example, the need to systematically produce student assessments and integrate skills building into their teaching. I draw upon the disciplinarian approach for the conceptualizations of history education that more closely aligns with institutional goals. While the disciplinarian approach has included many studies on teacher efficacy, knowledge, and beliefs on teaching the concepts of historical thinking (Harding, 1999; Young, 2003; Sliwa, 2003; den Heyer, 2004; Mayer, 2006; Cunningham, 2009), less has been done on examining teachers’ efficacy, knowledge, and beliefs on critical approaches to history. This gap is not limited to just history education, as Lund (2006) has identified gaps in the literature on multicultural education in Canada more generally, by noting the limited number of studies that examine teachers’ understandings of deploying pedagogy towards social justice in Canadian schools. My study therefore contributes to this field the perspectives of secondary history teachers currently teaching Canadian history on why and how race and racism should be taught in history education.

Teacher Identity in the Context of Race and Racism

In this section, I examine how scholars have identified and grappled with the role of teacher identities and beliefs on teaching about race and racism or teaching for social justice more generally. I found that the scholarship on how teachers enact anti-racist, multicultural, or critical pedagogy (depending on the theoretical frameworks from which the scholars operate) often center teacher voices and identities as authoritative sources. They emphasize the inherent connection between teachers’ life experiences and their pedagogical strategies. When researching how teachers teach (or not teach) about race and racism, they utilize a critical humanist lens to evaluate how life experiences inform their teaching. I use the following studies to consider how scholars have determined the impact and effect of teachers’ identities and beliefs to their teaching about race and racism, and how such teaching have manifested in a range of classroom contexts. Such insights inform my analysis of teacher identity as a discursive construct, and enable me to further understand how teachers operationalize their identities and beliefs towards “becoming” better and more effective teachers. The majority of the literature
reviewed here is conducted in the United States. One major reason for this is because, as Lund (2006) points out, the number of studies in Canadian contexts on teachers’ perspectives on teaching for social justice is much smaller and less diverse in its geographic and demographic contexts.

In the scholarship on teaching about race and racism in various grade levels in public school education, teacher identity and beliefs are posited as significant factors. In particular, teachers’ racial identity is an important determinant leading to successful teaching of race and racism in the classroom, because racial identity so often informs lived experiences. Milner (2005) interviewed and observed the classrooms of an African American teacher of largely white students living in suburban neighbourhoods. He describes how the teacher expressed her desires to change students’ thinking and assumptions, and the strategies she used to affect these cognitive changes such as relating to students her own personal encounters with racism. He emphasizes his participant’s “knowledge of two realities” as being instrumental to her motivation to teach for social justice and to her approaches in the classroom (2005, p. 411). He observes:

As evident in this research, who teachers are as racial and cultural beings often emerges in their curricular selections and implementation. What and how a teacher teaches reflect how that teacher perceives himself or herself and who and what a teacher stands for. Moreover, we know that who teachers are, their experiences, and stories often find themselves in their work with students. Thus, teaching, on certain level, is almost always a personal and political endeavor, and helping teachers understand themselves (their beliefs, politics, values, and philosophies) will make them more effective and efficacious with their diverse students. (Milner, 2005, p. 421)

Milner draws a direct correlation between the teacher’s self-constructed identity and their teaching practice. Drawing from such a conclusive observation, he proposes that the solution to more effective forms of teaching that respond to the needs of underserved students and the priorities of social justice education is to encourage teachers to engage in deeper and more nuanced self-reflection on their identities. Therefore, using a critical humanist perspective that values the self as authentic enables an understanding of teacher identity as both influencing teachers’ pedagogy and enabling teachers to improve their pedagogy.
Bolgatz’s (2005) study of an interdisciplinary class taught by two middle school teachers on race and racism in History and Language Arts, and Mosley’s (2010) study on the attempts of a white teacher candidate to teach for social justice, both support Milner’s conclusions. Bolgatz (2005) observed that students related to the personal stories told by their teachers, one a black man and the other a white woman. Such stories, such as the black male teacher’s personal narratives of racism made humorous, connected well with students and encouraged other students of colour in the classroom to speak up about their encounters with discrimination and racial stereotypes. Likewise, the white female teacher’s frankness around her own difficulty with talking about race helped the white students in the classroom feel more comfortable expressing their experiences with race. Mosley (2010) highlights the struggles experienced by the white female teacher candidate whose efforts to transition into becoming an anti-racist pedagogue led to many personally critical reflections, but also numerous shortcomings in the executions of her lessons as observed by the researcher. As a result of her findings, she calls for teacher education models that focus less on the failures of white teachers’ to address racism and more on opportunities for white teachers’ to grapple with antiracist pedagogy that incorporates both experiential knowledge of white teachers and external guidance from critically oriented faculty (Mosley, 2010). Both studies acknowledge the intrinsic role played by teachers’ racial identities in the effective implementation of anti-racist education.

Teachers’ lack of engagement with their own racial identities, most notably those of white teachers, are shown to result in subtle biases in their language and conduct in the classroom. Liggett’s (2008) and Watson (2012) both examine white teachers’ teaching as problematic when assumptions of race permeate in less visible ways. Liggett’s (2008) study of six white teachers engaging in classroom discussions on race with English Language Learners illustrated to her the ways in which the white teachers’ personal ignorance of race relations manifested in the form of strategies that minimized the impact of racial comments and dismissed the experiences of racial discrimination endured by the students. Watson (2012) focuses more intently on language used by teacher candidate participants that enacted what the researcher deems “norming suburban,” which describes “a theoretical framework to examine teachers’ evaluation of perceived cultural resources and when these resources get assigned to urban and suburban students” (p. 988). In other words, the teacher candidates positioned white suburban
students and their families as the norm, establishing criteria that they used to gauge the ‘inferior’ abilities and cultural capital of racialized, urban students.

Both scholars attribute the teachers’ “background experience, societal influence, [and] teacher education programs” to how the teachers and teacher candidates conceptualized race in their pedagogy and teaching philosophies, respectively (Liggett, 2008, p. 387). The teachers in Liggett’s (2008) study did not examine or acknowledge their white racial identities vis-à-vis their teaching practice and were ineffective in being sensitive to racial comments and the needs of their English Language Learner students. Watson’s (2012) analysis of the teacher candidate participants’ responses showed how coded language on race (such as equating urban with students of colour and lack of cultural capital) were used without any awareness of the normalizing effect of casting suburban students as white. These two studies lend credence to the conclusion that teachers can become better teachers for social justice if they reflect on their identities by: acknowledging the shortcomings of their experiences (and lack there of, such as white teachers’ exposure to people of colour in their past and daily lives), locating the areas where they could broaden their perspectives, and mobilizing their experiences in the classroom in order to openly acknowledge their experiences and shortcomings in generative ways.

These studies are unanimous in the inherent connection between teacher identity and pedagogy, especially in the context of teaching for social justice. Much of the way that teachers’ roles are conceptualized involves intense affective and cognitive labour in self-examining their racial identities, life histories, personal biases, and investments in the status quo. A great deal of importance, value, and trustworthiness is placed on individual teachers’ authentic selves and the ways that they become reflected in the teachers’ pedagogies. While such a focus provide great impetus for teachers’ to become self-reflective individuals in their chosen careers, they also result in individualizing solutions that require each teacher to reach a certain point of race consciousness in order to produce better teaching in their own classrooms. These studies also assume that gaining a nuanced and critical race consciousness (such as an understanding of white privilege, racialization, colonialism, etc.) results in more critical, interrogative forms of teaching that aim to dismantle power relations embedded in the education system. My teacher-based inquiry grew from recognizing the saliency of teacher identity in the scholarly literature; yet, it is also drawn to the as yet unclear way that changes in teachers’ approaches to their identities and
beliefs can constructively and generatively impact problematic forms of teaching that uphold oppressive ideals. Therefore, my project offers an analysis that centers the discursive over the subjective. What I mean is that ‘good’ or ‘bad’ teaching is not attributed to personally held beliefs, but is seen as the way power operates that construct such teaching as normal and acceptable. I approach teaching about race and racism as discursive events with their own operative logics. By using a poststructural lens, I examine the history teacher subject as a formation of such discursive events rather than a product of individual teachers’ intentions. It is my hope that engaging in such a paradigmatic shift will generate insights into how discursive practices enable the formation of an identity construct as a different way to conceptualize teaching for social justice.

**Canadian and World Studies Curriculum in Ontario**

In Ontario, secondary school consists of Grades 9 to 12. “Canadian History Since World War I” is one of five compulsory courses that students must take in Grade 10, alongside English, Math, Science, Civics, and Careers. Students typically take “Canadian History Since World War I” in their second year of high school, during one of two semesters. Grade 10 course selection requires students to choose between ‘academic’ or ‘applied’ versions of these courses (some courses are labelled as ‘open’). As defined in the Canadian and World Studies curriculum document (2013), academic courses “develop knowledge and skill through the study of theory and abstract problems,” whereas applied courses “focus on the essential concepts of a subject, and develop students’ knowledge and skills through practical applications and concrete examples” (p. 18). Participants teaching both the academic and applied versions of the grade 10 courses, “Canadian History Since World War I,” are examined in this project. CHC2D is the course code for academic and CHC2P is for applied. I will use the appropriate course code to refer to each version, and will use CHC2D/P to refer to both courses more generally.

The Canadian and World Studies program, in the context of grades 9 and 10, encompasses the subject areas of Geography, History, and Politics (Civics). The curriculum defines the vision and goals of the program:

…Canadian and world studies program will enable students to become responsible, active citizens within the diverse communities to which they belong. As well as becoming
critically thoughtful and informed citizens who value an inclusive society, students will have the skills they need to solve problems and communicate ideas and decisions about significant developments, events, and issues. (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2013, p. 6)

These subject areas are primarily concerned with instilling in students the skills and knowledge necessary to position themselves in our complex world. As described in the quote above, there are certain values that are upheld as intrinsic to participating in society. Responsibility, active citizenship, and critical thoughtfulness emphasize students’ autonomy and voice. The recognition of diverse communities and inclusivity highlights the social landscape in which students will find themselves. Finally, certain universal skills are defined as necessary for students to attain in order to fulfill the above goals.

Each program has its own curriculum document, outlining the relevant instructional frameworks, skills, and topics that teachers should teach to their students. According to the website of the Ontario Ministry of Education (2015), each curriculum document undergoes review according to a mandated timeline to ensure that they are “current, relevant and age-appropriate.” The Ministry consults many relevant stakeholders in this process such as Faculties of Education, parents, students, and universities, while engaging with research in the subject areas, focus groups of educators from Ontario school boards, subject experts, and the subject standards of other provincial jurisdictions (2015). The Canadian and World Studies curriculum document has been revised three times in the last twenty years, in 1999, 2005, and most recently, in 2013.

“Canadian History Since World War I”

The curriculum document (2013) defines the primary purpose of History as developing a sense of time in order to explore the questions, “Who are we? Who came before us? How have we changed?” (p. 7) Patterns of human activity as illustrated over time become the primary frame through which students are expected to grapple with and negotiate history as a discipline. The section that centers on the Grade 10 history courses expands on these questions:

These courses convey a sense of the dynamic nature of Canada and of its interconnections with other parts of the world. Students learn that Canada has many
stories and that each is significant and requires thoughtful consideration. Students will
develop their ability to apply the concepts of historical thinking in order to deepen their
understanding of modern Canadian history…The study of history in Grade 10 enables
students to more fully appreciate Canadian heritage and identity, the diversity and
complexity of Canadian society, and the challenges and responsibilities associated with
Canada’s position in the world. In doing so, it helps prepare students to fulfil their role as
informed and responsible global citizens. (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2013, p. 11-12)

Students come to know of Canada in the process of becoming informed and responsible global
citizens. The emphasis on the development of historical thinking skills in conjunction with
developing appreciation for and knowledge of Canada’s multifaceted histories directly coincides
with the disciplinarian approach. Students are expected to gain understanding of the
developments of societies and events through interpretation and analysis of historical and current
issues (2013). They are engaged in analysing the interactions of diverse groups over time and to
understand and empathize with people of the past. Finally, historical literacy skills are part of the
curriculum and students are expected to practice navigating historical evidence. Through the
extensive practice of these skills and meaningful engagement with historical knowledge, the
Ministry (2013) expects students to be well prepared to engage in “the world of work and as
responsible citizens in the various communities to which they belong” (p. 9).

In versions of the curriculum document for “Canadian History Since World War I”
released prior to 2013, chronology is eschewed in favour of historical themes, such as ‘Change
and Continuity’ and ‘Communities: Local, National, and Global,’ under which suggested topics
were organized. On the contrary, the 2013 version attempts to situate themes within chronology.
Other than strand A, which focuses on historical inquiry and skills building, strands B to E is
informed by a periodization process that separates Canadian history since World War I into four
periods: B. 1914 to 1929, C. 1929 to 1945, D. 1945 to 1982, and E. 1982 to the present. This
framework enables the course to historicize three overarching themes that run through all four
strands as Overall Expectations. These expectations are ‘Social, Economic, and Political
Context’; ‘Communities, Conflict, and Cooperation’; and ‘Identity, Citizenship, and Heritage.’
Specific Expectations, listed under each Overall Expectation, provides suggested topics in
parentheses that teachers may use to create fulfill the expectation. For example, teachers may use
the topics of “racism and antisemitism, segregation, discrimination in jobs and housing, and residential schools” to enable students to “describe attitudes towards and significant actions affecting ethnocultural minority groups in Canada during this period” in the Overall Expectation B. 1914-1929 and the Specific Expectation B.2 Communities, Conflict, and Cooperation (2013, p. 113).

The curriculum explicitly adopts the disciplinarian approach to history education, evidenced by the adoption of the historical thinking skills in both the secondary and elementary history programs. Teachers are expected to use the Benchmarks of Historical Thinking to support their implementation of the curriculum. In the example given above, students are tasked with using the historical thinking skills of identifying historical significance and cause and consequence to examine all of the items under B.2 Communities, Conflict, and Cooperation. The thematic approach within a chronological framework enables major coverage of Canadian history since teachers are expected to begin in 1914 and end the course in present day. The installation of discipline-based skills development in the curriculum not only gives teachers more guidance on how to steer away from lecture-heavy, content-based strategies, it also symbolizes the fulfillment of one of the major goals of disciplinary-oriented scholars such as Seixas—that is, to reform history education to reflect the academic field of history and to secure the place of a discrete course in history as relevant and necessary to our time in this current moment.

For the critical approach to history education, however, the curriculum falls short. The imperatives outlined by scholars of the critical approach are absent from the categorical frames used to organize the curriculum. For example, race as a topic is subsumed under the theme of Identity, Citizenship, and Heritage, where individuals and communities that share racial identities are brought together under assimilationist rhetoric that celebrates diverse and multicultural contributions to the Canadian national identity. For example, under D. 1945-1982, D3.3 mandates that students should be able to “explain some significant events, developments, and/or issues that affected First Nations, Inuit, and/or Métis people in Canada during this period, and assess the impact of these developments on identity, citizenship, and/or heritage in Canada” (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2013, p. 120). The suggested topics include “forced relocation of some Inuit communities; the recognition in the constitution of existing Aboriginal and treaty rights; [and] the continuing operation of residential schools” (Ontario Ministry of Education,
By premising Canada as the primary analytical frame, the systematic annihilation of First Nations, Inuit, and Métis societies serves the ironic function of further authorizing Canada as a legitimate nation-state as they reinforce the theme of “Canadian heritage”.

Meanwhile, topics representative of racism often fall under Communities, Conflict, and Cooperation. For example, under C. 1930-1945, C2.1 mandates that students should be able to “analyse some significant ways in which Canadians cooperated and/or came into conflict with each other during this period with a focus on explaining key issues that led to those interactions/and or changes that resulted from them” (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2013, p. 116). Suggested topics include “the riot at Christie Pits; internment camps for ‘enemy aliens’; Christie v. York, 1940” (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2013, p. 116). The wording of these expectations already interpret such events as “conflicts” between individual Canadians, and not representative of the anti-Semitism, anti-Asian racism and xenophobia, and anti-black racism that shaped the political and cultural landscape of Canada at the time. Even the category of Canadian used to describe both the perpetrators and victims of racialized injustice obscures the ways in which nationality and belonging constituted (and still constitute to this day) contested sites for bodies that do not fit the mold of the quintessential Canadian—white, cisgendered, middle-class, and heterosexual. That the historical events occurred precisely because the nationality and belonging of Jewish, Japanese, and black bodies was always in question to ‘Canadians’ makes this expectation all the more ironic.

**Race and Racism in “Canadian History Since World War I”**

In the section providing program-planning considerations to teachers, the Canadian and World Studies program makes explicit an equity and inclusive education focus. It recognizes the presence of discriminatory biases, systemic barriers, and power dynamics as limitations on students, urges inclusivity of all school community members regardless of “ancestry, culture, ethnicity, sex, physical or intellectual ability, race, religion, gender identity, sexual orientation, socio-economic status, or other similar features,” and encourages diverse perspectives by “drawing attention to contributions of women, perspectives of various ethnocultural, religious, and racial communities, and the beliefs and practices of First Nations, Métis, and Inuit peoples” (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2013, p. 48). While the curriculum emphasizes the high regard it
places on the contributions and perspectives of the groups listed, it serves to highlight the invisible and normative position that dominant groups such as white men occupy. In a celebratory manner, the curriculum dictates that perspectives and contributions of marginalized groups (such as women) will be included. Yet, even as it claims to recognize the presence of systemic barriers and power dynamics, there is no recognition of whom the systemic barriers and power dynamics benefit. There is no indication that the goal is to dismantle such systems, simply that the effects of such problems on marginalized students will be treated through an additive (i.e., including everyone that have been left out, rather than decentering those who have been elevated and privileged) approach to education.

History education, as described:

Provide numerous opportunities for students to break through stereotypes and to learn about various social, religious, and ethnocultural groups…and how their beliefs, values, and traditions are reflected in the community. Students also investigate injustices and inequalities within various communities, but not simply through the lens of victimization. Rather, they examine ways in which various people act or have acted as agents of change and can serve as role models for responsible, active citizenship. (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2013, p. 49)

Based on the description above, the curriculum does emphasize the potential of history education to promote social justice values. Yet anti-discrimination instruction, through a historical lens, turns to diverse representations as the ideal model. The consequences of race and racism are reduced to the problems of stereotypes while solutions are reduced to developing understanding of various groups’ cultures. Injustices and inequalities are situated within various communities, and not as effects of larger dynamics, either discursive or structural. Such analytical frames are conceptually restrictive, as it limits the ways in which teachers and students can understand race and racism beyond the groups that both resist and are victimized. For example, such a framework does little to create opportunities to examine how race and racism, as effects of racialization processes, generate value-laden meanings to skin colour—not just inferiority to some but also superiority to others. This is further reflected in curricular contexts, which I demonstrate below through an overview of how the curriculum presents the three historical topics featured in this project: the Holocaust, the Japanese Canadian internment, and the demolition of Africville. I
juxtapose such curricular representations with how scholarly literature have approached them to illustrate the diversity-focused constructs of race and racism supported by the curriculum.

*The Holocaust*

The Holocaust appears in the same contexts in both the academic and applied versions of “Canada History Since World War I.” The table below illustrates the instances in which references to the Holocaust occur:

**Table 3.1. The Holocaust in “Canadian History Since World War I” Curriculum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Overall Expectation</th>
<th>Specific Expectation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHC2D</td>
<td>C. 1929-1945</td>
<td>C3.2 Analyse responses of Canada and Canadians to some major international events and/or developments that occurred during this period (e.g., the Holocaust) and assess the significance of these responses including their significance for Canadian identity and heritage (2013, p. 117)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. 1929-1945</td>
<td>C3.3 Analyse the impact of the Holocaust on Canadian society and on Canadians’ attitudes towards human rights (e.g., with reference to changes in Canadians’ responses to minority groups; more open refugee policies, including those affecting Holocaust survivors and other displaced persons (2013, p. 117)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. 1982-Present</td>
<td>E3.3 Assess the significance of public acknowledgements and/or commemoration in Canada of past human tragedies and human rights violations, both domestic and human rights (e.g., the Holocaust)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHC2P</td>
<td>C. 1929-1945</td>
<td>C3.2 Describe the responses of Canada and Canadians to some major international events and/or developments that occurred between 1929 and 1945, including their military response to World War II (e.g., the Holocaust) and explain the significance of these responses for Canadian identity and/or heritage (2013, p. 134)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. 1982-Present</td>
<td>E3.4 Describe some of the ways in which Canada and Canadians have, since 1982, acknowledged the consequences of and/or commemorated past events, with a focus on human tragedies and human rights violations that occurred in Canada or elsewhere in the world (e.g., government recognition of the Holocaust and Holodomor and of genocide in Armenia, Rwanda, and/or Srebrenica) (2013, p. 140)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In both the academic and applied courses, it is framed as one of many international events during the period of 1929 to 1945 that impacted Canadians and calls for students to examine the ways in
which Canadians responded. In the academic course, it also features in a Specific Expectation rather than included as a suggested topic, which mandates that teachers must teach the Holocaust and how it influenced Canadian perspectives on human rights. Finally, students are asked to assess the significance of public acknowledgements of past human tragedies and human rights violations, of which the Holocaust constitutes one of many suggested topics.

While the curriculum explicitly makes connections between the Holocaust and its impact to Canadians’ conceptualization of human rights, there is little connection made to any notions of its impact on anti-racist education. Short (2000) points out that “if the history of the Holocaust is taught well it cannot help but promote an understanding of racism” (p. 295). He asserts that Holocaust education is particularly well-suited to anti-racist education in that it “nurtur[es] in students a willingness to act against racism” (Short, 1999, p. 50). Numerous studies also indicate that Holocaust education that explicitly prioritizes anti-racist principles can positively impact the beliefs and attitudes of students on racism (Carrington & Short, 1997; Gross, 2013). In particular, Short (2000) highlights the ways in which Holocaust education can specifically address the dangers of conformity when faced with intense moral dilemmas, lessons from which youth would benefit. Yet he also points to the dangers of teaching about the Holocaust in ways that undermine its anti-racist potential, such as reinforcing anti-Semitic attitudes by virtue of the absence of information about Jewish people and inadequate explanation of the roots of anti-Semitism, resistances and rescues enacted by Jewish and non-Jewish people, and the role and responsibility of the global community (Short, 2000).

The critical approach to history education, I believe, would deem these curriculum expectations inadequate in formulating a framework in which Holocaust education can be adequately taught to combat racism and injustice. For example, while it is possible to say that phrases such as “responses of Canadians and Canada,” “the impact…on Canadian society,” and “the ways in which…Canada and Canadians have…acknowledged…and/or commemorated” work to situate Canadians both historically and contemporarily in the historical and moral questions raised by the Holocaust, their lack of specificity in naming anti-Semitism in conjunction with Canada and “Canadian heritage and identity” constitute a distancing of our complicities in the Holocaust. On one hand, such lack of specificity allows for interpretations of the curriculum that are non-prescriptive and flexible for teachers. On the other hand, such lack of
specificity allows for interpretations of the curriculum that must rely on individual teachers’ motivations to teach for social justice to engage and interrogate how racism operates in historical contexts and over time. Critical scholars, myself included, would suggest that the anti-racist approach to Holocaust education be made far more explicit in the Specific Expectations.

*The Japanese Canadian Internment*

The language used to represent the historical topic of the Japanese Canadian internment in the curriculum is similarly non-specific and generic in its reference to historical injustice. In fact, the absence of the word “racism” is damning. In the table below, I include all references that name the Japanese Canadian internment as well the internment of “enemy aliens” during the 1929-1945 timeframe:

*Table 3.2. Japanese Canadian Internment in “Canadian History Since World War I” Curriculum*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Overall Expectation</th>
<th>Specific Expectation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHC2D</td>
<td>C. 1929-1945</td>
<td>C1.4 Describe the main causes of some key political developments and/or governmental policies in Canada during this period (<em>e.g.</em>, the decision to intern Japanese Canadians) and assess their impact on different groups in Canada (2013, p. 116)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. 1929-1945</td>
<td>C2.1 Analyse some significant ways in which Canadians cooperated and/or came into conflict with each other during this period (<em>e.g.</em>, internment camps for “enemy aliens”) with a focus on explaining key issues that led to those interactions and/or changes that resulted from them (2013, p. 116)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. 1982-Present</td>
<td>E3.3 Assess the significance of public acknowledgements and/or commemoration in Canada of past human tragedies and human rights violations, both domestic and international (<em>e.g.</em>, Ukrainian- and Japanese-Canadian internment) (2013, p. 124)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHC2P</td>
<td>C. 1929-1945</td>
<td>C1.4 Describe the main causes of some key political developments and/or governmental policies in Canada during this period (<em>e.g.</em>, the decision to intern Japanese Canadians during World War II) and explain how they affected the lives of people in Canada (2013, p. 133)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|        | E. 1982-Present      | E3.4 Describe some of the ways in which Canada and Canadians have, since 1982, acknowledged the consequences of and/or commemorated past events, with a focus on human tragedies and human rights violations that occurred in Canada or elsewhere in the world (*e.g.*, apologies for the Chinese Head
The Japanese Canadian internment is primarily identified as one of several government policies that differently impacted various groups in Canada. It is also framed as a moment of conflict between different groups. The last expectation for both courses points to the Canadian government’s public apology and reparations issued to victims and descendants of the Japanese Canadian internment to signify the internment as a significant part of Canadian history.

Perhaps due to the emphasis on the relevance of political and government policy in the analysis and evaluation of the internment, Kobayashi’s (2005) reminder that “…racism occurs within, without, and in spite of the law” comes to mind (p. 30). By focusing on the internment as a government policy of its time—for example, the fear over national security that made such unjust policies reasonable—the “longer history of racial exclusion and generalized fears of the ‘Yellow Peril’” seem less relevant (Sugiman, 2009, p. 188-189). According to Dhamoon and Abu-Laban (2009), “it has been by now well established by historians that the Othering of Japanese-Canadians in the name of the ‘security and defence of Canada’ in the 1940s had more to do with a re-nationalization project than the ‘necessities’ of war” (p. 171). It was the “desire for a preference for a white nation” (Dhamoon & Abu-Laban, 2009, p. 171) that worked in conjunction with “racist sentiment and motivated by economic concerns about the growing competition posed by prospering Japanese-Canadian fishermen on the country’s west coast” (Sugiman, 2009, p. 188).

It is significant that “racism” does not appear in any of the Specific Expectations as detailed here. As scholars have made clear, the internment of Japanese Canadians was about far more than the fears of the Canadian government of an invasion on the coasts of British Columbia or that Japanese Canadians were spies for the Imperial Japanese Army. A long history of anti-Asian racism (i.e., “Yellow peril”) and xenophobia were major motivators to enacting a policy that removed the freedom of a group of people on the basis of ethnicity and race through the relocation of their bodies and decimation of their livelihood and personhood. This notable lack of explicit acknowledgement in the curriculum of racism reflects Wood’s (2014) comparison of Canadian and American attempts at redress:
In Canada, however, limited involvement by the government and other public institutions continues to hinder reconciliation for WWII internment. BC never established its own public education program, and only recently offered an apology for the province’s role in WWII removal and internment—an apology now tainted by a leaked policy memo that suggests the gesture was an attempt to gain votes for the Liberal party….In contrast to the National Japanese American Memorial in DC, there is no counterpart memorial in Ottawa, or elsewhere in Canada. Furthermore, it took five years for the Canadian War Museum to alter an exhibit that, by juxtaposing WWII internment with Japanese aggression, implied that military necessity justified removal and confinement. (p. 361)

Wood’s (2014) reference to the exhibit in the Canadian War Museum can be compared to the placement of the Japanese Canadian internment topic in the Specific Expectation that focuses on key political developments and governmental policies in the curriculum. The effects of racism are erased in favour of an implicit preference for the argument of military and wartime sensibility. Again, the effect of such a curriculum leaves the responsibilities of teaching about race and racism in critical ways to the individual teacher. That is deeply problematic, as rather than a “neutral” approach to history that leaves much to interpretation, such a curriculum actively participates in obscuring the historical and ongoing impact of racism in Canada.

The Demolition of Africville

Based on the curriculum, Africville can be understood as a moment of social conflict that has since been resolved following public recognitions and apologies by the City of Halifax, Nova Scotia in 2010, and constitutes a defining moment in the historical formation of Canadian identity. The table below details the instances where Africville is represented in the curriculum:

Table 3.3. Demolition of Africville in “Canadian History Since World War I” Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Overall Expectation</th>
<th>Specific Expectation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHC2D</td>
<td>D. 1945-1982</td>
<td>D2.1 Describe some significant instances of social conflict and/or inequality in Canada during this period and analyze them from multiple perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sample Questions: “What were the positions of Africville residents, municipal politicians in Halifax, and other groups on the expropriation of Africville? How might you explain differences in these points of view?” (2013, p. 119)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHC2P</td>
<td>E. 1982-Present</td>
<td>E3.3 Assess the significance of public acknowledgements and/or commemoration in Canada of past human tragedies and human rights violations, both domestic and international (e.g., <em>the demolition of Africville</em>) (2013, p. 124)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. 1945-1982</td>
<td>D3.1 Describe ways in which some individuals, symbols, and/or events during this period contributed to the development of identity, citizenship, and/or heritage in Canada (e.g., events: <em>the demolition of Africville</em>) (2013, p. 136)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. 1982-Present</td>
<td>E3.4 Describe some of the ways in which Canada and Canadians have, since 1982, acknowledged the consequences of and/or commemorated past events, with a focus on human tragedies and human rights violations that occurred in Canada or elsewhere in the world (e.g., plans to build a human rights museum and/or a memorial to Africville) and explain the significance of these commemorations for identity and/or heritage in Canada (2013, p. 140)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the academic course, the demolition of Africville is framed as a “significant instance” of social conflict and inequality that requires an examination of multiple perspectives. The multiple perspectives primarily include Africville residents and municipal politicians in Halifax. Students are expected to explain the differences in views. Towards the end of the course, students encounter Africville again in the context of assessing the significance of public acknowledgements made by state governments for past human rights violations and tragedies. In the applied course, the demolition of Africville constitutes an event that contributes to notions of Canadian identity and heritage. Students also understand the expropriation of Africville as a past violation that requires state recognition and apology.

Again, none of the expectations explicitly mention racism. Using language such as “social conflict and/or inequality” and “human tragedies and human rights violations” serves to remove the inherent role that anti-black racism played in the formation of a segregated black community and in the justification for the demolition of said black community. Asking students to identify the differences in the multiple perspectives on the demolition of Africville, as D2.1 of CHC2D states, also does more to validate the justifications to remove Africville as a legitimate perspective than it does to train students to act against racism in their own lives. In other words, it does harm in its focus on using “skills” (being able to compare perspectives by locating differences) to judge the perspectives of Africville residents and City of Halifax politicians. Although the intention may be to develop the skills deemed necessary for students to become
critical thinkers, it enables a false equivalence of the two perspectives on the basis of rationality and evidence. Rather than the criteria of ‘what is different,’ critical approaches in history education would make explicit the development of the skill to make comparative assessments of different perspectives on the basis of justice.

Nelson (2000) makes clear the ways in which anti-black racism shaped the geography of the land:

…I would posit, the City's destruction of Africville was the culmination of a moral panic at any possibility of an independent, sovereign blackness. The nation makes itself not through exclusionary practice alone, but through, to borrow Sibley's term, "geographies of exclusion". Through the desecration of space as black, the appropriation of space as white, the suppression of the story of this violence and the denial of accountability, the life of Africville is grounded upon a geography of racism, and its discursive organization.

Africville would not have been possible without the processes of racialization of both Blackness and Whiteness. As a segregated community outside of the city of Halifax, it was discursively constructed to become many things through public discourse, academic scholarship, governmental policy, and journalistic representation: “a slum; a repository for the wastes of society; a site of danger, degeneracy, and lawlessness; a social problem; an object of pity; a site of attempted social reform and rescue; and a place of daring escape and transgression” (Nelson, 2011, p. 133). Such frames of reference were associated with Blackness, justifying the bulldozing of homes and forced relocation from such ‘slums,’ which was characterized as a humanitarian project from the white City of Halifax to the black residents of Africville. Nelson (2000) points to this when she expounds on the failings of information (or in this case, the curriculum):

For the purposes of demonstrable, racist harm, it will never suffice to engage in a strictly information-based investigation, for it can never be proven within such a paradigm that Africville was destroyed because a black presence was disdained. The legal, social and historical logic of 'relocation' tells us that the city's actions were unfortunate but necessary, humanitarian, compassionate, non-racist, integrative, progressive, and, perhaps above all, innocent. (p. 183)
Likewise, the curriculum fails in its representation of Africville because it prioritizes a reasoned and empirical approach to history. Racism as “social conflict and/or inequality” assumes that they can be appropriately taught simply by “analyzing them from multiple perspectives.” That can only be true if such topics are taught not for any anti-racist goal but to communicate a type of history that actively serves to uphold the interests of the status quo. In other words, such an approach renders history itself complicit. As Nelson (2000) suggests:

Africville's story does not begin in 1962; it does not even begin in 1862. It begins in slavery, in Preston, in the founding of Halifax and the nation, in the hunting of the Mi'kmaq by British settlers. In short, our perceptions of what functions as 'evidence' must shift to enable the building of a context of ongoing oppression which may inform the way such issues are approached in law, to re-examine common key assumptions about fairness and equity which, by design, will serve the case badly. Our framework must shift from one of innocence or pity to one of justice. (p. 183)

In Summary

My project both aligns and departs from the above literature in a number of ways. Firstly, I share the goals of what I call the critical approach to history education, which aims to disrupt the homogenizing and colonizing imperatives of history education. Secondly, I focus my examination of pedagogies on race and racism in history education on the teacher figure. However, I use a poststructural approach that draws on the discursive practices that enable the construction of the history teacher subject.

I have provided a summary of how the curriculum document in Canadian and World Studies defines and constructs race and racism in history education and, more specifically, Canadian history. It is important to note that the curriculum expectations are meant to be a guide for the teacher, rather than a state-legislated policy document that mandates what happens in the classroom on a day-to-day basis. This underscores the significance of examining how teachers and students negotiate processes of teaching and learning in the classroom that extend beyond curriculum documents that do not account for such dynamic relations. However, using scholarly literature to consider how curricular representations of historical topics can be problematic
makes visible the limitations of the curriculum in the implementation of an educational enterprise that is anti-racist in its goals.
Chapter 4: Methodology

Poststructural methodology enables a study of “the operation of language, the production of meaning, and the ways in which knowledge and power combine to create accepted or taken-for-granted forms of knowledge and social practices” (Fawcett, 2008, p. 666). Rather than centering each participant’s identity and experiences as the unit of analysis in the study of teacher identity, poststructural methodology centers the analysis of identity formation as a discursive process that creates meaning in the enactment of discourse. This is an important distinction to make regarding poststructural methodology. My project is concerned with both the use of language and practice in the creation of a viable subject position. In order to do so, I must resist “notions of experience where experience is viewed in an essentialist manner and where experience is associated with individuals accessing the ‘truth’ of a situation” (Fawcett, 2008, p. 668). The access to truth reinforces a battle of interpretations that pits one truthful narrative with another. Poststructuralist thinking, however, sees descriptions of experience as being “culturally and discursively constitute[d]… Their descriptions are, at the same time, a construction of the events that occurred, together with an interpretation of them” (Maynard, 1994, p. 23, quoted from Fawcett). Maynard’s (1994) rejects the validity of a “‘raw’ experience” in poststructural thinking by shifting the emphasis on how participants use “language, meaning, power-knowledge frames, discursive interplays, and construction of self” to construct and authorize those very experiences as the truth of their realities (Fawcett, 2008, p. 168). Poststructural methodology uses a range of research methods to make such discursive techniques visible.

In interviews, for example, poststructural methodology calls for the researcher to engage in the following analytical techniques:

Attention is paid to interpretive shifts and the ways in which the subject develops the account or deals with prompts introduced by the researcher. Similarly, omissions and gaps within the text are closely scrutinized, as what is not said or attended to can be seen to be as revealing as that which is said and included in the text. (Fawcett, 2008, p. 668-669)

Skepticism undergirds the strength of poststructuralism as a paradigm. Claims to authority in the production of knowledge are never assumed but always interrogated as symptomatic of particular
power relations. That is why researchers of the poststructural orientation consider interpretive shifts of the participant through language and practice, as well as the gaps, as significant meaning making processes. This is not to say that representation is completely abandoned, but that “the site of the analytical investigation is the textual frame within which the participants speak, rather than the participants themselves” (Fawcett, 2008, p. 669). In the context of my project, then, the history teacher subject is representative of the discursive practices that my participants undertake in order to make meaningful the act of teaching about race and racism. It does not represent the individualizing frames of identity invoked by my participants, such as questions of ‘who I am’ or ‘who I want to be’ as a teacher. Instead, as Ellsworth (1989) advises, the attempts that my work makes to “construct meaningful discourses about the politics of classroom practices must begin to theorize the consequences for education of the ways in which knowledge, power, and desire are mutually implicated in each other’s formations and deployments” (p. 316).

It becomes no longer possible to assume the inherent truths uttered by participants, as in critical research. A basic premise of critical research is that social groups experience oppressive realities on the basis of the unequal value placed upon various social identity markers, such as race, class, gender, ability, and sexual orientation. In order to foreground such realities, Given (2008) highlights how “[a] basic research question [in a critical research project] will always be whether or not such groups explicitly criticize these objectified features of social life and what means are at their disposal to try to change them” (p. 174). Inherently part of critical research is the trust placed on the subjectivities of participants, that the reality as communicated in their own words constitutes their truth. As opposed to the mapping of discursive patterns in the techniques used to authorize one’s claim to a representation of reality, critical research methodology is interested in identifying “(a) patterned coordinated social action, (b) the conditions responsible for action coordination, and (c) people's experiences of life within or in relation to such patterns” (Given, 2008, p. 172). Understanding people’s experiences must concurrently engage in the possibilities towards action in dismantling said conditions that restrict the autonomy and freedom of people’s lives. Critical research is thus action-oriented in its goals, aiming to produce scholarship that works towards emancipation of marginalized peoples.
I expand on the critical approach to methodology because my goals are ultimately critically oriented. As I demonstrated in Chapter 3, there is a long tradition of critical research being done in the fields of history education and teacher identity to combat social injustice. Ultimately my project is positioned as directly in conflict with forms of teaching and curricula that uphold racist and colonizing logics in education. By using a poststructural methodology, however, I aim to mobilize my project towards making harder that which is too comfortable in the ways that we understand what it means to teach for social justice, or about race and racism. Lather (1992) raises the dilemmas that poststructuralism brings to research, such as questions of narrative authority in empirical work, the possibilities of opening rather than closing down productions of meaning, and how “our own desires as emancipatory inquirers shape the texts we create” (Lather, 1992, p. 95). All of these are relevant to my project and determines how my project departs methodologically from other educational scholarship on history education and teacher identity in two major ways.

First, I echo Noblit’s (2004) assertion that poststructural approaches show how “claims to final signifieds or truths in theory or research are instead claims to power” (p. 193). Research into race and racism in teaching inevitably, as the scholarship demonstrates, involves invocations of how teachers did or did not experience racism in their own lives, and how these experiences (or lack thereof) impact teachers’ abilities to teach the ‘real’ truths about race and racism in our society. As well, the requirements of developing the effectiveness of one’s approach as an anti-racist pedagogue involves reflecting on how such experiences reflect privilege or marginalization, often using individualizing lenses such as personal responsibility and complicity. While I am not refuting research that illustrates the problematic or empowering approaches to teaching about race and racism endorsed by white teachers and by teachers of colour, I remain suspicious of connections made by teacher participants between personal experience and processes of teaching. I explicate more on this in the following section on decentering the subject in my research.

Second, while I have a specific set of politics from which I derive motivation and desire to complete this project, I am also skeptical of the promise of critical research to deliver solutions that will emancipate marginalized peoples from institutions predicated on oppression. Instead, the poststructural approach examines how any actions taken produce “unanticipated
consequences, irony, discontinuity, and contradiction” (Noblit, 2004), p. 193). There is no grand narrative indicating that teaching about race and racism in certain ways will somehow rescue us all from the material effects of racism. There are, however, particular effects produced by the ways in which teachers have taught and are teaching about race and racism that I aim to make visible through this project.

In this chapter, I first present the ways in which this project engages and disengages with notions of the self. I consider how poststructuralism shapes the methodological approach of this project primarily through decentering the subject. I then describe the process of gaining ethical approval, and the selection of research site and participants that I undertook for this project. Following that, I describe how poststructuralism as a paradigm guided the use of semi-structured interviews, focus group interview, non-participant observations, and teaching resources (which included a variety of documents and visual-cultural material). Finally, I describe the processes of thematic coding and analysis that I undertook through a poststructural framework.

**Decentering the Self in Educational Research**

Research on education has traditionally positioned the teaching subject as a central figure. Teachers are framed as people of authority in the classroom whose knowledge and life experiences, expressed as various identity markers, directly impact the learning and well-being of the students through their pedagogy. Elevating the identities and voices of research participants in research, an imperative that grew more urgent in the post-World War II era, speaks to a particular set of politics that come from histories of oppression and injustice in which the most marginalized are also often the most silenced. As St. Pierre (2013) describes, “The social movements encouraged us to embrace multiculturalism and diversity, and, because we wanted to hear everyone’s voices and know what they knew, we invented new methodologies to capture that knowledge” (p. 649). Working within such historical and contemporary contexts, scholarship on race and racism in education often carry the promise of delivering solutions to inequity that will emancipate marginalized peoples from institutions predicated on oppression. For example, numerous studies on white teachers demonstrate how their racial identities, their conceptualizations of race and racism, and their experiences of privilege shape their motivations to teach and their effectiveness as teachers in various geographic and socio-economic
educational contexts (Liggett, 2008; Keith, N, 2010; Jupp & Slattery, 2010; Rezai-Rashti & Martino, 2010; Milner, 2011). In such studies, the teachers have commonly been reified as either positive or negative forces that alleviate or perpetuate the systemic problems of the education system. By drawing a causal link between teachers’ lived experience and their pedagogy, such research presents as premise the possibilities of liberation by leading teachers towards greater insights into the realities of racial oppression in society and to creating more equitable learning environments.

However, by centering teachers’ identities, the inquiry of history teaching on race and racism remains rooted within an individualizing framework. Quality and content of teaching are attributed to the quality and content of a teacher’s character. If the teaching is characterized as bad or ineffective, the individual is the source from which to seek an explanatory answer. Implementing lessons learned from such a project ultimately rely on teachers’ willingness to self-reflect and, to put it simply, become a better person. As Talburt (2000) observes in her study on lesbian academics, “Despite the unknowability and instability of lesbian, voice and visibility have become defining tropes of identity politics in order to validate individual and collective identities” (p. 9). By foregrounding teachers and their thought processes as the origin from which decisions and actions stem, the assumption is that the self and its derivatives can always be known, excavated, and represented in language. The assumption is also that hidden within a teacher’s role is the capacity to change societies. To attempt to undo the strenuous hold that essentialist identity categories has had on research on teaching about race and racism is not to diminish or devalue individual experiences of hardship or struggle. Nor is it to conflate the pedagogical practices of my participants. It is to recognize what is at stake when we rest all our hopes for liberation on the autonomy of the self.

Thus, poststructuralism positions as premise a theoretical approach to identity. It is in the doing that the sense of becoming is constructed. In other words, it is only in putting to practice the logics of pedagogy and the discourses of race and racism that one is able to represent and make recognizable the knowledgeable and righteous history teacher. Claims to agency and voice are “provisional, nonunitary, and situated… [T]hey are continually being fashioned in practices, [as] the social effects and not the originators of history and of social relations” (Britzman, 1995, p. 235). This chapter explores the research and analytical methods undertaken for this project in
order to resist building three separate case studies based on excavations of participants’ life histories and beliefs—that is, to resist engaging in the same claims to voice by authorizing participants’ experiential narratives. Poststructuralism opens up the possibility for this project “[to take] very seriously what we have wanted language to do in this world and what that desire has really, actually done in the making of the world” (St. Pierre, 2013, p. 650). It is in this way that project contributes methodologically to the field through an examination of history teaching on race and racism that weds discourse with materiality to interrogate how teaching engages with particular constants, contradictions, and ambiguities that trouble our desire to make reality sensible, knowable, and, ultimately, good.

**Ethics Approval, Research Site, and Participants**

In order to receive ethics approval from the University of Toronto and the school board, I had to reflect deeply upon the harm that my project could potentially enact upon my participants. My research methods required participants to place their words and actions under the scrutiny of an academic researcher, who would then interpret those words and actions. Such an endeavor involves risks that may be unforeseeable to participants; it was therefore my responsibility to ensure that my conduct prioritized participant autonomy and safety. By autonomy, I mean that I had to ensure that I provided full disclosure of the potential risks of participation to the teachers. Such a guarantee means that I respect the autonomy that each teacher has in making the fully informed decision to participate or not to participate (hence, ‘informed’ consent!). By safety, I mean that I had to ensure all aspects of my project could guarantee full confidentiality to my participants so that their participation would not negatively impact their person- and livelihood. Equally relevant to both autonomy and safety was the standing offer made to teachers that they could withdraw from the project at anytime throughout the data collection process by using a range of avenues to communicate such desires to me. However, I also had to take into account the limitations of my own attempts to ensure the autonomy and safety of participants. For example, safety did not guarantee safety from negative emotions as a result of my research methods, such as participants experiencing feelings of discomfort or anger from answering my questions. Equally, the steps I had to undertake to access research sites involved the bureaucratic structure of the education system—for example, principals were my first line of contact. It was therefore impossible to protect the anonymity of teacher participants from their principals. This
was a risk I had to accept and one that participants had to bear in mind before making their decision.

While poststructuralism informs the methodological and analytical approaches of this project, I was informed by the critical orientation in the completion of the ethic protocols. Doing harm to participants through this project would be completely antithetical to the goals of this project. Ethics explicitly requires researchers to center their participants in order to effectively assess the potential risks of their projects. In determining my ethical responsibilities as a researcher, I especially recalled the focus on social justice as the primary goal and the centering of participants’ voices as valid and legitimate in critical research. I believe that the ethical considerations in the implementation of this project are a part of the political goals of this inquiry. I use poststructuralism to highlight the discursive strategies undertaken by participants to make sense of teaching about race and racism, not to undermine or devalue their personal narratives or the content of their characters. Therefore, if ethical considerations constitute keeping participants from harm, than it is, in fact, imperative that I engage the critical approach to determine how to minimize harm.

Upon receiving ethics approval from the university and school board for my project to proceed, the next step was to contact the principals of secondary schools in order to gain access to potential research sites. Principals, as the administrative leaders of their respective schools, were the first point of contact at the local level. I emailed the principals of twenty-nine secondary schools within the school board to gauge potential interest in my research from principals. To select the contacted schools, I first assessed all of the board’s secondary schools and their proximity to me in order to minimize travel times during the data collection process. I then ensured that CHC2D/P were offered to grade 10 students based on the selected schools’ websites. If the website was ambiguous in that regard (i.e., the History Department sections were blank), I decided to contact the school in question.

To establish initial contact with principals, I sent a digital package composed of documentation that outlined the parameters of my project, participant selection criteria, and consent forms (see Appendices A-D). I received responses from ten principals over the course of October 2014. Four principals responded with rejections to my offer on the basis of lack of interest among their teachers after they disseminated my recruitment materials. Two principals
responded with rejections on the basis that their school did not offer the course. One principal responded with rejection because their school was not a semester school; students took all their courses throughout the school year. I would therefore be unable to observe the implementation of certain lessons throughout the curriculum, as I had hoped to finish data collection in the first semester and to begin analysis in 2015. Three principals responded to me with interest to hear more about my project. I will refer to them as Principal A, B, and C.

After establishing contact with Principal A via telephone, she expressed willingness to forward my materials to her teachers and informed me that she would let me know if any of her History faculty wanted to participate. I called Principal B at her request in her initial email response. In our conversation together, she emphasized the importance of the topic under examination in my study and promised to put me in touch with the lead teacher of a History Department. I was able to speak to the lead teacher fairly soon afterward. She was, I would say, wary of the prospect of her teachers participating in the project and was very upfront with me about the reasons why. She told me that from teachers’ perspectives, participating in such a project opened them to possible scrutiny from their principals. She felt that consulting with the teacher’s union was a necessary step that she had to take before she could bring my project to her teachers. I was taken aback by the suggestion, but I came to respect the autonomy of her decision-making as stated in my ethical approach above. Such avenues for information such as the union constitutes another manner by which teachers become fully informed before making the decision to become a participant. Teachers’ awareness of the lack of anonymity to their principal if they were to participate in my project also increased the risk of the project becoming a form of surveillance by a principal upon the teacher. This conversation with the teacher leader helped me to realize that a teacher would have to be ready to accept such a risk as a participant.

While I waited for responses from Principal A and Principal B’s teacher leader, I contacted Principal C for a face-to-face meeting at her school. I coordinated with the Vice Principal to arrange a time. On the day of the meeting, I had brought along my copy of Afua Cooper’s (2006) *The Hanging of Angélique: The Untold Story of Canadian Slavery and the Burning of Old Montréal* to read as I waited to meet her in her office. This turned out to be a serendipitous decision. In the Vice Principal’s office, I had placed my book facing up on the table as I chatted with her. The moment that Principal C came in, she spotted the book and
warmly told me of the moment she had met Dr. Cooper at a release party for the very same novel. Such an admission seemed to me to establish a sense of camaraderie on the basis of a commonality in our political investments. She then told me that she believed my project had value and that she would be “very interested” in the findings (personal communication, Nov 6, 2014). I describe this moment in such detail because I was and still am very grateful to this principal. This occurred during a time in the process of finding a research site in which I was discouraged and pessimistic about my chances of meeting a principal who would invite a Master’s student to conduct a study on race and racism in her school. Although I had little empirical evidence on which to base these thoughts, at the time I could not help but wonder if the lack of response was because of my research topic. It was a moment both surreal and heartwarming.

Both Principal C and the Vice Principal reassured me that I would meet the four history teachers in their school who was teaching CHC2D/P in the first semester and made plans to rearrange teaching schedules so that they would all be available to meet me during the first period. All of the history teachers met my selection criteria: they must be (1) working at the selected school board, (2) Ontario certified teachers with at least five years of long-term occasional or permanent teaching experience, (3) teaching CHC2D and/or CHC2P in the Fall semester of 2014-2015 school year, and (4) self-identify as teachers who address issues of race and racism in their teaching of history. The teachers were demographically diverse and diverse in their course load. One teacher taught the academic version of “Canadian History Since World War I.” Two teachers taught the applied version of the course. The last teacher, while not teaching the course specifically, taught a course for Credit Recovery in which students in the classroom were “recovering” different credits that they had failed in prior years; at least three of his students were completing the History credit. Initially, all four teachers were willing to participate; however, one teacher, who taught the applied course, expressed discomfort with being audio-recorded during the individual interviews. Based on my ethical approach to respect the autonomous decision-making of my participants, I informed the teacher that the interviews had to be recorded. This was a nonnegotiable condition because I did not feel confident that I would be able to produce adequate interview notes for an hour-long interview. With that, the teacher decided not to participate.
Finally, I followed up with the schools of Principals A and B. Principal A informed me that teachers at her school did not express interest in participating. I then decided to inform the teacher lead of the second school that I was no longer accepting participants due to the limited time left of the first semester (September to January), the difficulty of analytically approaching my data consisting of three teachers from one school and one from another, and the advice of my faculty supervisor. The research site that I eventually chose, the school of Principal C, is located in a low-income neighbourhood in southern Ontario and serves primarily racialized students. Black and South Asian students comprise the majority of the student body. I was able to engage the participation of three teachers (n=3). Data collection began on November 19, 2014 and concluded on January 7, 2015. Participants’ pseudonyms, years of teaching experience, racial background, gender, and course taught are outlined below:

**Table 4.1. Research Participant Profiles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Peace</th>
<th>Mr. L</th>
<th>Betty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years of Teaching Experience</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Background</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course taught</td>
<td>Credit Recovery (3 students were recovering their CHC2P credit)</td>
<td>“Canadian History Since WWI” – Applied (CHC2P)</td>
<td>“Canadian History Since WWI” – Academic (CHC2D)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Engaging in the strategies, as I have outlined above, in order to negotiate for entry into public schools constituted a more critical humanist process than a poststructural one. There are two major reasons why this is so. Firstly, teachers were most concerned with the prospect of being observed, evaluated, and reported upon by the researcher to those who had power over their careers and work conditions. The wariness of the teacher lead in Principal B’s school and the teacher in Principal C’s school who did not wish to be audio-recorded both articulated the conditions under which teachers operate in their schools. In response to their concerns, I could not position my project within the poststructural tradition in which their conduct would not be attributed to the quality of their characters. After all, I cannot force readers of this thesis to interpret my findings in the way they were intended—readers would take with them what resonates. In my conversations with the two teachers, I found myself leveraging the critical aspect of my project. That is, I reiterated that I respected their decision based on what they felt to
be best for themselves and their careers, while also emphasizing the value of my project and their participation to furthering our understanding of how to best reshape education to uphold the goals of social justice and equity. It seemed, then, that the critical humanist goals of my project were more politically expedient in this process than the poststructural framework.

Secondly, the moment in which I felt reassured and elevated by Principal C’s confidence in my project was purely a critical humanist one. In the intersubjective space we had created in our conversation, a mutual recognition of our political goals had taken place. Acknowledgment of the value of my project by a principal was, for a teacher like me, a form of validation. This is not validation born from a need to be given accolades for the work that I was doing; rather, this was validation that the work I was doing was *worth doing* in the face of what felt to be insurmountable apathy and disinterest from school boards and schools at large. Feeling such a sense of validation is very critical humanist, as it depended upon my recognition and Principal C’s recognition of the other’s personal investments in the teaching of race and racism in our public school system. Thus, along with the political expediency of the critical humanist goals of my project, I also relied heavily on the formation of connections with school administration and teachers based on mutual desires to create educational change for social justice.

**Individual Interviews**

As defined by deMarrais (2004), qualitative interviews are useful when researchers aim to gain “in-depth knowledge from participants about particular phenomena, experiences, or sets of experiences” (p. 52). In order to interrogate how teachers teach about race and racism, I conducted two semi-structured interviews with my participants. A first interview took place after our initial meeting. After classroom observation, there was a follow-up interview. I then transcribed all recorded audio of interviews, and provided transcripts to participants for their input and requested revisions. I used two interviews to ensure that I had enough data to conduct an effective poststructural analysis. As Lather (2006) explains:

The task is to listen for the sense people make of their lives in order to attend to how thinking gets organized into patterns, how discourses construct and constitute with a sensitivity to issues of appropriation that does not revert to romantic ‘too easy’ ideas about ‘authenticity’ in negotiating the tensions between both honoring the ‘voices’ of
research participants and the demand for interpretive work on the part of the inquirer. (p. 50)

Reading interviews in these ways prevents my project from foregrounding voice and experience as singular explanatory frames for teachers and their practice. Instead, voice and experience become constituted as techniques of power through which teachers and researchers seek a point of origin for effective or ineffective teaching. In my theoretical framework in Chapter 2, I described how Foucault conceptualizes power as the enactment of action upon other subjects capable of action. Central to my project is questioning how teachers conceptualize and implement (actions) the teaching of race and racism upon their own selves (capable of actions) in the formation of a history teacher subject. It is not to judge the content of the connections made between a teacher’s authentic self and their pedagogical practice; rather, I aim to address how these connections form patterns that produces a fully rational and justifiable project of teaching about race and racism.

The questions I asked are shaped by my poststructural theoretical position (deMarrais, 2004). For the first interview, I engaged teachers in thinking through the ways in which they conceptualized race and racism, grappled with content knowledge, and rationalized their teaching practice (see Appendix E). There were three main areas on which the first interview engaged participants. The first area is how they understand race and racism, addressed by questions such as “When the word ‘racism’ comes up, what comes to mind?” The second area is how they relate race and racism to history education in the Canadian context, using questions such as “Why teach about race and racism in Canadian history education?” The third area is how they implement lessons on race and racism, where I asked questions such as “Tell me about your process of planning and teaching a lesson on race and racism in Canadian history that you’ve taught in the past.” Through these questions, I encouraged participants in thinking through their thinking in order to consider how relations of power constitute the ways in which competing discourses shape what is and can be known, and what is and can be taught in simultaneous and productive ways. I also hoped to consider what underlying assumptions and normative positions are iterated and reiterated on education, history, teachers, and race and racism.

I set up the first interviews individually with each participant to take place on a date and in a location that was most convenient for them. The first interview sessions also involved
teachers in the informed consent process. For each participant, I ensured that they understood the parameters of the project and what I expected from their participation. After they agreed, they signed two consent forms—one for me to keep and the other for them. I met Peace for his first interview on November 19, 2014 in the guidance office of the school. The interview was one hour and ten minutes. I interviewed Mr. L on November 21, 2014 in the office of the Canadian and World Studies Department. The interview was one hour long. Lastly, Betty’s interview on November 24, 2014 took place in a large drama classroom for fifty-two minutes. For the second interviews, I used the same procedure to set them up so that they would occur after classroom observations. I interviewed Mr. L for the second time on December 16, 2014 in his classroom for forty-eight minutes. I interviewed Betty on December 17, 2014 in the school’s staff room for fifty-two minutes. Finally, I interviewed Peace for the second time on December 18, 2014 for twenty-two minutes. The discrepancy in the lengths of the second interview between Peace and the other participants is due to my limited access to history teaching while observing his classrooms, which I describe in the section on non-participant observation.

After classroom observations, the follow-up interview engaged participants in retelling the events that occurred in the classroom (Appendix F). I asked for their expectations and teaching goals for the lessons, and whether they felt they had met them satisfactorily. I also asked them to consider the relevance of the first interview to their teaching practice and how conceptualizations of race and racism were engaged in practice. I consulted my own observation notes to locate moments during the lessons that I thought required further elucidation on the part of the teachers. For example, I noticed that Betty often asked students to imagine themselves in the same position as those who historically suffered from government policies enacted on the basis of race (observation, Dec 1, 2014). During her second interview, I inquired after the pedagogical motivation of such a teaching strategy, to which she replied that it helped to foster empathy in her students (personal communication, Dec 17, 2014). The interviews ended with a focus on the resources that were used and materials generated by the participants, where I asked them to “take me through some of the lesson materials you created for these lessons. Explain what your pedagogical goals were.” Giving participants the opportunity to think through their conduct provides more data on how they think they know what they know.
Both interviews were sites in which I observed the interplay between the logics and rationalities underpinning the discursive formations that frame race and racism, and the participants’ invocation of the discursively constructed teacher self in relation to their teaching of race and racism. The first interview focused on participants’ productions of knowledge and how such productions intertwined with the relations of power that circulated between and through our bodies. The second interview focused on participants’ interpretations of their experiences while teaching about race and racism. What is of key importance is not “what actually happened” during the lesson, but how participants make sense of the moments that took place in order to produce as effect a rational and reliable history teacher subject in which to take up. The interviews thus follow my poststructural orientation by centering participants’ interpretive shifts of their epistemological and ontological assumptions about their teaching.

**Focus Group Interview**

A focus group enables participants to “activate and…build collective experiences” and to interactively grapple with ideas in ways that make them visible and coherent through different forms of representation (Ryan et al., 2014, p. 331). It offers an opportunity for the researcher to examine the social relations that are not only impacted by various identity markers, but the types of dynamics fostered by the context and space that participants occupy. Particularly for this project, a focus group interview allowed participants to present and negotiate their approaches to teaching race and racism in their roles as history teachers. Such negotiations constitute formations of patterns in interpretive shifts that poststructural analysts examines in order to trace the circulations of power. It was with this methodological perspective in mind that I engaged my participants in a focus group interview at the conclusion of their participation in my project.

The fact that they were teachers in the same school meant that they already had familiarity with each other in a collegial context. While the first and second interviews presented opportunities to learn more about each participants’ conceptualizations of race and racism and their pedagogical approaches, the focus group provided further insight into how “their concepts withstand the challenges from other people and how these may be modified in the light of discussions with peers” (Wilson, 1997, p. 221). I was especially interested in what patterns of discourse were repeated in the focus group and the dynamics of dialogue that played out between
participants. Similar to the first and second interviews, I focused my questions on pedagogical practices for teaching about race and racism in history education (see Appendix G).

The focus group interview was on January 7, 2015 as the last research method to be implemented. It occurred during the first period, where all three teachers had no classes to teach, and took place in an empty meeting room by the school’s main office. The focus group interview was thirty-eight minutes long. While the ideal number of participants for a robust focus group far exceeds the three that I had as five to eight allows for greater interactivity (Cheng, 2007), their shared occupation and relevant expertise in the topic prompted several conversational turns that did not require moderation from myself as the researcher and moderator of the focus group. For example, participants’ discussion on available and effective resources suddenly turned to an exchange of comparisons and criticisms made towards Canadian versus American history resources (personal communication, Jan 7, 2015).

I primarily asked questions, asked for clarifications, redirected questions, and offered prompts that built on what participants had spoken about. I hoped to embody such focus group facilitation best practices as respect for participants, knowledge of the topic being discussed, and good listening skills (Franz, 2011). I entered into the dialogue fully aware of my own researcher role, and the impossibility of maintaining a neutral, objective presence. However, I do believe that my fears of imposing too much of my own perspectives both propelled the conversation forward and held it back from reaching certain insights that may have been beneficial for the group to then further discuss. For example, towards the end of the interview, Betty and Peace discussed how the Palestine-Israel conflict should be addressed given the scenario Peace described of Palestinian students approaching him for guidance on how to make sense of the situation. While Betty talked about using inquiry and multiple perspectives to engage students intellectually on the issue, Peace emphasized the fears of being accused of anti-Semitism and the impossibility of maintaining a neutral, balanced approach (personal communication, Jan 7, 2015). In such a discussion, I could have pushed both teachers to further deconstruct the notion of neutral and bias-free teaching on topics that are immediately relevant to students. My tendency to rely on the objectivist construct of the neutral observer, for fear of backlash from participants on the basis of my more “critical” views, kept me from suggesting such rethinking. Therefore, in attempting to be as unobtrusive to the conversation as possible while sharing
“responsibility and authority of the focus group with participants,” I do feel that some of the effectiveness of the focus group interview was lost (Ryan et al, 2014, p. 331).

Non-Participant Observation

With participants’ invitation, I conducted non-participant observations of my participants teaching lessons on topics that they identified as being relevant to race and racism. These lessons covered the historical topics of the Holocaust, the Japanese Canadian internment, and the demolition of Africville. Participants identified these lessons as representative of issues of race and racism in Canadian history in their planned curriculum. As I did not gain access to the research site until midway through the Fall semester 2014, I was unable to observe their lessons on other topics that they also identified as relevant to my project such as residential schools and the Chinese Exclusion Act. This is symptomatic of the curriculum’s focus on chronological coverage of historical events throughout Canadian history. The selection of the three topics is not evidence of whether participants’ coverage of race and racism in Canadian history is comprehensive or lacking; rather, it is more a statement of the limitations of this project itself in not being able to gain access to school sites at the beginning of the semester. By the end of the data collection process, I had observed five of Betty’s lessons, one of Mr. L’s, and two of Peace’s.

During my observations, I decided that I would be consistently seated at the back of the classroom and take extensive field notes. I made every effort to keep my focus on only the teacher. This is part of my ethical obligations as detailed above; while my participants were fully informed of the risks of participating in my project, students did not have the same luxury. I did not believe that it was ethical to interact with students, knowing that their interactions with me may influence my analysis but also knowing that they did not consent to interact with me as a researcher. To them, I was a visitor to their classroom, akin to a student teacher, who was learning from their own teacher. I did not take part in classroom routine or discussion in order to pose as little a distraction to the class as possible. Therefore, no observation notes were taken pertaining to students, except in moments where their interaction with the teacher was relevant to the context of the lesson. For example, when a teacher asked a question that pertained to a video being shown on the topic of Africville, I recorded students’ responses using italics to
differentiate their responses from hers. I did not identify students by name or by any markers of identity in order to protect their identities.

For my field notes, I focused on both the dialogue of the teacher (and occasionally the students’, as described above), and the implementation of the lessons. For example, I recorded verbatim the teachers’ introductions of the historical topics to the students. When students were asked to turn their attention to a Powerpoint presentation or a film, I wrote descriptively on how the teachers set up the medium and recorded what they said to prepare students for the next stage of the lesson. I also recorded my own immediate thoughts, questions, and concerns as the lessons proceeded. These notes in particular served as a constant reminder that I was not a neutral presence in the classroom. Not only did my very presence affect the dynamics of the classroom, I was bringing my own perspectives and beliefs to my role as researcher. Thus, by recording these thoughts amidst the more “objective” style of note taking, I ensured a greater transparency to my observations and subsequent findings.

Observation as research method enables the recording or documenting of ongoing events (Preissle & Grant, 2004), which I identify as the implementation of lessons on race and racism. Poststructural perspectives on reality become an important consideration when conducting participant observation. I cannot access and represent a stable reality in my writing. The process of generating and interpreting observation notes involves invoking my own interpretive lenses to make sense of the teachers’ teaching. I cannot somehow stand outside of discourse to produce an account of teachers operating within discourse when teaching about race and racism. As Preissle and Grant (2004) describes of poststructuralism as theoretical framework in observation-based research methods:

[Poststructuralism] require field workers to examine their assumptions about getting it right and getting it all, to make these assumptions available to audiences, and to consider the applicability of such assumptions to the research questions and research participants at hand…[S]uch assessments must be contextual, local, and particular. (p. 179)

Undertaking this portion of data collection required me to be reflexive of my own positionality as researcher and teacher with critically oriented political goals, and my own assumptions about what constitutes teaching (described in greater detail in Chapter 1). In order to bring this
reflexivity to the fore, I kept a journal throughout the data collection process, and took specific measures to ensure that I did not try to “silence” my own voice in order to present a false semblance of objectivity.

For example, there was a moment during my time in Mr. L’s classroom in which I felt that he did not adequately address a student’s question (a student who happened to be black and male). In my field notes, I recorded my immediate thoughts on the situation and acknowledged, at least to myself, what a good question the student had asked as well as the immediate withdrawal of participation from the student after his question was not directly answered (observation, Nov 28, 2014). I could not speak up due to my own data collection procedures—I was seated at the back of the classroom and was not to participate in the lesson. At the same time, I could not assume the objectivity of my own interpretation of events (i.e., that the student felt dismissed). Yet, I felt viscerally (and recorded so) that I had to speak. Ultimately, I made the decision to speak to the student after class to answer his question and recognize his contribution to the class discussion. I struggled with my positionality as researcher, and decided that my critical goals were more important in that immediate moment. It was important to me that such events were recorded into my notes as they reveal the difficulty of conducting research with people for whom the topic has immediate and real negative impact to their lives. Such reflexivity also reflects the poststructural approach to observation in which no interpretations of reality exist outside of discourse. My processes as outlined here are attempts to make my own interpretive shifts visible.

**Document and Visual-Cultural Material Analysis**

I requested resources and lesson materials used by the participants in their lessons for document analysis after interviews and observations were completed. There were two stages to the collection of documents. First, I requested that participants submit the resources and materials they used in the lessons that I observed. In other words, documents and visual-cultural materials like worksheets and Powerpoint presentations were transferred to my digital files almost immediately after my observations of their classrooms. Second, I requested that participants submit their formative and summative assessments at the conclusion of their participation in my project. I received a combination of unit tests, final exams, and a cumulative course assignment.
Document analysis enabled me to consider the artifacts of teaching that may reinforce or contradict discourses spoken or enacted by participants in interviews or in classrooms. I considered these documents as constituting an archive of teaching about race and racism. I borrow this conceptualization from cultural theory, as described by Stoler (2002):

In cultural theory, ‘the archive’ has a capital ‘A,’ is figurative, and leads elsewhere. It may represent neither material site nor a set of documents. Rather, it may serve as a strong metaphor for any corpus of selective forgettings and collections – and, as importantly, for the seductions and longings that such quests for, and accumulations of, the primary, originary, and untouched entail…From whichever vantage point…the ‘archival turn’ registers a rethinking of the materiality and imaginary of collections and what kinds of truth-claims lie in documentation. (p. 94)

Examining, for example, the organization and implementation of lesson materials, such as films, Powerpoint presentations, and worksheets, allowed me to consider how teachers’ production of professional knowledge relate to enacted pedagogy, and subsequently to the ways in which teachers’ teach about race and racism. For example, the use of popular films to teach the Holocaust enables me to examine the expectations of the teacher in using such a medium in their lesson—how teachers imagine students would receive the film, the kinds of instructional techniques used to “ready” students for the viewing. Studying these patterns helps elucidate on the regimes of practices that operate in the circulation of these materials towards constituting what forms of teaching is best suitable when addressing race and racism. The consumption of these materials enables me to identify what conditions must simultaneously be in classrooms and in materials for particular ways of teaching to occur, and allows me to examine “what could be written, what warranted repetition, what competencies were rewarded…what stories could not be told, and what could not be said” (Stoler, 2002, p. 91). Thus the materials make visible the absences as much as the presences in generating possibilities of knowing, thinking, and doing. Finally, such materials also shape the ways in which teachers perceive student learning, and how these perceptions normalize different forms of teaching.
Thematic Coding and Analysis

I drew on Attride-Stirling’s (2001) approach to thematic networks to shape my coding and analytical processes. Thematic analysis enables me to map salient themes in a source of data and across different sources of data (Attride-Stirling, 2001). I was particularly interested in examining common patterns in ways of conceptualizing, implementing, and reflecting on teaching about race and racism across all three participants. Thematic analysis allowed me to simultaneously look beyond the content of the data and to look across types of data, such as an excerpt from an interview and a question on a summative assessment written by a teacher. The located patterns across types of data become the themes. Thematic coding and analysis also “take into account both patterns of commonality across all cases and the contextual aspects of the phenomenon that account for differences among participants” (Ayres, 2008, p. 869). This method served me well in decentering the self to locate the patterns of interpretive shifts and conduct, detailed above as analytical tenets of poststructuralism, while enabling me to still recognize that such patterns do not manifest in exactly the same ways for each participant.

Coding could not begin until I received feedback from participants on their interview transcripts. While Mr. L did not request any changes to his transcripts, Betty and Peace required that I made several grammatical and syntactic adjustments to their transcripts. They did not request any substantial changes. I accepted all of their changes, as it was part of my ethical obligation to respect teachers’ autonomy. After completing all necessary revisions based on participants’ feedback on the interview transcripts, I used QDA Miner Lite, a free qualitative analysis software program, on a Windows operating platform to generate thematic codes and to code the data. It shares similar coding tools as NVivo. I used it primarily to identify codes in my data by uploading files into the program, generating a codebook during the coding process, and exporting the coded data into Excel for further analysis.

I knew from the beginning of the coding process that I did not want to privilege the first interviews as an authoritative source of data above all others, as doing so would be antithetical to my poststructural methodological strategy of decentering the subject (as outlined in this chapter). Therefore, I first coded my classroom observation notes, lesson materials, second interviews, and focus group interview first. I separated those codes by lesson topic: the Holocaust, the Japanese
Canadian internment, and Africville. I made sure to code across participants so that I was also not privileging identity as an analytical frame. There were some codes that were also based on themes I found across lesson topics, although not many; they pertained mainly to what was practiced and used in the classroom and how participants made sense of their pedagogical practices. Once I had completed this first set of codes, however, I went through the data to recode and create new codes that I found upon my second reading. I created more codes that were entirely independent of the lesson topics, and began noticing particular themes that I had not noticed before because I was so focused on identifying codes specific to the discrete lesson topics. For example, while each lesson topic had a code that detailed the use of students’ emotional output as a pedagogical strategy, I could not make a comparative analysis of how such emotions were operationalized across lessons because they were organized by the lesson topic and not by the patterns of affective pedagogy employed by teachers. After realizing this, I went back to reorganize the codes in order so that I could gain a more macro view of both—seeing how lessons on different topics differed across the same codes, but also how some codes were common across lessons (such as the conceptualization of racism as tragic narratives and how historical topics were constructed along a continuum of most to least tragic.

I then coded the first interviews and focus group interview. This time, however, I organized the codes by participants. Each participant had a set of codes that referenced how they conceived of race and racism, and history education. However, it quickly became clear that I was foregrounding the individual and the self through this approach. Even though I was seeking patterns in the claims that they were making, I would still end up using identity as the primary mode of analysis. After completing the coding process based on each participants, I combined all the codes across participants and reviewed the first interview and focus group transcripts again using the new codebook. At this point in the process, I had generated two seemingly disparate codebooks based on my data sets.

After exporting both codebooks into a single Excel file, I read through the excerpts under each code to generate Basic Themes that “are simple premises characteristic of the data” (Attride-Stirling, 2001, p. 389). Using a table in Microsoft Word, I wrote summarizing statements based on the data from clusters of codes that shared similar ideas and concepts. I then further condensed these summarizing statements into a list of thirty-eight Basic Themes. Each
Basic Theme could be traced back to one or several codes. Once I went back and checked the Basic Themes against the Excel file of codes again, I printed them out. I cut them into slips of paper that I reorganized into Organizing Themes. From the thirty-eight Basic Themes, I generated nine Organizing Themes which “summarize the principal assumptions of a group of Basic Themes” (Attride-Stirling, 2001, p. 389). At this point, each Organizing Theme represented codes derived from interviews, classroom observations, and lesson materials. It is through this process that the two codebooks were analyzed across for salient themes, and then combined to illustrate common principles across all of the data. Finally, the Organizing Themes were digitized and organized under five Global Themes which provides “a summary of the main themes and a revealing interpretation of the texts...Each Global Theme is the core of a thematic network” (Attride-Stirling, 2001, p. 389).

The table below demonstrates a small portion of this stage of the coding process:

Table 5.2. Formation of Basic Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Issues Discussed</th>
<th>Basic Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- How Racism Works</td>
<td>- Racism exists throughout societies</td>
<td>There are multiple ways of defining racism (i.e., cultural upbringing, belief system, structure of power), and it is commonly understood to have changed over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Manifestations of Racism</td>
<td>- Racism changes over time</td>
<td>Race-thinking is the most salient determinant of racism, even as racism manifests in systemic and structural inequities against specific groups. Race-thinking is attributable to everybody, and whiteness disappears.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Manifestations of What is Not Racism</td>
<td>- Racism has an origin (past, present, future)</td>
<td>Acknowledging racism helps undo racism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Racism Past and Present</td>
<td>- Racism = cultural upbringing, belief system, structure of power</td>
<td>‘Light’ and ‘moderate’ racism is positioned vis-à-vis extreme racism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Racism can always be much worse than it is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Individual &lt;---&gt; Systemic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Race-thinking/feeling (is the root)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Everyone’s responsible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Acknowledging racism helps undo racism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attride-Stirling’s (2001) thematic networks thus allowed for malleable movement and formation of overarching themes that were unrestricted by data types, participants, or topics. It allowed for the triangulation of data that enabled me to explore precisely what Hook (2001) describes as “extra-textual factors” that are necessary to corroborate the findings of textual analyses (p. 38). In the context of this project, that means that interviews as the vehicle through which participants represent themselves with assumed authority are triangulated with “history, materiality, [and] conditions of possibility,” through a framework that recognizes these seemingly disparate pieces as claims to power (Hook, 2001, p. 38).

Theoretically, I drew upon Hook’s (2001) insights on the shortcomings of a primarily textual-based analysis. He says that to remain preoccupied only with the contents of the text means that the researcher “will not be able to properly engage with discourse as an instrument of power precisely because they will not have reference to a greater macro perspective where different and powerful material instances of power are intimately connected to its various textual elements” (p. 34). The decision to employ a range of research methods, as described above, is precisely to ensure that such a macro perspective can be achieved in some form. It is not enough to examine only the ways in which teachers represent their own teaching; to consider more broadly what it means to teach, it is necessary to see how such teaching play out in the classroom (Schoenfeld, 2013). I therefore used Attride-Stirling’s (2001) thematic networks in conjunction with Hook’s theorization of Foucauldian discourse analysis methodology in order to generate multi-tiered analyses that allowed for the diversity of participants, data, and patterns.

**In Summary**

In this chapter, I provide an overview of the methodological turns taken in the execution of this project. I make explicit my poststructural framework by exploring how I envision the decentering of the self shapes my research methods and analytical processes. I present each research method and their relevance to the project while locating their implementation within the poststructural framework. Finally, I detail my thematic coding and analysis to illustrate how I engaged with the data on multiple levels to account for the range of participants and forms of data.
Although I went into this project confident that a poststructural framework was enough to guide my methodological decisions and insights, I found that the execution of this project required explicit engagement with the critical approach. For example, in the development of my ethics protocol and in my negotiations to gain access to the research site, I relied heavily on the self as the starting point through which to connect with my participants and others who supported my project. I needed to constantly center teachers in my considerations of how my project could enact harm. It was a constant struggle of hoping that I had the foresight to predict how certain data collection methods would turn out in the hopes that I would not be reflecting in hindsight on the harm I inflicted.

As well, I believe that had I strived to make my own political investments and views more clear to participants, especially to those I implicitly feared backlash and the potential withdrawal from my study, there may have been more generative conversations about the enactment of pedagogy for social justice. I felt the same urge to protect myself as much as the teachers who eventually decided not to participate in my project. Yet, at this point, it feels like a disservice to my participants, to whom I was not entirely honest all of the time about my positionality and reflexivity. Perhaps it is because I am both younger in age and in my career trajectory as a teacher, and what the ramifications might be if I spoke with honesty. I was also not interested in speaking authoritatively from my position as a woman of colour, as that undermines the poststructural skepticism towards claims to authority. Yet, to speak from my positionality always already confers authority on the basis of my personal experience, against which no one can argue. The same applies to my participants. So how do I continue to negotiate the tension of being transparent about my politics while resisting the tendency of such conversations to become a battle over the authenticity of my life experiences over those of others? That remains a dilemma upon which I continue to reflect.

In conducting this project, I attempted to be both critical and poststructural at the same time. Outlining my struggles with the paradigms, as I have done above, accomplishes two things. It forces me to hold myself accountable where I have fallen short in the ways that I approached the project. It also forces me to become very aware of my own idealism towards the capacity of this project to instigate change. Neither would be possible if I did not attempt, throughout this project, to employ both paradigmatic approaches in different and complex ways. By identifying
the areas where I found the critical approach and the poststructural approaches to be particularly useful, I have come to believe that researchers can indeed be both critical and poststructural.

In both paradigms, there are areas in which they remain incommensurable. For example, their approaches to subjectivity, truth, and power differ vastly on both ontological and epistemological grounds. Yet it is precisely this incommensurability that makes them so useful when placed together in a research project of this nature. The poststructural paradigm enables me to retain the political goals of the critical paradigm, such as resisting racial injustice in society, while enabling me to criticize the desire for emancipation within critical scholarship that tends to elevate the self as the solution to oppressive educational practices. Likewise, the critical paradigm enables me to focus the analytical and theoretical insights of the poststructural paradigm without losing sight of my political and anti-oppressive goals. Using both paradigms was a consistently complex and strategic process where the most advantageous elements of each paradigm were employed to offset the less useful elements within the other. Only through such constant reflexivity and by troubling my use of them, as I have detailed in this chapter, could I have reconciled my employment of both paradigms.
Chapter 5: Data Presentation

In the first section of this chapter, I construct each participant’s profiles as individual case studies to introduce them to the reader. Using a critical humanist approach, I highlight how they frame their pedagogy in the context of race and racism through their identities and experiences. I extend the analysis in order to demonstrate how such an approach might be helpful or limiting for this project. My intention is to illustrate how the data can be represented through two paradigmatic lenses. The first is a humanist approach that centers the teacher participants and their personal experiences as major determinants of their identities. Humanism foregrounds the self as authentic and autonomous by mobilizing voice and identity as trustworthy modes of representation. Poststructuralism, on the other hand, decenters and de-essentializes the self by regarding voice and identity as discursive constructions with specific categorizing imperatives. Framing the data through this juxtaposition demonstrates the various limitations that the humanist approach places on this project. While I share the political goals of critical scholars—that of educational research for social justice—I also place under suspicion the promise of emancipation in humanist critical research on education. Such research assumes that “effective” practices and strategies can be excavated from excellent teachers and subsequently emulated by well-intentioned, but less critical teachers. This approach is rooted in a framework of self-improvement, relying on educators’ willingness to subscribe to practices legitimated by research and policy. A poststructural analysis of history teaching makes visible the particular discourses and material practices in the field with relation to race and racism that shape the history teacher into a viable subject position. This enables a different mobilization of this project in the fields of teacher education and curriculum development by refusing to attribute “bad” teaching to “bad” people. Instead, a poststructural analysis engages teachers not in the search for newer and better pedagogical practices, but in the constant critique of “assumptions, of familiar notions, of established, unexamined ways of thinking the accepted practices are based” and “to make harder those acts which are now too easy” (Foucault, 1981, 172).

In the second section on the first set of interviews, I use participants’ responses to locate three discursive techniques that make the history teacher subject intelligible as an identity that can be taken up; I refer to them as the three modes of intelligibility. I argue that these modes rationalize the figure of the history teacher subject and justify the necessity of such a figure in
the classroom. I use these modes to answer part of my research question; that is, to locate from what discourses on history education the history teacher subject is centered. These modes center on a morality discourse that is predicated on the authority and knowledge of the history teacher subject on what constitutes “right” and “wrong.” Alongside teachers’ pedagogical expertise, morality discourse in history education makes sensible the production of premeditated moral lessons in the teaching of race and racism. My analysis in this chapter and the next seeks to problematize how such morality discourse permeates the teaching of history.

The first mode of intelligibility identifies the moral imperatives of history education; that is the intrinsic potential that history education holds to “teach” the next generation about the wrongs of the past so that they would not be repeated in the future. The history teacher subject is the vehicle through which such potential can be carried out. The second mode of intelligibility alludes to the “how” of teaching such historical moral lessons—the history teacher subject possesses the knowledge and pedagogical expertise to guide students through the moral questions of the past so that students emerge as a moral, righteous people. The third mode of intelligibility positions the history teacher subject as able to determine the capacity of history education to address race and racism in particular ways, such as how race and racism should be referenced (or not) in the curriculum document for Canadian and World Studies. These modes culminate in activating forms of intelligibility that I come to understand and interpret through the history teacher subject.

In the third section on classroom observations and lesson materials, I provide an overview of the three historical topics that participants taught in the timeframe that I was there as researcher, and how they operate within a will to truth by deploying such historical events as tragic narratives and discrete units of analysis. The conclusion I draw here coincides with the third mode of intelligibility; that is, in shaping how race and racism as historical topics are organized, narrativized, and presented. I bring attention to how the participants present the Holocaust in particular through what I call the “spectacularization of death,” in that death in its various audio-visual representations (i.e., statistics, imagery, and stories of violence and brutalization) come to define racism through a paradigm of tragedy. Other historical events, such as the Japanese Canadian internment and the demolition of Africville, are measured against such a standard of tragic tales of racism, are found wanting, and are therefore seen as limited in their
capacity to teach effectively about the effects of race and racism.

In the last section, I use the second and focus group interviews to explore how participants make race and racism palatable for the classroom in order to engage their students. The palatability necessary to teach about race and racism links to the second mode of intelligibility, where history teachers’ knowledge of their student enable them to generate pedagogical strategies that can best meet student needs in fulfilling the goals of history as forms of moral lessons. Participants describing their use of entertainment and empathy, to engage students’ interest and to engage students’ emotions respectively, construct what appears to be commonsense about teaching more generally. If students are not engaged intellectually or emotionally, or both, then teaching about race and racism will fail to elicit any desire in students to take their learning further by effecting change in the world against racial injustice. This progression of learning, whereby teachers must “hook” students into the topic first before they can conduct any “real” (i.e., effective) teaching, necessitates representing race and racism in particular ways.

These last three sections explicitly shift away from identity as the primary lens by disrupting the cohesive and coherent participant-centered narratives of the previous section. Readers “experience” the data through my own encounters with each data set. Organizing by data type reinforces my poststructural approach by unsettling my own and the readers’ expectations of identity-based examinations of the data. By focusing on the form of the data rather than by participant, I aim to make visible the discursive and material patterns that occur across participants and contexts.

**Humanist Conceptualization of the Self**

I met with Peace to conduct his first interview on November 19th. From our very first meeting, Peace had expressed enthusiasm for my project and for his participation. He had asked me to take on an active role in providing resources in support of his lesson planning in teaching race and racism to his credit recovery class, and he identified the subject as being absolutely critical to his own development as a teacher. Our politics, particularly our approaches to race and racism and our views on education, aligned completely:
E: When the word racism comes up, what comes to mind?

P: Racism. Well, a thing that comes to mind meaning learned behaviour. Something that's learned. When I think of racism, I think of equality, belief system, ideology, power in particular. Like, the whole question of, can non-whites be racist? I don't think so. I think there can be prejudice, but I think it comes to power. So racism is an ideology in which in order to really truly act on it, you have to have power. And then they all manifest itself in a variety of different areas in terms of businesses, politics, who has economic power. When I think of race, I think of ideology. I think of a belief system that says certain races or groups are better than other people and more importantly I think of power. Like certain people have political power, economic power.

E: Who?

P: White males. And not just white males, but in terms of females, white females. White males, white females, middle-class, upper-class. That kind of power and privilege.

E: So also I'm starting to hear this class analysis, intersecting...

P: Yeah. It's very much so, yeah. And to be even more specific, white, middle-class, upper-class, males, females, able-bodied, straight. (Peace, personal communication, Nov 19, 2014)

His explicit articulations of a system of socio-economic stratification based on racist ideology and the impact of various intersecting identity markers such as class and gender exemplifies a critical perspective on racism in Canada. By identifying power as the primary vehicle through which inequity is perpetuated, he suggests that the effects of racism play out in institutionalized contexts and actively constructs certain groups of people sharing common identity markers as superior and other groups sharing other identity markers as inferior.

When questioned as to where such views originate, he credits his life experiences as a black man:

From an early age it was ingrained in me that you're a black male, you got to work twice as hard…So the one level was personal, so familial, personal. You're black. And so that's with
me to this day... Work twice as hard, be twice as driven, to prove myself. Over and over again. So that's one way. The other way was more like cultural awakening. So like reading, watching movies about blacks in Canada, blacks throughout the world, the history of different ethnic groups. So another way was just through reading. History, culture, Canadian history, look at these from different groups...People I associate with, who know a lot about history, like activists, community activists, sort of have the, helped me to develop an awareness of race and racism. (Peace, personal communication, Nov 19, 2014)

Moments like these illustrate the ways in which he foregrounds his identity throughout the interview as a black male teacher at a school located in a low socio-economic neighbourhood, comprising mostly black and South Asian students. Peace’s pedagogical approaches, such as “[u]sing history to examine who has power, which stories are being told, which stories are being mandated, and what can we do to restructure society,” align with his political views (personal communication, Nov 19, 2014). However, his experiences have also shown him that such views are “too radical”:

I'm not saying I'm the second coming, I'm Malcolm X, but it's important to me, right? And I think it's harder for those educators to get ahead than if you're just toeing the company line, playing it safe as a person of colour...[F]or me, like when I go for interviews, I would say that as a leader, I want to try and work with the staff and students in my classroom and as a leader outside, to try and create a school culture that is free of racism, sexism, homophobia and I mean it. I'm not just bullshtting. Like I really mean it... It scares people. (Peace, personal communication, Nov 19, 2014)

He perceives his views as being atypical of other teachers and administrators in his profession. A critical humanist perspective of his interview would elevate his black identity and the way it has informed his teacher self. Peace thus takes on the characterization of the radical black teacher by naming explicitly to me that which he often censors around others at his school. As a first interview, it proved to be an exceptional challenge to my desire to decenter the subject because he offered such compelling personal narratives of the development of his critical consciousness in relation to his experiences as a black man.

It was on the morning of November 21st that I met Mr. L for his first interview. It was clear
throughout the interview that Mr. L had read through the interview guide I had provided prior to
the interview and was familiar with what I was about to ask. Unlike Peace, Mr. L rarely
referenced his own racial and ethnic identity as a Chinese Canadian man in conjunction with his
perspectives on race and racism in education. To me, his approach seemed more to be that of a
distant observer:

Going back to the education system, I can say that the system right now is rather unfair…
We do have a good curriculum, but the ways the schools are set up and the ways the
schools are funded is extremely inequitable. For example, if a school is situated within a
very wealthy neighbourhood, then the population that goes to the school will be a lot
higher in terms of quality, their ability to fundraise, as well as parental involvement. So
that would be a lot higher in places that are geographically with higher economic status.
However, schools in lower socioeconomic neighbourhoods, they are usually less funded
because of their inability to fundraise as well as the lack of involvement from parents and
students because they don't see the school as a focus of their life. They don't feel any pride
in the school because of how the system works, because of how their peers behave,
because of how the schools lack these and these and these kinds of things. (Mr. L, personal
communication, Nov 21, 2014)

This perception of society was not represented to me as having come from his lived experience
or his racial identity marker. He attributes this knowledge to his six years as a teacher and to his
years as an undergraduate student, “Because I did Social Sciences in university, so since
undergrad, I have always been informed about race and racism and how that relates to
socioeconomic status… Because we see it from a sociological standpoint, so we view problems
from beneath” (personal communication, Nov 21, 2014). Throughout the interview, his
perspectives relate class to race, and subsequently this correlation to the students that he teaches.
He identifies class as a major predictor of students’ success, and “recognize[s] that property is a
powerful determinant of academic advantage” (Ladson-Billings, 1998, p. 21).

Yet his position on whether his students’ lower academic abilities and their lack of
motivation were a product of their environment or their autonomic decision-making constantly
wavers throughout the interview. He explains this uncertainty in detail at one point:
Like their parents, they have to work three jobs, they don't really stay at home, so that's why the kids don't really get any parental involvement... So on one hand, I recognize that aspect of their life, but on the other hand, I feel frustrated that why can't they step up and why can't they just recognize the need to step out of the poverty cycle? Why can't they step outside the circle and just force themselves to behave? Force themselves to realize that they need an education to move out of this cycle of poverty. So sometimes on one hand I recognize this, on the other hand I feel very frustrated that why can't they be stronger? Because I know there are people whose parents have nothing, their parents were, you know, target of prejudice and racist systemic oppression. But they managed to step out and got to who they are today because they realize the need to change. So this is a conflicting mentality. (Mr. L, personal communication, Nov 21, 2014)

He paints a bleak picture of generational poverty and clearly identifies such problems as a product of society, while struggling to understand why his students cannot see education as the solution to their poverty. Mr. L seems to exemplify two contradictory teacher identities—a teacher with an enlightened perspective on race and class relations in the context of the education system, or a teacher with a deficit view of his applied level class. His views appear incommensurable, and he recognizes this ambiguity within his own struggle to reconcile his political view with his teaching experiences. In this critical humanist interpretation of his interview, Mr. L becomes the ambiguous Asian teacher, straddling notions of critical anti-oppressive thought and the model minority mentality of self-achievement towards economic success (Ladson-Billings, 1998; Pon, 2000).

Three days later, I interviewed Betty for the first time. Like Peace, she describes how her personal experiences impacted the ways in which she understands race and racism:

Growing up in the community I grew up in, it wasn't very multicultural. So there were very few minorities and they... They were just integrated in as regular kids within our society. I never personally felt that my group of friends or I ever developed a prejudice, it was never something that was in my home that we felt or thought of so I didn't... When I went to university, and now I was in a much larger community that's much more multi-racial, I didn't think about treating people differently. I was shocked to hear in my experiences and
traveling and stuff that people who were educators did have racist viewpoints. Because I was like, why would you be an educator if you felt that way? Don't you think all people deserve to learn and everybody deserves a chance? So I guess my experience with racism, especially towards colour of skin, has... grown. (Betty, personal communication, Nov 24, 2014)

Here she describes her journey to becoming a person with a more nuanced perspective on race relations. Although the environment in which she grew up was not diverse, she cites her home life as being free of prejudice towards others and having carried that mentality with her into adulthood. Her perceptions of race and racism are very much rooted in individualizing discourses of the self. In her view, people engage in racist conduct because of prejudicial feelings and thoughts, and everyone is capable of racism. What is important to note is that she identifies herself as never having felt or thought such prejudices. She firmly establishes her credibility as an open-minded and non-judgmental individual through her personal experiences.

When I mentioned institutionalized racism, she knew the term and could define its meaning as “the infrastructures within the systems that the public or government has created [which] marginalizes different groups of people” (Betty, personal communication, Nov 24, 2014). Yet when describing the differences between Canada and Australia, where she completed her post-graduate teacher training, she credits the perpetuation of systemic racism to one’s thinking:

Well, I mean there are a lot of socio-economic problems for the Aboriginal people in Australia. A lot of the similar problems that our own Aboriginal populations face with things like alcoholism and drug abuse and suicide are apparent in the Aboriginal communities in Australia as well. The difference between the more educated society in Canada and the educated society that I was experiencing in Australia was, here we tend to acknowledge, maybe hope that we can help in some way, make strides to have the Aboriginal people have a voice. Where in Australia at the time that I was there, it was more ignorance, they don't matter, sort of crush their spirit. (Betty, personal communication, Nov 24, 2014)

She cites ignorance and ill will on the part of the majority population as a major factor to why
the intergenerational impacts of settler colonialism and racism on indigenous communities in Australia have not been addressed effectively. The above quote constructs a binary between Canada and Australia, where one country has more successfully rectified their historical legacy of racism than the other. Her personal experiences lend credence to the perception of Canada as a nation with a progressive and liberal citizenry and a benevolently multicultural national identity. Such a construction of Canada has been challenged many times (Bannerji, 2000; Thobani, 2007); yet her observations of people in various geographic and socio-economic contexts—as a teacher who travels frequently and who is currently working in a school located in a low socio-economic neighbourhood—has shown her that everyone is capable of prejudiced forms of thinking that use stereotypes of different groups of people to justify bad conduct towards those groups.

Any notion of racism that defines white people as the recipients of power at every level of society in Canada due to histories of settler colonialism, genocide, slavery, and discriminatory government policies naturally runs counter to a definition of racism as types of thinking of which everyone is capable. Her statements are based on an individualizing framework that attributes racism to negative forms of thought and action, overlooking the systematization of racist ideologies in our society such as in our education, legal, and health systems. By focusing on her own personal encounters with the racist thoughts of others in her undergraduate studies and teacher education, she positions herself as someone who has never had such racist thoughts and who dedicates her teaching practice to eradicating such forms of thinking. Therefore, in elevating the connection between her lived experiences and her teacher identity, she becomes the innocent white teacher.

In the critical humanist approach described above, each participant’s process of self-representation takes on incredible saliency. Trusting the authority of their words and perspectives lends empirical validity to my own analysis. I also validate their experiences as teachers and as individuals, as well as their labour as professionals working towards particular pedagogical and anti-oppressive goals. In these ways, a humanist approach that elevates the voices of these people is valuable and helpful. However, characterizations such as the radical black teacher, ambiguous Asian teacher, and the problematic white teacher are essentialist in their summation of the participants’ race and their personal and political knowledge. These characterizations presumably represent the whole of the teachers’ identities. Such humanist ways of understanding
identity necessitate an analytical response that fulfills only two purposes. One is to empower and elevate the voices of the participants as a way of affirming the truth of their experiences, especially those who themselves experience marginalization. Another purpose is to enlighten participants and readers to more critical perspectives. It encourages what Lather (1992) deems “an analysis designed to oppose a ‘correct’ reading, the researcher’s, against a ‘mystified’ one, the [participant’s]” (p. 95). Such analyses are limited in scope through the reification of emulating specific character traits and perspectives as the solution to effective pedagogy on race and racism.

Ellsworth (1989) asserts the same position. In her review of the literature on research in support of social justice oriented teaching and education, as well as her own experiences teaching a post-secondary course on anti-oppression, she grows increasingly suspicious of the turn to what had become commonsense notions of what anti-oppressive education entailed. She explains:

For me, what has become more frightening than the unknown or unknowable, are social, political, and educational projects that predicate and legitimate their actions on the kind of knowing that underlies current definitions of critical pedagogy. In this sense, current understandings and uses of “critical,” “empowerment,” “student voice,” and “dialogue” are only surface manifestations of deeper contradictions involving pedagogies, both traditional and critical. The kind of knowing I am referring to is that in which objects, nature, and “Others” are seen to be known or ultimately knowable, in the sense of being “defined, delineated, captured, understood, explained, and diagnosed” at the level of determination never accorded to the “knower” herself or himself. (p. 321)

Her analysis here is relevant to my project on two levels. Firstly, by relying solely on the critical paradigm, I elevate participants’ pedagogies and teaching philosophies that highlight the exact frames that Ellsworth notes above, especially those that value the authenticity of voice and the self. There is little room to examine the contradictions always already present when such pedagogies are put into play in the classroom. As Ellsworth points out, such pedagogies rely on the trust placed on the excavations of truth that serve to render “objects, nature, and ‘Others’” knowable. Students of colour, very often, are positioned as that precise “Other” when educators
purport to know exactly how to teach them and what they “need” to know in order to become productive members of society—or in this case, moral, anti-racist individuals who will resist racism (yet oftentimes the racism experienced by students of colour is not acknowledged). Secondly, conceptualizations of race and racism that rely on voice, authenticity, and experience as the primary frames of representation often present the understanding of racism as an interpersonal, individual problem (and as belonging “to the past”) rather than being systemic and ongoing in our present day. An example would be to solely examine the demolition of Africville through the eyes of those who suffered from the forced relocation and destruction of their homes in an attempt to elevate their experiences and stories, and believing that having done so, “racism” is now properly recognized and accounted for. Missing from such a narrative would be the processes of racialization that enabled the City of Halifax to label Africville a health hazard and justify its demolition, while simultaneously participating in the ghettoization and environmental segregation of the community (Nelson, 2000).

Therefore, by rejecting the self as the source of contention (i.e., attributing the success and/or failures of anti-racist pedagogy on individual teachers’ characters), this project instead focuses on how the history teacher figure operates as a vehicle for discourse in teaching about race and racism. Discourses, being regularly full of contradictions and making little sense when mapped and examined, enact something upon the world in order to be intelligible. The data for this project, then, constitute a series of discursive events that construct and delineate what is possible in history education. Rather than a true representation of participants’ realities, this rest of this chapter focuses on how the data illustrates the construction of the “history teacher” as a subject position in the teaching of race and racism.

Poststructural View of the First Interviews

In this section, I present a poststructural approach to the first set of interviews that I conducted with participants. These interviews constitute moments in which participants establish their authority as having expertise on the subject of teaching about race and racism in history education. In the process of doing so, they speak into existence their process of subjectification into the role of history teachers in order to give meaning to being a history teacher and teaching as one. Having demonstrated above the critical humanist approach, which honours participant
voices and identities, I briefly consider how voice can be interpreted by using a poststructural analytical framework. I then illustrate how the participants use three modes of intelligibility that lend legitimization to the history teacher as a subject position. These modes of intelligibility are to define the purpose of history education in the context of teaching about race and racism, define the skillsets they possess in teaching about the consequences of race and racism, and define the specific constructs of race and racism that can be taught in history education. Rooting the history teacher subject in these discourses renders it intelligible to me as a recognizable subject.

The nature of interviews compels a particular representation of reality from participants that constantly seeks authenticity. As Boyd (2008) notes, there is something like a ‘will to voice’ that exists in qualitative interviews in that “[t]he impulse to position one’s self as authentic subject reflects and reiterates the possibilities of intelligible speech” (p. 188). In the process of making one believable in an interview, what is already said determines what can next be said. A statement or a set of statements spoken aloud makes a particular thought recognizable and, at the same time, renders other statements inadmissible within the intersubjective space. While my participants’ life experiences and political orientations differ, they nonetheless operationalize their knowledge and experience through the modes of intelligibility as described above. The modes of intelligibility employed become visible when I map participant responses I received to a specific set of questions from my interview guide:

1. Why teach about race and racism in Canadian history education?

2. What are important considerations for secondary history teachers when teaching about race and racism?

3. Describe how you use the curriculum document for CHC2D/CHC2P when teaching about race and racism in those courses (Appendix E)

By asking them these questions, I am already conferring the assumption of believability to my participants by requesting for their pedagogical and content knowledge. I operate under the logics of academic research, which makes sensible the asking of interview questions. These questions carry their own imperatives and introduce some discourses over others. Participants’
responses are thus shaped by the need and expectation to be intelligible to me based on what I am asking of them. Their voices “must, therefore, be read as texts, open to interpretation, and their disclosures should be understood as part of a larger process of reiteration, where identities are constantly reconstructed around very limited sets of meanings” (Boyd, 2008, p. 180). My very participation in this project as researcher is what produces those “limited sets of meanings,” a contradiction with which I must contend. My asking of these interview questions, listed in numerical order, also forces me to analyze and describe these modes of intelligibility to readers as three discrete and ordered items, rather than as discourses that are interrelated. Although I present these modes by how they correspond to my interview questions, Chapter 6 demonstrates how they often work in tandem to justify a range of pedagogical practices in the teaching of race and racism in history education.

Participants used the first question to imbue history education with moral purpose in our society, which justified their teaching of race and racism. To define the purpose of history education, participants describe the purpose of history and then situate history education within this context. Betty explains:

For me as an educator, history is the story of our country, our people, our culture, and how we've come to the place where we are. It shows where Canada came from and where we can go… So in order to get better, you have to understand the past. (Betty, personal communication, Nov 24, 2014)

Likewise, Mr. L elevates the importance of knowing our history:

The purpose of history is to be a human. The difference between a human and an animal is that humans know about their history. Animals don't. And in order to know who we are and why we are the way we are today, you have to know about history and how we have come to this stage in our society. How have we progressed or how have we not progressed? (Mr. L, personal communication, Nov 21, 2014)

Their responses shape a specific role that history education plays. History as an object of analysis naturally “teaches” lessons to those that engage with it, answering such complex questions as how far we have progressed as a society. This raises the importance of the field within the
context of an education system that delineates secondary teachers into experts of specific subject areas. History teachers, then, are an integral part of this process of learning about our history. Pedagogically, teachers should be able to mobilize history through modes of instruction that maximize the subject’s potential to teach particular types of lessons, as Peace elaborates:

P: So I think history is really incorporating lessons of the past and hopefully using those lessons, whether it's World War I, World War II, the Great Depression, using those lessons from the past to understand the present, ultimately to create a better world…So I think history in its best form is about incorporating what you're learning in the course, whatever that unit is, to actually create change. Personal change, as well as societal change. (Peace, personal communication, Nov 19, 2014)

Each of these responses ensures that history teachers are necessary components of the history classroom, in which students grapple with change as the primary analytical lens. The presence and absence of change in history, and the potential for change in the future all depend on the abilities of history teachers to teach the subject in specific ways. History education on race and racism thus serves as the catalyst to transform history into positively impacting the present and future. This iteration of history education infuses the promise of liberation, though at great moral and societal risk, because the alternative to an ineffective form of history education is for students to repeat the mistakes of the past.

Participants used the second question to outline and determine how students should engage with history on race and racism. They concurrently construct themselves as knowledgeable of students’ moral characters and the methodologies necessary to provide what students fundamentally need to become agents of change. This mode of intelligibility is particularly convincing given that the Ontario Ministry of Education (2010), in specific policy documents, credits successful and equitable teaching to teachers’ extensive knowledge of students’ learning needs through the use of evidentiary record keeping. This is not to remark on the effectiveness of such a conceptualization of teaching, but to highlight that this logic extends to students’ moral development when we speak of race and racism in history education. To lay claim to such knowledge, that of the ability to know what students need to become moral individuals and transform students’ sense of self in the face of oppression and injustice, is to exert one’s authority as a teacher along already familiar notions of teaching. Peace, for example,
sees the necessity of politicized history education by “[u]sing history to examine who has power, which stories are being told, which stories are being mandated, and what can we do to restructure society” (personal communication, Nov 19, 2014). He also describes how history can help students feel empowered, “like oh look at all these heroes and sheroes, but also saying what can I do to solve poverty, what can I do to further First Nations rights” (personal communication, Nov 19, 2014). Peace outlines clear goals in which students are able to develop understanding of their own strength and autonomy, and examine societal structures of power.

Betty’s approach, while different from Peace’s, focuses on transforming students’ ignorance and emotions into more positive ways of thinking:

There should be more inquiry and discovery based on the students’ part but they do need a foundation in facts so that they’re not just speaking from an emotional standpoint and from their own standpoint. That they need to develop empathy and look at all sides of what was going on in order to understand fully what was happening in the past… (Betty, personal communication, Nov 24, 2014)

Betty presents a methodology in which her knowledge of students’ morality directly influences the approach she takes to teaching about a particular historical topic. She identifies fact, empathy, and objectivity (as opposed to subjectivity and emotional bias) as crucial components that students require to think and learn about race and racism. In other words, she is capable of shaping her students into better people. The notion of producing change in and through students is also present in Mr. L’s approach:

I will not directly try to influence or tell the kids this is what you need to do, this is what should happen. That's not what I say to the kids. I try to tell them what happened, and so from telling them what happened in the past, the kids will understand what they should do and what they should not do in the future. (Mr. L, personal communication, Nov 21, 2014)

He reiterates the same underlying logic of a distinct methodology to guide (albeit indirectly) students towards some form of self-realization. These assertions of methodological expertise that aim to transform the morality of students’ conduct and beliefs legitimize teachers of history through their demonstrated understanding of the logics of teaching to the student as a whole
Furthering exerting their expertise, participants used the third question to define the capacity of history education to address race and racism by considering how race and racism should be presented in the course. The words race and racism appear only a handful of times in the overall and specific expectations, notwithstanding the sections on anti-discrimination education pertaining to Canadian and World Studies more generally (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2013). Although all three participants articulate different conceptualizations of how the curriculum should construct race and racism as topics for study, they nonetheless normalize specific conditions within the field of history education that pertain to race and racism as teachable topics. When asked if the curriculum expectations should mandate that teachers must teach about race and racism, Betty responds:

B: I think it has to be vague because you can't put that much detail into the curriculum document or else you're just sort of telling people exactly how to teach the course and it would just be such a huge document if they had to do that for every course about putting in all the specifics. I think between the resources that are within the textbook plus what the individual teacher has learned through their educational experience, you need to have it vague or else there's not going to be any real learning and teachers would just become robots. That's not what we are, that's not what history education should be.

E: Do you think race and racism as topics should be explicitly mentioned in the curriculum though? As a required teaching topic.

B: I think that saying race and racism puts a bit of a negative connotation on all of it and if we are trying to break down stereotypes then maybe not calling it race and racism because that instantly gives negativity towards it… Rather than saying race and racism, I think we need to focus on the empathy and the understanding of all the various groups that are within Canada. And I think that it is in the document. (personal communication, Nov 24, 2014)

While elevating a form of history education that must maintain teachers’ autonomy to exercise their professional judgment and pedagogical knowledge, Betty is also narrowing the spectrum of
meanings that race and racism should take on in the classroom. Her claim is further justified by the assertion that such interpretations of race and racism are institutionally legitimated in the curriculum document. The absence of negativity, like celebrating and understanding the other, affects much more effective forms of history education on race and racism; thus such conditional terms lend authority to her subject position as history teacher within the context of our interview.

Mr. L makes similar statements regarding history education:

E: So, do you think it's problematic that the curriculum doesn't say specifically you have to teach about these topics of race and racism?

L: It is not problematic at all, no. Because the curriculum tries to be as broad as possible. It allows differences in people's teaching styles and it also allows for teachers to modify their lesson plans and expectations for different groups of students. Because the [school board] is very, it's a very large board. Not only that, but also a very diverse board in terms of learning needs. Some students in one school, they don't learn as quickly and as much as students in other schools…And so, a broad curriculum allows educators and teachers to choose what they think is best for their students. (personal communication, Nov 21, 2014)

Like Betty, Mr. L values the freedom of teachers to tailor their pedagogical approaches to teach the students that they interact with everyday. The suggestion that race and racism be included as specific expectations rather than in the list of suggested topics (i.e., they must be taught in the course, as opposed to the document merely suggesting that they be taught) appears to be an untenable position. Race and racism should thus be understood as individual topics that are addressed at the discretion of the history teacher, based on their perception of student readiness. In this way, he also asserts his authoritative knowledge and understanding of Canadian history education and curriculum in the context of race and racism.

Peace likewise composes a picture of an ideal approach to race and racism in history education by constructing certain conditions within the field. He suggests:

I think [the curriculum] does a good job of doing some surface knowledge, like your contributions of this, that, discussing race, class, gender. But I don't think it does enough
job of highlighting some major themes within race over the years, over the decades, so that students raise the connection. I don't think it engages enough social action projects where kids can see a correlation between what they're learning in class in history in terms of race and racism, and what it means to be stopped by the police. Like in this neighbourhood, like racial profiling, or like employment equity, so many people of colour with high education not being able to get a job. (Peace, personal communication, Nov 19, 2014)

He notes two particular shortcomings in the curriculum—the constraints it places on thematic approaches and centering students’ lives—which themselves create standards for effective teaching on race and racism. It would be remiss, however, not to note that Peace’s assertions here are far less institutionally legitimized than those expressed by Betty and Mr. L. This demonstrates how the modes of intelligibility I have outlined above cannot be excised from other discourses not expressed in the interviews. Even as the participants employ certain discursive strategies to make themselves intelligible as history teachers, it does not mean that the content of such strategies all hold equal cultural currency in the education system. However, participants engaging in these modes of intelligibility do create a history teacher subject that I as researcher come to understand and interpret.

These three modes of intelligibility are made possible through the activation of the discourse of morality as the guiding principle to justify and normalize the teaching of race and racism in history education. In order to teach towards certain goals that pertain to the shaping of students’ characters, participants approach the task of teaching about race and racism through a discursive lens steeped in notions of what being a “moral” person entails. When participants describe how they want their students to come to the realization of right from wrong through their learning of the lessons, the production of the lesson already determines what is to be known. Chapter 6 describes in more detail the relationship between the representation of race and racism in pedagogical contexts to the predicted outcomes of the lessons on the basis of what students should have learned. What I aim to emphasize here is that the mobilization of morality discourse makes the framing of lessons on race and racism as both a lesson of history (learning about the past) and an exercise of character building (learning how to be a good person) perfectly reasonable and, in fact, even desirable. The history teacher subject is thus situated in the interstices of such a conceptualization of history teaching.
Poststructural View of the Observations and Materials

Embarking on the observational portion of data collection offered an even greater opportunity to examine how participants engaged race and racism in their classrooms. I was curious to know what imperatives drove the design and execution of their lessons. Considering the teaching materials alongside my observations enabled certain patterns to emerge in the ways that participants constructed knowledge in their classroom practices. These patterns operate within what Foucault calls a will to truth. Below, I first present a general illustration of the lessons and materials implemented by participants on the three historical topics I was able to observe: the Holocaust, the internment of Japanese Canadians during World War II, and Africville. I then describe how the will to truth is enacted through the centering of tragedy in the study of race and racism. By locating tragedy as the measure against which lessons on race and racism are measured in order to predict their effectiveness to evoke the most powerful forms of learning for students, participants demonstrate in this section the enactment of the third mode of intelligibility as described in the previous section. Maximizing the effects of the tragic appeal of a historical narrative on race and racism through pedagogical strategies that I call the “spectacularization of death” dictates what becomes commonsense in the teaching of race and racism. That is, history education can address the ramifications of race and racism with students through historical narratives; the greater emotional shock and trauma induced by such historical narratives, the greater the pedagogical potential.

In teaching the Holocaust, both Betty and Mr. L employed a wide array of descriptive statements and media forms to build a tragic narrative for students. To begin, Betty explained, “11 million people were exterminated… Through archaeological digs, they are finding more death pits of Roma people in other countries. Not included in the 11 million” (observation, Nov 25, 2014). Mr. L also explained during his lesson:

Here’s a fact that will shock you. 6 million Jews were murdered. Everybody. Women, babies, children, young, old. Not just Jews, but also g[*]psies.¹ Who are the g[*]psies?

¹ I am choosing to censor the slur often used against Roma peoples.
They’re people who traveled around and don’t have their own countries. The mentally ill. The disabled. (observation, Nov 28, 2014)

The numbers were staggering to hear, especially when paired with other historical artifacts such as photographs, personal diaries, and propaganda images. Every effort was made to illustrate to students the unimaginable scope of the Holocaust as the most extreme form of racism, engineered by one man and a complicit population. Betty used quotes from Hitler to elaborate on how anti-Semitic sentiment grew among the German people:

[Y]ou’re hearing words like this coming out… ‘It’s Jews and foreigners’ fault that this happened. When Hitler came to power, things started getting better…You start to believe that yes, maybe it is okay for us to be as cruel as nature and apply Darwin’s theory on evolution to our own society. (observation, Nov 25, 2014)

A section in her Powerpoint presentation, titled “Cold Hard Facts,” provided percentages of the casualties of the Holocaust from the total Jewish population in Europe. Along with her Powerpoint presentation, she also showed the film, *The Boy in the Striped Pajamas* (Mark Herman, 2008), which offered a viscerally powerful depiction of the gas chambers.

Mr. L dedicated a slide in his Powerpoint presentation to the construct of the Aryan Race and historicized the development of anti-Semitism in Europe (i.e., with statements such as “Jews were seen as Christ-killers” and “In 1275 they were made to wear a yellow badge in 13th C England”). In another slide with photographs of mainly Jewish victims, Mr. L described, “Sixteen children were taken, one left alive...Do you see hope in their eyes? Not much” (observation, Nov 28, 2014). He presented another photograph of women with children lined up:

Here is an extremely disturbing picture. These are real pictures. Here is a group of women with babies, waiting in line to be executed by the Nazis and the Ukrainian collaborators. They had to be stripped of their clothing because they may be valuable and reused for other thing. They just had to stand and wait in line to be executed. Some you can see in the middle, they’re carrying a baby girl. A few minutes after, everybody’s dead. You can see someone is not fully dead, a soldier goes up to them and shoot them a few more times to ensure they’re fully dead. (observation, Nov 28, 2014)
These moments drove home the utter tragedy of the Holocaust in a number of ways. The statistics represented a numerical understanding of reality—numbers so large one could not fathom the breadth of death and destruction by the Nazis. The images coupled with the narratives personalized the victims and incited various emotional states such as horror, grief, and shock. The presentations of information and artifacts enticed students to perform what participants deemed appropriate as evidence of learning. The students were positioned as witnesses to the sheer depravity of humanity and to make their own choice, “[b]ecause humans can be both brutal and compassionate. You can choose to be hateful or you can choose to be compassionate. What you do will change other people’s lives” (Mr. L, observation, Nov 28, 2014). His choice of film was the National Geographic documentary, *A Human Lampshade: A Holocaust Mystery* (Steven Hoggard, 2012). The Holocaust in both lessons presented to students an audio and visual spectacle.

The Japanese Canadian internment was presented quite differently. The central text of Betty’s lesson on this topic was an autobiographical narrative of Mary Kitagawa, whose family was interned for the duration of World War II, and several accompanying questions that were borrowed from a larger resource on teaching the historical event (Nikkei National Museum & Cultural Centre, 2011). Betty began the lesson by describing the mentality of Canadians and the Canadian government at the time:

> What event happened during WWII that Canada would start getting afraid of the Japanese? … Pearl Harbour is part of the United States, so that makes us a little afraid. If the Japanese can get to Hawaii, maybe it’s really not that far from Vancouver and bomb something in BC. We were a little nervous and wary. (observation, Dec 1, 2014)

A class reading of the story of Mary Kitagawa followed this description. Students read about the terrible living conditions in the internment camps, and the dispossession experienced by internees, such as that of education, livelihood, and property. After the story, she asked:

> What are your impressions about the Japanese Canadian experience? It’s horrible, why?... There was no concern or care how they lived and how well they lived… Are you surprised that many of them would stay? If your country treated you this way and you had a chance to go back to your country of origins, you might want to go back…So they kind of had a
depressing lot, this family. But they persevered... You can see the racism wasn’t just the Government, but even after all this was over, it talks about how people were still really rude and it was hard for them to get jobs, all those kinds of things. It made life very difficult for them. Right?” (Betty, observation, Dec 1, 2014)

She summarized the lingering impacts of the internment on Kitagawa and her family. Upon conclusion of the lesson, Betty assigned questions for students to answer in response to the story, such as what they found ‘surprising’ and ‘disturbing’ about the story. Evidently, Betty still sought an affective reaction from students. Yet the construct of the learned student formed on the basis of their emotional output clearly differed in comparison to the Holocaust lesson. Little was done to incite the same level of discomfort in students regarding the topic. For example, students were not positioned to stand witness to the horrors conducted by the Canadian Government in the name of national security. The structure of the lesson lacked the spectacular elements of the one on the Holocaust, relying more on Betty’s summarizing of the story as students read sections aloud.

In the case of Mr. L’s lesson on this topic, the Japanese Canadian internment was not explicitly taught and was instead included in a work period where students answered questions from a workbook as part of the larger theme of war on the home front (Canadians at War 1939-1945 [Santor, 1979], which provided primary sources and statistical information for student analysis. Some questions included, “According to the 1941 Census of Canada, how many Japanese-Canadians were born in Canada?(p32),” “Which law allowed the Canadian government to evacuate and detain all persons of Japanese ancestry in Canada? (P32),” and “What happened after the Canadian government threw the Japanese out of the coast? (P33).” The page numbers indicated where the answers could be found.

I observed two class periods on Africville in Betty’s classroom. She introduced the topic by announcing that her source was from Mary Pamela Vincer’s (2008) major research paper, *A history of marginalization - Africville: A Canadian example of forced migration*. The first half of the time was dedicated to providing students with descriptive accounts of the diversity of the African and Caribbean diaspora that lived (and still live) in Africville and Halifax, Nova Scotia. This portion of the lesson involved teacher narration and an accompanying fact sheet for students to follow along. Betty described four groups: slaves from the United States, Black Loyalists,
Jamaican Maroons, and black refugees of the War of 1812. After this introductory discussion, Betty showed two videos. The first was *Remember Africville*, a documentary directed by Shelagh Mackenzie (1991) and hosted on the website of the National Film Board of Canada, and *Stolen from Africville*, directed by Logical Ethix (2007), a hiphop artist and part of the organization Stolen From Africa. Betty used the first documentary to summarize several important points about Africville, such as the location (by the dump through which the sewer pipes ran) and the state of the land (owned by Africville residents). The second video featured interviews with former residents of Africville, focusing heavily on Nova Scotians’ thoughts and perspectives on this historical event. The artists attended an annual picnic for Africville residents and their descendants, were interviewed at local radio stations, and visited several sites such as the monument at Seaview Memorial Park. After showing this second video, Betty once again re-emphasized similar points as in the last lesson—the loss of community for Africville residents in addition to loss of land, and future next steps to be taken. Mr. L never taught the topic of Africville to his class due to time constraints.

The three historical topics that I have described here are all positioned as representative of racism in Canadian history. Yet, they are presented as tragic to varying degrees. While Betty measures the extent to which she is able to elicit discomfort in her students, what emerges in the quote below is that these historical moments of racism construct a standard for tragedy:

> I think definitely for the Holocaust lesson because it is so brutal and tragic what happened that I don't think anybody should be comfortable with that...I don't think they were as uncomfortable with the Japanese internment. I mean there were a lot of things they didn't like about the Japanese Internment, but because it doesn't go to the extreme of actually, you know, killing mass groups of people, I mean there were people who died because of the conditions but its, it's, after the Holocaust it doesn't seem quite as tragic. So they're not quite as uncomfortable... With Africville, because most of the students had prior knowledge to it, it was comfortable. Because they already had some understanding of what Africville was and what had happened. So I didn't get to make them feel uncomfortable there. (Betty, personal communication, Dec 17, 2014).

Two conditions are outlined. First, the number of people killed in each historical moment indicates a level of racist extremity. Second, the order of events based on chronology allows for
maximization of student affect in response to historical tragedy, while also diminishing such capacity in every subsequent historical topic taught. By rendering such historical topics into tragic narratives of race and racism, participants employ what Foucault calls the will to truth. As Hook (2001) posits, the more grounded a set of discourse is in “the natural, the sincere, the scientific,” the stronger its claim to truth within a given discipline (p. 6). In other words, that which is founded upon a premise of authorized knowledge—in this case, “the sincere”—is most truthful in its claims, but that which appears founded on the absence of such premises is dismissed. The legitimacy of tragedy as the genre of choice with which to teach about racism most effectively is guaranteed by the will to truth.

Participants hoped to mobilize the extreme level of tragedy in their construction of a Holocaust narrative to reach certain learning goals with their students. The sensibility of tragedy as a learning tool sustains the will to truth. Foucault (1977) explains:

But this will to truth, like the other systems of exclusion, relies on institutional support: it is both reinforced and accompanied by whole strata of practices such as pedagogy — naturally — the book-system, publishing, libraries, such as the learned societies in the past, and laboratories today. (p. 14)

Realizing pedagogical goals through the use of tragedy constructs and legitimates particular truths of what constitutes racism in the classroom space. Teaching and learning become processes that determine which claims are deemed acceptable and unacceptable in the construction of that which is “truth”. Oftentimes, by virtue of the hierarchical and institutionalized structure of the classroom, the teacher acts as the arbiter of acceptable and unacceptable knowledge. In this way, a will to truth is enacted through participants’ representations of reality that produces knowledge as common sense and constrains what can be known. Pedagogically, Betty wanted to incite discomfort “for the shock value” and to teach students how processes of dehumanization enabled Nazi Germany to “make them do what they want them to do…[I]t’s also to get them to understand how these people are controlled. And that by dehumanizing him is what takes the power away from this very large group of people” (personal communication, Dec 17, 2014). Mr. L wanted students to realize the “true” face of racism so that they would “use the word racism less, like in a more relevant scenario, instead of just, oh why're you dissing me, why're you riding me… Look what they have done, that's racism,
okay?” (Mr. L, personal communication, Dec 16, 2014). Based on such intended outcomes, the Holocaust lesson is positioned as the pinnacle of historical moments of racism through the spectacularization of death in Betty and Mr. L’s lessons. The lessons on Japanese Canadian internment and Africville would appear to provide less opportunities for teaching moments such as those mentioned above. Their less tragic historical narratives are presented with far less diverse composition of teaching approaches, and there is a lack of the shock value that so permeates the lessons on the Holocaust. In these ways, tragedy becomes the standard for evaluating the effectiveness of a lesson on race and racism.

**Poststructural View of the Second and Focus Group Interviews**

The second and focus group interviews gave participants the opportunity to discuss in greater depth the ideas and motives behind their pedagogy and approaches to race and racism. Participants built on their conceptualizations of race and racism as teachable topics from the first interviews as a follow-up to the observations. For the focus group, they often expounded and reminisced on common experiences that they shared as history teachers. A consistent theme that arose across the interviews is the processes that drove participants to make palatable to students the study of race and racism in Canadian history. In this section, I present various moments in which participants describe how they structure race and racism in their pedagogy in order to engage students, and discuss how such efforts structure the ways in which racism becomes knowable and meaningful. Participants enact the second mode of intelligibility by demonstrating how and what they know about teaching that enables them to produce very effective lessons on race and racism. In the context of this section, participants are most concerned with helping students to form connections with the material, whether such a connection is one of interest or emotion. In other words, participants demonstrate their knowledge of what students need in order to engage with the material in ways that promote the goals of the first mode of intelligibility—that students become moral people and instigators of social change.

Participants came to an easy consensus that teaching race and racism is an intrinsic part of teaching Canadian history, referring to the many instances in which they have taught such lessons before. They describe the reaction of students when they teach about historical topics on race and racism, and that students generally react very positively to such lessons. They are able
to collectively make definitive statements regarding students' unanimous interest in such lessons, regardless of what group of students they teach:

L: Yeah, they get excited when we talk about racial stereotypes. Like we do posters for World War I and then we do the techniques of propaganda, and we look at some of the techniques. And one of the techniques is stereotypes, and we talk about people used to use race to stereotype and use it within the propaganda poster, and when we start to, when I try to explain what's a stereotype, what's racial stereotype, I give some examples and they get rahhh yes. They get very excited about it. You know, for example, the stereotype is, Asians are bad drivers, and they're like, yeeah, they go all crazy. So it's really going to that and we say, yes it's not true, it's a stereotype, right? And they get excited about that. Every time. Every group of students. That's something fun.

B: They generally like the lessons that are focused on the variety of societies. They generally, I don't find it hard to engage students when we're going to, they love the Holocaust. They just

P: Eat it up.

B: They can't get enough of it. They're like, miss, what other movies can I watch about it? And that's not even really the Canadian history part. Yeah, they seem to really, you know, it's shocking in a way, and so they kind of, really want to know lots and lots and lots about it. And I don't feel like I'm ever pulling teeth in order to get them engaged when we're talking about mistreatment in the past towards a certain group. They do seem to really engage in that more so then when you're trying to get them to understand how did Canada become a more independent country.

P: Well, I think a really good point was kids get excited about stereotypes and the Holocaust. (personal communication, Jan 7, 2015)

This popularity of lessons on race and racism, as expressed by participants, is accompanied by descriptions of numerous strategies and resources that evidently have “worked” in the classroom. For example, Mr. L’s focuses on the excitement from students generated by a study on racial stereotypes, and Betty’s emphasizes the effectiveness of the shock factor in heightening students’
Motivated by the need to keep students’ attention and engage their interest, Mr. L opts for a
depiction of the Holocaust that entertains as well as informs students of various historical perspectives of the event. The potential for students’ boredom to take over the flow of the lesson—students napping, becoming distracted, diverting their attention—heightens the necessity for entertainment to take precedence in the choice of material. He juxtaposes oral histories of Holocaust survivors against the quest to test the authenticity of the human lampshade, and ultimately finds the former wanting in its capacity to entertain. During the focus group, he again identifies student engagement as the primary goal:

E: So what do you see as an effective lesson on race and racism? What needs to be there and what can be achieved through such a lesson?

L: First they have to be engaged in the discussion and topics, and it's more, I would try to make it as multi-faceted as well as interactive, like a feedback kind of thing. Like asking them to think and asking them to discuss. I mean if they're not engaged, it doesn't matter what kind of topic you have. So, yes. The engagement part is important with the race and racism to get them to open up and start talking about it. (personal communication, Jan 7, 2015)

In this way, his pedagogical approach demands that students must respond in certain ways that can be deemed as evidence of “engagement.” He makes necessary the need for racism to be interesting enough for students.

In response to the same question during the focus group interview, Betty outlines her own approach:

I kind of feel like I always want to start from the students' understanding of what they see. Like if it's a certain group, talking about what they think racism stuff is towards, what their perception due to media and their own backgrounds and their own experiences so you can start from there. And then you can, you know, give them more facts and information and let them experience and see from a variety of different perspectives of how racism has affected Canadian history in the past, and has set up our society as it is today and our system as it is today. So the students then can go from where they are, and then take steps to learning what actually happened. (personal communication, Jan 7, 2015)
Betty demonstrates how this approach plays out in her lesson on the Holocaust. At the beginning of the first lesson, she asked students to write on a slip of paper, “[o]pinions, knowledges, anything you know. Doesn’t have to be ethical… What does it mean to be Jewish? Words that come to mind. Yes, you can write your stereotypes down” (Betty, observation, Nov 25, 2014). This form of anonymous confession encouraged the class to uniformly reflect on “their own stereotypes about people” (Betty, personal communication, Dec 17, 2014). The activity enabled her to extract from students the objective that makes her pedagogy effective; that is, there was now concrete evidence of what needed to be “changed” within her students. Betty believes that *Boy in the Striped Pajamas* (Mark Herman, 2008) was a good choice for her class:

First we discussed what the Holocaust was and how it happened and they did some reading and we watched a movie called *Boy in the Striped Pajamas* so that the students could learn to empathize and see things from the perspective of children and how innocent they are and then how devastating this event could be. I liked the reaction of the students after the film. A lot of them were like, why are you showing us a film with such a sad ending, blah blah blah. And I'm like, well that's history, that's how it happened, you know? People died in the gas chambers and so it was good to see that they could relate in a way and talk and empathize with characters, and I think it was a smart idea to choose a movie where it's a child because they can understand from a child's perspective. Because they are children, or they have been very young children. (personal communication, Dec 17, 2014)

For Betty, empathy is a key element in her pedagogical approach to race and racism. The film centers the experiences of a German child and a Jewish child in Nazi Germany, where a series of events eventually lead to both children being killed in a gas chamber. She believes that the film demonstrates how “racism doesn't just affect the victims, it also ends up affecting other people, whether they're participating in the racism or not” (Betty, personal communication, Dec 17, 2014). Her motivation in choosing this film exemplifies how teaching constitutes creating entry points for students through which to come to know the topic under discussion. Students should be able to relate to both children, and to understand the mindsets of both oppressors and victims. This leads to forms of self-reflection by students that she positions as the end goals of her lessons.

Resources were also at the forefront of Peace’s thoughts during the second interview.
Although he has not taught the grade 10 Canadian History course in many years, he continues to lament the lack of community-based resources:

One thing I didn't do as a history teacher, and I'm still trying to do it, is reach out more to the community. Find out what's out there that's working, right?… So I guess what history education can do is, is to actively seek out community initiatives that are designed to make the society more equitable. So actively seek it out, actively go into the community and have students do community-based projects. I didn't do enough of that. Make those linkages and I think that would help. Like for example, if it's policing, maybe as a history teacher, invite a local initiative that the kids can see, here are some youths your age working with the police, and here's some specific things they've done to try and correct what you're facing in your life. Maybe you want to get involved. That kind of stuff, right? That's what I think history education can do. (Peace, personal communication, Dec 18, 2014)

He envisions history education as the vehicle through which students become empowered to act and fight against inequity in the world. He frames race and racism in the context of students’ own lives, who currently face different types of discrimination that are reminiscent of what they learn in class. Student action that confronts specific social issues becomes the evidence of learning that Peace’s approach generates. Race and racism must then be framed as part and parcel of a larger fight against social injustice, against which students must resist.

As illustrated by their first and second interviews, the participants are not reluctant to teach about race and racism; in fact, they describe explicitly what compels them to bring such topics to the classroom. Each of their pedagogical approaches shape race and racism in ways that abide by certain standards of teaching, which necessitate appropriate levels of interest, emotions, and action from students. These standards are not mandated by any particular policy or legislation, but are legitimized by participants’ own beliefs on what is valuable in teaching about race and racism.

In Summary

In this chapter, I describe how my presentation of the data shifts from a critical analytical
framework to a poststructural one. I come to the decision to map the construction of a history teacher subject position after exploring the limitations of examining the data through the paradigmatic frames of identity and voice. In order to disrupt the critical humanist approach of representing each participant as their own individual case study, I instead organize the data by form in order to disrupt the saliency of the self and to map discourse and materiality in teaching race and racism in history education. Doing so enables me to consider “[t]he social structures and processes that shape our subjectivities… In this way, the meaning of structures, as well as the subject positioned within, become sites of political struggle” (Youngblood Jackson, 2001, p. 386). My analysis thus does not eject such political struggles from its focus, but examines the conditions—the modes of intelligibility through which history education constitutes a moral enterprise—under which such political struggles play out.
Chapter 6: Analysis

In this chapter, I aim to answer the research question that I asked in Chapter 1: How does a history teacher subject position emerge from the discursive practices of history teachers teaching about race and racism in Canadian history? Focusing on the formation of the history teacher subject is central to my poststructural analysis as it centers the productive effects of teaching about race and racism. I argue that it is the history teacher subject that is produced by the various ways in which teachers rationalize, enact, and justify their pedagogical practices. This departs from the literature on teacher identity as outlined in Chapter 3, as much of the scholarship traces the connection from the teacher’s individual, authentic self to the effectiveness of their social justice-oriented pedagogy. In this chapter, I map the productive effects of pedagogy in order to formulate how such practices imbue a subject position with meaning.

In Chapter 5, I outlined three modes employed by participants that enabled the history teacher subject to become intelligible to me as an “identity” that held purpose, responsibility, and knowledge of how to teach race and racism in history education. I determined how the three modes operated within morality discourses that enabled the history teacher subject to make the following determinations—the moral imperatives of history education, the pedagogical knowledge necessary to transform said moral imperatives into effective teaching, and the manner by which history education takes up race and racism as areas of study in the classroom. I further explicate, in this chapter, how the history teacher subject performs these modes of intelligibility in the classroom both discursively and materially. Oftentimes, all three modes of intelligibility work simultaneously to make possible the undertaken the pedagogical practices that I describe. This chapter will thus make visible the complex ways that knowledge and conduct are taken up when mobilized towards the task of teaching about race and racism in the context of history education.

I begin with the construct of the history teacher subject as a moral gatekeeper, whose responsibility is to shape a righteous generation of students. I locate this subject position in the centre of Foucault’s power/knowledge nexus. Using the lessons on the Holocaust, Japanese Canadian internment, and Africville, I illustrate how such a figure sustains and is sustained by processes of knowledge production that mediate how students come to know of race and racism in Canadian history. I argue, as well, that power/knowledge produce as effects the ways in which
students come to *not know* of race and racism. I then examine pedagogy as a set of practices both enacted and, in this case, embodied by the history teacher subject. Using Foucault’s theory of governmentality, I demonstrate how the history teacher subject enacts particular teaching practices that use race and racism as tools to conduct students’ conduct through affect. Such practices are enacted to attain what discourses of teaching and learning produce as normative notions of what “proper” student behaviour and speech entails. In order to generate or defer forms of wanted and unwanted student affect, however, I show how teacher conduct becomes an area that requires governing by the history teacher subject. In this way, pedagogy becomes a form of teaching that the teacher must enact upon herself—embodying the principles of “good teaching” in order to maintain the appropriateness of students’ affect. As both the moral gatekeeper and conductor of student conduct and affect, the modes of intelligibility are in full effect. The history teacher subject exercises their moral responsibility to provide the most effective lessons that offer students the incentive and motivation to become better, more righteous people. Therefore, both constructs as I have outlined in this chapter aim to better students’ moral compasses and it is precisely such a justification that the practices I describe in this chapter are conceived of as commonsense.

Included in each section, however, are alternative readings and interpretations of the participants’ practices as they were performed in my observations. I offer such different readings in order to engage in Foucault’s notion of critique. I described this in further detail in Chapter 2. Foucault (1981) defines critique, in “So is it important to think” as such:

[A critique] consists in seeing on what type of assumptions, of familiar notions, of established, unexamined ways of thinking the accepted practices are based…Criticism consists in uncovering that thought and trying to change it: showing that things are not as obvious as people believe, making it so that what is taken for granted is no longer taken for granted. To do criticism is to make harder those acts which are now too easy. (p. 172)

Such a critique forces a reconceptualization of knowing, doing, and thinking in the realm of teaching about race and racism. The politics of my project are, in the diagnostic sense, to excavate the processes by which race and racism are deemed “teachable” in the secondary classroom. These include an array of exclusions, categorizations, and normalizations that simultaneously *and* in contradiction to each other. I do not attempt to map them as if analytical
point A leads, in a linear and clear fashion, to analytical point B. Teaching is itself a “messy” task, giving teachers little foresight into what might become of the class at the end of the lesson, unit, and course. It is precisely the positivist orientation of intention and prediction in education that I hope to interrogate, as the state of being constantly unsettled may itself prove to be useful, particularly in teaching about race and racism.

My analysis does not suggest “better” ways for teachers to teach about race and racism in history education. By documenting the discursive practices of my participants, I am not positioning the history teacher subject as a desirable figure to adopt. Alternative readings of the discourses I describe in this chapter enable me to explore the gap between teaching and learning. For example, I use the work of various scholars that have studied the historical topics that were taught in the lessons I observed to show how knowledge, when filtered through various pedagogical approaches, produces a way of knowing that simultaneously obstruct other understandings from being known. I then explore what implications such practices have on our dependence on knowledge to communicate a “true” representation of our histories. Likewise, I show how student affect can neither be predicted nor controlled, and that teachers’ desires to do so require those same teachers to constantly conduct their teaching in reactionary ways.

In the last section of this chapter, I build on Elizabeth Ellsworth’s notion of pedagogical mode of address, which signifies how educators teach with an intended recipient in mind and structure their pedagogy to reflect such intent, by making visible what I call “pedagogical misfires.” This term extends what I show in the first two sections of how pedagogy constitutes complex, multi-layered processes that always fail. What I mean is that while the modes of intelligibility are predicated on the predictability and controllability of pedagogy, my data shows that there is never guarantee of success in the transformation of students into ideal change makers for social justice. Instead, I argue that the uncertainties and failures of pedagogy are themselves teaching moments. Pedagogical misfires are dangerous in that almost all teachers fear them because they are indicators of control slipping away. Yet, they can also disrupt the assumptions we hold dear and produce new modes of teaching and learning, such as what Ellsworth (1997) describes:
Unfinished societies and individuals, and failed fits between the social and the individual are necessary if agency, creativity, passions for learning, and transgressions of, rather than conformity to, relations of power are to be possible. (p. 53)

The History Teacher Subject as Moral Gatekeeper

In this section, I examine how constructing the history teacher subject necessitates the simultaneous processes of knowledge production along relations of power, which works to affirm what can and will be known. I use the term “moral” in the section title, rather than “ethical,” very intentionally. The reason is because the opportunities created for students to engage in analysis of Canada’s histories are predetermined on the kinds of character development skills that participants aim to instill in students. I illustrate how moralizing imperatives are embedded in the pedagogical decisions enacted throughout the lessons that I observed. To use “moral” is to point towards the depoliticizing effects of such moralizing imperatives in discussions about racism, and how such effects obscures more critical understandings of racism. At the same time, morality discourse maintains the use of objectivizing lenses that resists the naming of racisms that are both ongoing and to which we are complicit in our present realities. I use the term “gatekeeper” to refer to the ways in which the history teacher subject uses pedagogy to present lessons on historical topics that project the kinds of qualities that are desirable for students’ development. In other words, race and racism (and ways to “resolve” racism) take on a variety of meanings in different historical contexts on the basis of such pedagogical goals.

First, I situate the theory of power/knowledge in the context of history education and the history teacher subject. Second, I illustrate how participants’ mobilization of history education as a high-stakes subject matter on which the morality of the future rests leaves the history teacher subject with the responsibility of determining the moral character of future generations. They become moral gatekeepers and their classrooms become spaces in which students grapple with Canada as an object of analysis along a linear continuum of progress. Teaching historical topics on race and racism facilitates this process by providing teachers the knowledge with which to create opportunities for students to develop “better” moral character. Third, I explore how Betty and Mr. L’s lessons on the Holocaust, Japanese Canadian internment, and Africville illustrate
how the history teacher subject derives legitimacy through the facilitation of students’ access to race and racism conceptualizations as part of the moral education project. Over the course of producing knowledge towards the fulfillment of various pedagogical goals, however, the history teacher subject must inevitably mediate the kinds of knowledge that filters into the discursive space of the classroom that both opens and forecloses ways of understanding race and racism.

Power/knowledge operates through what Foucault characterizes as the ‘will to know,’ which Mills (2003) describes as “a voracious appetite for information for categorising and measuring objects…[We] see the will to know reinforced and renewed by whole strata of practices, pedagogies, libraries, institutions, technologies and so on” (p. 71). In the previous chapter, I demonstrated how race and racism as teachable topics generate an array of representational models that employ precisely the utilities as mentioned by Mills (2003). Participants do not wield power as they take on the history teacher subject; rather, power runs through the range of practices in the process of subjectification that they undertake. This notion of becoming the history teacher necessitates practices that then produce knowledges and ways of knowing that further lend credence to their position before the classroom. Hence, knowledge and power cannot be seen as separate. Mills (2003) explains:

Foucault characterizes power/knowledge as an abstract force which determines what will be known, rather than assuming that individual thinkers develop ideas and knowledge…[It is] power-knowledge, the processes and struggles that traverse it, and of which it is made up, that determine the forms and possible domains of knowledge. (p. 70)

The production of knowledge cannot be attributed to individual figures with teacher credentials and training to grant them legitimacy. Tracing the operations of power/knowledge enables us to question how it is that material representations of historical topics on race and racism affirm only particular knowledges, and towards what ends such knowledges are validated (i.e., changing and shaping students’ moral characters). An examination of how the production of knowledge always already foregrounds power relations, then, focuses on the proliferation, classification, and exclusion of knowledges rather than the wielding of power by individuals for their own ends.

Addressing race and racism in history education is consistently presented as requiring forms of pedagogy rooted in moral righteousness. As described in Chapter 5, the first mode of
Intelligibility situates the history teacher subject in the moral imperatives of history education. If the purpose of history education is to transform the past into a lesson to be learnt, then the field of history education and all its resultant components (i.e., teachers, students, curriculum, pedagogy) must be constructed to respond to an ongoing, yet imminent moral crisis. The past always threatens to overtake the future. Such a conceptualization reflects the critical approach to history education, as described in Chapter 3, in the constant re-imagination of futures in which the mistakes of the past are not repeated. Peace emphasizes the potential of history education to transform the world:

Using history to examine who has power, which stories are being told, which stories are being mandated, and what we can do to restructure society… [S]o that there is a sense of an equal distribution of wealth, an equal distribution of opportunities, and I think the reason why people don't want to go there in terms of history is that it would mean... If you go there in terms of history, meaning social change, meaning restructuring society so that everyone truly has equity of opportunity and that everyone truly has equal access to power, political, academic, educational power… it would be the end of white power and white privilege basically. (personal communication, Nov 19, 2014)

He outlines various ways that history education can challenge the imbalances of power throughout society on a number of individual and systemic levels. History education can even end white supremacy. This concept naturally positions students as the agents who will carry what they have learned in history class to actually implement such changes. Teachers are ultimately imbued with the responsibility of shaping the moral responsibility of students and their capacity to generate change in future generations.

In order to transform the world through history education, participants must shape students' moral character and develop their capacity for change. History education becomes the vehicle through which teachers fulfill their roles as the architects of the next generation. Mr. L makes this an explicit part of his role as a history teacher:

Because the reason why we study history is so that we can learn from the past and help them to create a better future. So if we learn about the Holocaust, for example, if we learn about the race and racism, topics of race and racism, we hope that the kids after knowing
what happened in the past, they can do something about it in the future to prevent it from happening. (personal communication, Nov 21, 2014)

Mr. L combines the second and third modes of intelligibility in his response, in that his determination of tenable representations of race and racism in history education (the third mode) rests entirely on his understanding of what his students need to learn to become change makers (the second mode). He cites history education on the Holocaust, for example, as a form of intervention that hopefully interrupts a series of mistakes that stem from “the past”. Within such a context, the authority and purpose of the participants’ identities as teachers of history are determined by the urgency with which they represent this societal dilemma. Fulfilling this self-generated prophecy of imminent moral disaster requires forms of knowledge production in lessons on historical topics on racism that centers ideas of what progress entails. The lessons on the Holocaust, Japanese Canadian internment, and Africville constitute opportune moments in which discourses of race and racism are mobilized and circulated to students within the classroom space and allotted time frame. Conceptualizations and configurations of race and racism differ, and even contradict each other, across the lessons described below. Yet they still function to situate the history teacher subject as the moral gatekeeper, on the one hand, and the history students as agents of change, on the other. Thus the history teacher subject occupies the nexus where power and knowledge meets—both mediating and producing what and how students come to know of race and racism. In teaching each of the three topics, those inside the classroom “encounter” race and racism over and over again. What I mean by this is that there is no pattern or reason to the ways that each historical topic is presented in relation to each other, and the point is not to locate participants’ intent in the representations. It is to examine how the implementation of these lessons based on historical topics on race and racism produces the history teacher subject as moral gatekeeper in the desire to mobilize history education to change the world through students.

During the two lessons on the Holocaust, the ideologies, symbols, and mentalities that comprise anti-Semitism were thoroughly defined and illustrated, drawn causatively to why the Holocaust happened. Mr. L explained to students that anti-Semitism meant “hatred against the Jews” (observation, Nov 28, 2014), and Betty described it as “[d]eep-seated hatred against Jewish people” (observation, Nov 25, 2014). There was no ambiguity to this definition, and it
was further supported by a plethora of examples and images. For example, Betty began her presentation of anti-Semitism and Nazism with an explanation of its famous symbol, the swastika. In her Powerpoint presentation, she explained its origins as “an ancient Indian symbol (Sanskirt) that is over 3000 years old, meaning well-being, good luck, and prosperity” and credited Adolf Hitler for the transformation of the symbol to mean “the mission of the struggle for the victory of the Aryan Man…be[coming] a symbol of hate, anti-Semitism, violence, death, and murder” (observation, Nov 25, 2014). Along with the swastika, Mr. L also included an analysis of the symbology of persecution in Nazi Germany, illustrated by a question on his World War II unit test, “What symbol did all Jews have to wear to identify themselves? A. Star of David, B. Pink Triangle, C. “J” on sleeves, D. Star of Isaac.” Along with such symbols, participants also expounded on the ideologies embedded in the Nazi German imaginary of the Aryan Race, “This was the name of what Hitler believed was the perfect race. These were people with full German blood, blonde hair and blue eyes” (Betty, observation, Nov 25, 2014). Anti-Semitism and Nazism were understood as not just a mindset or bigoted thinking, but a culture predicated on the demise of the Jewish people and the superiority of the German people.

Anti-Semitism was further taken up using a historical and spatial analysis through the examination of the historical formation of anti-Semitism and the four steps to the final solution. As Mr. L explained, “Why were Jews the scapegoats? Why were they the target? Because they were the easy targets. The Germans are not the first ones to hate the Jews… They were driven out of almost every European country” (observation, Nov 28, 2014). He described the biblical and historical context of anti-Semitism, and summarizes the events leading to WWII. He continued, “It was very convenient for Hitler to blame the Jews because of long lasting stereotypes about Jews. The Jews were a scapegoat, blamed for everything” (observation, Nov 28, 2014). Participants also described how the repeated relocations of Jews were an intrinsic part of the final solution. Betty asked:

What does ghetto mean? What do you associate ghetto with? Usually we think of American poor neighbourhoods. We associate ghettos with low-income areas in the States. The word actually comes from Europe. During WWII, they created Jewish ghettos, where Jews were isolated and designated as ghettos to isolate them from the rest of society.” (observation, Nov 25, 2014)
By making explicit the construction of ghettos as deliberate and intentional, Betty demonstrated how anti-Semitism as policy manifested. Mr. L likewise outlined the steps taken by Nazi Germany, “First… Identify them. Ghettoize them…Next stage is to put them into camps. The last stage is to get rid of them” (observation, Nov 28, 2014). The spatial and geographical impact of anti-Semitism were emphasized through images and maps in both of their Powerpoint presentations that showed the conditions of ghettos and locations of death camps scattered throughout Europe.

According to Short (2000), the anti-racist potential of Holocaust education can only be fully realized if it is taught effectively and with deep considerations for how the subject matter is treated in curriculum and its impact on students. Other scholars on Holocaust education are in agreement that situating the Holocaust within a fully contextualized historical narrative of anti-Semitism is an effective way of teaching students about racism in a specific historical context (Carrington & Short, 1997; Gross, 2013). The participants in this project shaped the study of the Holocaust to account for the ideological underpinnings of anti-Semitism, the coordinated policies and tactics for subjugation and elimination by Nazi Germany, and the bystander effects of non-Jewish German citizens (i.e., through the use of the film The Boy in the Striped Pajamas, further explicated upon in the third section of this chapter). They introduced the conceptualization of racism as “stages,” represented by the four stages of isolation that both Betty and Mr. L emphasized in their Powerpoint presentations. This production of knowledge about the Holocaust serves the pedagogical goal of situating students as witness to the horrors of the Holocaust and the dimensions of anti-Semitism that generates a version of the past from which students come to learn particular moral lessons. Mr. L, for example, ended his lesson on a statement about the choices people make when faced with injustice, “You can choose to be hateful or you can choose to be compassionate. What you do will change other people’s lives” (observation, Nov 28, 2014). In the context of his lesson, he made clear what constituted “being hateful” and “being compassionate” by drawing explicit causative links between anti-Semitic ideology to the material violence, brutalization, and genocide of Jewish peoples. Such a connection drove home the consequences of inaction with the hope that it propeled students towards action.
The lessons on the Japanese Canadian internment and Africville approached the conceptualizations of racism quite differently. In teaching the Japanese Canadian internment, there was no mention of the anti-Asian racism and xenophobia that positioned Japanese Canadians as the Other vis-à-vis “mainstream,” white, Canadian society (Sugiman, 2009). The lesson framed the internment only as governmental policy motivated by the fears of a Japanese invasion after the bombing of Pearl Harbor. Implicitly, such justifications legitimized the policy.

Betty introduced the topic by detailing the wartime context in which the internment took place:

You've heard the word internment before. You may not remember it though. During WWI, we looked at the word 'internment' because Canada interned some of the enemy aliens. What are enemy aliens?... During WWI, enemy aliens would have been Germans, maybe Italians, Austrians… Canada interned some of the Germans and Ukrainians. Internment means… you take them out of the public and imprison them in camps. They're away from rest of society. What would be the purpose?... To protect other Canadians from the enemy… They were worried these enemy aliens might betray the Canadian people. (observation, Dec 1, 2014)

The focus of her introduction to the topic was entirely on the notion of enemy aliens applied to the Japanese Canadian population because of the role Japan played as enemy of the Canadian state during World War II. Comparisons made to the “enemy aliens” of World War I activated students’ prior knowledge of the notion of internment. By invoking the internment of some German- and Ukrainian-Canadians, the differences between the internment policies and experiences were erased. Betty further explained during the lesson:

What event happened during WWII that Canada would start getting afraid of the Japanese? … Pearl Harbour is part of the United States, so that makes us a little afraid. If the Japanese can get to Hawaii, maybe it’s really not that far from Vancouver and [they could] bomb something in BC. We were a little nervous and wary. (observation, Dec 1, 2014)

Here, the narrative became centered on Canadians’ fears of an invasive external force. The potential of that force being present within Canada’s borders was positioned as a motivation for the internment. The use of Mary Kitagawa’s autobiographical narrative in the rest of the lesson
expanded on the experiences of those who were interned, but never did the conversation steer towards racist and xenophobic ideology that shaped the process of the internment.

The impetus behind teaching the lesson on the Japanese Canadian internment in the larger context of World War II illustrates the capacity for the history teacher subject to produce how race and racism is conceptualized. Betty explains during the focus group interview:

One of the other things that I think that's very important when we're teaching about World War II, because we kind of focus about the Holocaust and talk about the atrocities and stuff there, and there's sort of this concept that oh in Canada we're not like that. And I always like to make sure that I teach about the Japanese internment because it just shows that Europe wasn't an isolated place that, and this didn't come out of nowhere. This was something that was around, this ideology of, you know, taking people out of their homes and putting them in camps and, you know, it wasn't just something that happened in one area of the world. It was actually something that kind of happens around the world. (personal communication, Jan 7, 2015)

What immediately stood out in her assertion here is the missing word: racism. In the lessons on the Holocaust, both Betty and Mr. L used the term anti-Semitism to describe a racist ideology and culture in Nazi Germany. Yet, even as Betty wanted to resist the notion that “in Canada we’re not like that” through her teaching, she did not identify the racist ideology that rendered the internment of Japanese Canadians acceptable. Instead, Betty calls it “this ideology of, you know, taking people out of their homes and putting them in camps” (personal communication, Jan 7, 2015). Even as a question on Betty’s final course exam that asked, “Did Canada treat immigrants fairly from 1914 – 1949? (e.g. Asian, European, etc.),” there was a lack of specificity to the forms of discrimination referenced in the question. Such an omission, in fact, produces as effect the very suggestion she hoped to resist—that “in Canada we’re not like that.” The Japanese Canadian internment was an injustice committed against a specific racialized group, but is not representative of racist ideologies. As demonstrated in Betty’s opening statement of her lesson, she credited the fears of a Japanese invasion on the west coast without ever calling into question the ways in which anti-Asian racist stereotypes and white supremacy justified and made reasonable such accusations.
Yet, scholarship shows how discursive formations of the racialized Other works to justify practices such as the Japanese Canadian internment:

In the name of security, such practices of racialized Othering served to reinstate the desire for a preference for a white nation. Indeed, Prime Minister William Lyon Mackenzie King asserted in 1944 that “the government is of the view that, having regard to the strong feeling that has been aroused against the Japanese during the war and to the difficulty of assimilating Japanese persons in Canada, no immigration of Japanese into this country should be allowed after the war” (Canada, House of Commons, 1944). (Dhamoon & Abu-Laban, 2009, p. 171)

Dhamoon and Abu-Laban (2009) situates the Japanese Canadian internment in a larger historical context of anti-Asian racism that positioned all Japanese peoples, regardless of nationality, as perpetually foreign. Anti-Asian racism also fundamentally elevated the ideal of the white nation state, infusing notions of superiority into the white racial category. Such anti-Asian racism has historical roots in Canada and, notably, in British Columbia:

[What was significant was the pressures coming from the province of British Columbia – the place where a majority of Japanese-Canadians resided prior to World War II, and the place where the resentments of the majority white population were strong on economic grounds (their “cheap labour”) and racial grounds (“a white man’s province” could not deal with “inassimilable” Asians/the “yellow peril”). (Dhamoon & Abu-Laban, 2009, p. 171)

Similar sentiments existed about Chinese peoples in British Columbia as well, and illustrated how such racism conflated diverse groups into the Oriental racial category (Stanley, 2011). Therefore, the teaching of the topic of the Japanese Canadian internment is devoid of all mention of the racist ideologies that sustained popular sentiment and the enactment of discriminatory government policies. This stands in stark contrast to the representation of the Holocaust, where there was full acknowledgement, recognition, and engagement with the workings of anti-Semitism. Yet, in a Canadian context, anti-Asian racism is not mentioned or engaged with on a deeper level that examines how it permeated Canadian society on a systemic level, manifested in the form of the Japanese Canadian internment. Even as the teacher herself expresses a desire to
implicate Canada in what she perceives as a global phenomenon of racism in that historical moment, the failure to name racism in such contexts point to productions of knowledge of racism that generate far greater elaboration in the teaching of the Holocaust, through examining the effects of anti-Semitism with students, than the Japanese Canadian internment. Teaching the demolition of Africville presents a similar dilemma in the presentation of racism in Canadian contexts.

The focus of the Africville lessons rested entirely on the displaced residents and their experiences of the relocation. Explanations were given detailing each black migratory group that arrived in Halifax, who later formed the community of Africville. Betty asked students to imagine:

I want you to picture, so you have dirty harbour water and a dump. This is probably not necessarily the most healthy and safest place to be living, right? But the land that this community lived on, they owned. This is not city housing projects, this is their own community, their own land, they built everything themselves. They paid taxes. They are as much legitimate citizens of this city as everyone else… They're not getting water, education, they're the ones who built the schools, they don't have any paved roads, everything is done by them. And they get a lot of the materials to do this from the dump. They have this real sense of community. (personal observation, Dec 12, 2014)

Students came to know of Africville as a community living in horrible conditions through no fault of their own. They learned of the sewer pipes that ran through the area, the city dump that sat next to Africville, and the city harbor by Africville into which ran the sewage from the pipes. They were encouraged to think about how the City of Halifax as a whole were “going to move forward” because “a lot of the people in Africville are still in Halifax. This isn’t just [about] them; this is broader than the small community that’s now been dispersed, right?” (observation, Dec 12, 2014). She collected hers and her students’ suggestions of how the City of Halifax as a whole could “move forward”, which included some variations of public demonstrations, reparations, rebuilding demolished buildings such as the church, and issuing apologies from the City. Without explicit focus on anti-black racism and the formation of black communities such as Africville, the systemic nature of racism in Halifax more specifically and in Canada more
broadly was erased (Nelson, 2000). It allowed for an interpretation of the demolition of Africville as a site of conflict between displaced residents and the City of Halifax, as the latter having “wronged” the former, which required subsequent steps performed by the City of Halifax to “right” that “wrong.” This model, of turning the historical gaze towards “what can be done” in the future, encourages an understanding of racism-as-social-conflict as something to be rectified and subsequently forgiven. Such a model constitutes how the history teacher subject produces and mediates ways of understanding racism as well as ways of responding to racism for students.

Students, however, also heard Gus Wedderburn, an elderly black man and a member of the Halifax Human Rights Advisory Committee, speak in Remember Africville (Shelagh Mackenzie, 1991):

When I first arrived in Halifax in 1957, I walked along…and I saw no coloured people. In those days we were coloured. We were not yet black. Some of us were negroes. And so I said to my friends, where are the coloured people of Halifax? And they said to me, they live in a place called Africville. And I asked, where is Africville? I would like to see Africville. Will someone take me to Africville? Where the pavement ended, Africville began.

His experience illustrated the racial separation that shaped the spatial formation of the land occupied by the people of Halifax. The racial categories that he named—coloured, black, negro—were indicative of a culture and ideology that affords such categories particular meanings. In the quote above, he referenced the processes of racialization undergone by black bodies of which were attached various signifiers. Audiences implicitly understood such signifiers to be negative because of their absence in the city center. When Africville was referenced, he juxtaposes its existence with the end of the pavement—a space that was geographically different from Halifax. According to Nelson (2011), Africville was discursively constructed as “a site of danger, degeneracy, and lawlessness; a social problem; an object of pity; a site of attempted social reform and rescue; and a place of daring escape and transgression” by a range of knowledge-making practices, such as academic research, public discourse, and journalistic representations (p. 133). There was, like the lesson on the Japanese Canadian internment, no
emphasis on processes of racialization in the formation and destruction of Africville. This absence was glaring given that, yet again, a governmental policy (i.e., displacement, relocation, and demolition of Africville and its residents) was enacted against a racialized community. The repeated emphasis by Betty on Africville residents’ loss of community, while true, glossed over the fact that Halifax and Africville, at the time, constituted two racially segregated communities. Why was this so? What circumstances drove black migrants, those that Betty described at the beginning of her lesson, to settle where they did? How did Africville’s living conditions become so inadequate? How did the dump end up next to Africville? By asking these questions, the state of Africville as a black community existing on the periphery of a white community is not simply assumed and taken for granted in order to study the circumstances of Africville’s demolition.

According to Vincer (2008), city officials of Halifax had refused applications from Africville residents for basic services such as water and sewer lines for the community for many years prior to the removal of Africville. The subsequent characterization of Africville as a slum by the City, which justified its removal on health grounds, “strengthened the racial hierarchy between Black and White people in Halifax, leaving the space and people of Africville at the bottom of the order and the city officials at the top” (Vincer, 2008, p. 53). Anti-black racism operates as an ideological force shaping the spatial landscape. The framing of Africville as a slum in need of City intervention neglects the role that the City played in creating the very conditions that enabled the physical geography of Africville (i.e., repeated rejections of petitions from Africville residents to the City to improve services) to form. For example, “Over the years a slaughterhouse, an infectious disease hospital, a prison and a landfill site were allowed to locate on the periphery of the community” (Vincer, 2008, p. 34). The lessons on Africville also ignores the discourses of whiteness and blackness that served to construct Africville as signifying “a looking glass through which the white community came to ‘know’ its superiority” (Nelson, 2001, p. 140). Hence, by focusing primarily on the experiences of Africville residents who lost their community, students were invited to come to know of the demise of Africville and how it exemplified racism through a representation that obfuscated ideologies of whiteness and anti-black racism.

To be clear, my aim in this section is not to discuss or assume the intentions of the participants who taught the lessons on the Holocaust, Japanese Canadian internment, and the
demolition of Africville. What I hope to do is to make clear the discrepancies and gaps in the ways that these lessons produce understandings (or lack there of) of anti-Semitism, anti-Asian racism, and anti-Black racism in their particular historical contexts. The approach to teaching about the Holocaust through explicit and in-depth engagement with the developments of anti-Semitism at the level of German society provides an understanding and perspective of racism that takes into account the transmittance of ideology to material effects. For example, participants described how Jewish people were scapegoated for Germany’s defeat in World War I and for the economic depression that followed, concurrently with the historical and contemporary anti-Semitism that permeated much of Europe—that attached negative meanings to “Jewishness”. In other words, such scapegoating was made possible because of the anti-Semitism that permeated throughout Europe (as well as the subsequent refusals of many nations to accept Jewish refugees during World War II). The historical circumstances of the post-war era operated in conjunction with anti-Semitic sentiments to make possible the Holocaust. It ultimately enables an understanding of anti-Semitism that not only holds Nazi Germany accountable for the horrific atrocities committed but reveals the complicities of all those who supported such actions through their inaction.

In contrast, anti-Asian racism and xenophobia are never mentioned in conjunction with the Japanese Canadian internment. Although participants identified this historical topic to me as representative of racism, their lessons maintained the understanding of the internment as a result of government policy and wartime fears, rather than a manifestation of the anti-Asian sentiments in Canada (particularly in British Columbia). Nothing was made of the ways in which anti-Asian sentiments likewise attached particular negative meanings to “Asianness” or “Oriental” (as was more commonly used) that justified the perception of Japanese Canadians as possible spies for Japan regardless of the complete lack of evidence (Kobayashi, 2005). The focus remained on Japanese Canadians’ experiences of internment. The lessons on the demolition of Africville follow similar patterns. As I have demonstrated above, the conditions and geographic location of Africville was never questioned. It was simply assumed that such a community existed and that the relocation was inevitable. Again, it was the experiences of the former residents that are highlighted, including the emphasis on the loss of their community spirit when Africville was bulldozed and its residents displaced. By not making clear the effects of anti-Asian and anti-black racism on not just the implementation of the respective government policies that interned
Japanese Canadians and displaced Africville residents but also on white Canadians who did not resist against such ideologies, white Canadians and Canadian society more generally are exonerated of their past and responsibilities to these communities. Unlike the Holocaust, then, the teaching of these lessons incited few calls to action as these events become embedded within a past that was long over, where the notion of responsibility rested only on those who directly committed the wrongs.

Through these lessons, the history teacher subject becomes engaged in power/knowledge by producing and regulating the various kinds of knowledge about race and racism to compel students to become agents of change. Discourses of morality as rigid conceptualizations of what constitutes “good” facilitate the productions and regulations of how race and racism can be known in the classroom space. However, such narrow understandings of race and racism gain authority as effective lessons when used to sustain universalizing and individualizing moral lesson (such as making the decision to be a good and compassionate person). The history teacher subject takes on the role of moral gatekeeper by constructing lessons on race and racism along moralizing narratives that simultaneously serve to depoliticize the kinds of discussions on racism that can occur in the classroom. The absence of anti-Asian and anti-black racisms in the Japanese Canadian internment and Africville lessons demonstrates that the intended moral lessons would not have been viable had such foci been present. It is in these ways that power/knowledge circulates within the classroom through these lessons to legitimize the history teacher subject. It is within this desire to produce a structured path of access to students’ moral capacities that generates limitations upon alternative representations of race and racism.

**Fashioning the Ideal Student: Mobilizing Affect**

Teaching involves not just processes of knowledge production, but also the implementation of practices that situate teachers and students within a variety of social relations. In the same way that the history teacher subject become meaningful in the position of moral gatekeeper, the history teacher subject likewise takes on meaning through the implementation and regulation of normative sets of practices. I argue that the history teacher subject occupies a position that necessitates the deployment of pedagogy towards affecting and molding students so that they demonstrate idealized notions of “proper” behaviour and speech. In this section, I use the theory
of governmentality to examine how education as an enterprise produces a regime of practices. I then trace the mobilizations of affect in the lessons on the Holocaust, Japanese Canadian internment, and Africville to illustrate how the history teacher subject not only teaches moral lessons as described in the previous section, but also reinforces the normative values we place on “proper” models of teaching and learning. Specifically, students’ emotional output in response to racism-related curricula enables mutually reinforcing governance of conduct between both teachers and students. After all, while the morality discourse permeates the ideological formation of “goodness” as a specific and rigid set of qualities reinforced in the lessons (usually at the end), morality discourse also plays a role in shaping what is understood to be “proper” affect in response to historical narratives of racism.

Many components of education are held as common truth and conducted as such—educational pathways that categorize and stream students, a cumulative assessment at the end of a course. Governmentality denotes the thinking that allows certain practices to appear collectively undertaken and self-evident. It is the idea that the basis upon which the normalcy of practices is drawn comes from “theories, ideas, philosophies and forms of knowledge that are a part of our social and cultural products” (Dean, 1999, p. 16). In terms of the relationship between teachers and students, it is not enough simply to determine how teachers govern students’ conduct. The history teacher subject, as a subject position that one must speak and do into existence, fulfills the duties of what teachers “naturally” do. That is, the teacher is not merely a producer and mediator of knowledge, but actively participates in teaching students how to “be.” Dean (1999) explains:

On the one hand, we govern others and ourselves according to what we know to be true about who we are, what aspects of our existence should be worked upon, how, with what means and to what ends. We thus govern others and ourselves according to various truths about our existence and nature as human beings. On the other hand, the ways in which we govern and conduct ourselves give rise to different ways of producing truth. (p. 18)

The ways in which teachers govern others and themselves are fundamentally related in education. The role that the productions of truth plays is also two-fold—what we view as truth shapes how we conduct ourselves and govern the conduct of others, yet the very process in which we undergo both tasks produces new forms of conduct and of truths. It is this organized
formation of government that Foucault deems regimes of practices (Dean, 1999). According to Foucault (1991), such practices “possess their own specific regularities, logic, strategy, self-evidence, and ‘reason’” (p. 248). How teachers conduct themselves and conduct others are not randomized processes, but contains clear reasoning to the sensibility of how teachers (re)act, what teachers say, and what teachers do, as well as how teachers expect others to (re)act, say, and do.

For instance, Peace is adamant that race and racism must be addressed critically in the classroom. He recognizes, however, that “when you’re dealing with these topics…whether it's residential schools, internment, head tax, slavery, women's rights, whatever it is, the Holocaust, genocide, race and racism is uncomfortable” (personal communication, Nov 19, 2014). He frames this discomfort as an obstacle that teachers will face when addressing race and racism. Peace predicts particular student behaviours that may occur:

At the student level, it could lead to tears, it could lead to [anger], it leads to a level of discomfort. At the secondary level…I think that's the biggest thing, that it's going to lead to discomfort. It could lead to uncomfortable conversations that you as the teacher don't have the answer to... It leads to levels of discomfort, because by discussing issues of race and racism, it leads to courageous conversations…What happens if you have a predominantly white class, or even if it's not white, some of the non-white students don't want to go there. Like why're you singling me out, because I'm this way or that way? So I just think that the biggest thing is, discomfort, resistance…and I think one of the biggest things is just the courage piece, because you know you are going to face resistance, you are going to face people who don't want to go there. But will you have the courage to actually go there? (personal communication, Nov 19, 2014)

Students’ affective reactions to course material become something that teachers should engage. In his quote, Peace positions the teacher as the one who receives student resistance and that teachers must face such resistance with courage. As a teacher, then, one’s practice requires stepping out of one’s comfort zone into situations unknown. Courage is itself a practice. Yet it is not something that only teachers do—that is, to “do” courageous things like facing students’ resistance—but something that students do. Teachers who have the courage to “go there” extend their governance beyond their own conduct to students as well, who must receive and respond to
the “there” that is in the classroom space. Kumashiro (2009) asserts a similar position when he posits that learning about one’s complicities in systems of oppression leads students into a state of crisis, which is “a state of emotional discomfort and disorientation that calls on students to make some change” (p. 30). He argues that there is no guarantee that the change undergone by students will be the desired one, as “[c]risis can lead a student to desire change, but it can also lead a student to resist change even more strongly than before” (2009, p. 31). Peace’s assertion, that students react emotionally to racism-related topics in the classroom, takes on significance as a truth in history education when examining the lessons on the three historical topics.

My analysis on the ways in which such a truth manifests as teacher conduct revealed two ways that the history teacher subject approached student affect. I demonstrate this below. First, students’ emotional output are anticipated and accepted as evidence of learning. In other words, participants’ understanding that students should react emotionally to racism-related topics made particular pedagogical decisions reasonable in their implementation and resulted in their active encouragement towards students to express such emotions. Second, participants also conceived of certain students’ emotional output as inappropriate to learning about race and racism. Such an understanding of what learning entails enabled teachers to conduct their own conduct in maintaining proactive and preventative measures in their teaching that strived to maintain a good learning environment for all. In both these cases, teacher understandings of what constitutes effective learning about race and racism propelled the conducting of their own conduct—a moralizing regime of practices. The presence of the anticipated student affect acts as an indication of students’ positive moral character, in that they embody the impossibility of indifference in the face of racialized violence and oppression. The morality discourse comes into play when the history teacher subject anticipates and induces only particular kinds of affect that signify “goodness” over other affective responses, while preventing other kinds of affect that are seen as counterproductive to teaching and learning.

Student affect as a pedagogical strategy on race and racism shapes the conduct of the history teacher subject based on teachers’ understanding of the most ideal learning conditions and emotional states for students who are learning about racism. As shown in Chapter 5, the Holocaust as a teachable topic was presented as an unbearably tragic narrative. The images, personal accounts, and film that were shown provided a spectacularization of death that, as
participants have explained, was meant to shock and horrify students. The connection between affect and developing an understanding of racism constitutes a truth that Peace details above and that Betty reiterates:

E: So there's one thing you said that stood out to me on the first day of the Holocaust lesson. You said, "Sometimes we have to be uncomfortable to learn something". Can you expand on that and to what degree that belief influenced your lessons and planning?

B: So, if something is familiar and easy and comfortable, I kind of feel sometimes you're not learning anything new and you're not learning anything more. You're not taking a risk in your understanding. So if something is uncomfortable, you're probably going to in some way pay more attention to it because your ease is, your comfortableness? I don't know, I'm trying to think of a word.

E: Your comfort level?

B: Yeah, your level of comfort is no longer there. So you kind of have to pay attention more because you know, this is not normal and it's not easy. So now you're kind of more awake because you're not, oh this is easy, this is my normal pattern, so it kind of changes how your brain is functioning.

E: Are there any moments in these three lessons where this was kind of motivating the decisions you made in the lesson? Things that you thought, okay, this will unsettle them.

B: I think definitely for the Holocaust lesson because it is so brutal and tragic what happened that I don't think anybody should be comfortable with that. (personal communication, Dec 17, 2014)

Her understanding is that cognitive and emotional dissonance lends itself to deeper understanding. Such a truth makes sensible the action of maximizing the potential for the Holocaust lesson to incite discomfort and other negative emotions in students. The teachers’ desire to unsettle students is itself a form of conduct born from the need to govern students’ conduct in order to best enable learning to happen. Like the moral gatekeeper, this is reflective of
both the second and third modes of intelligibility. Knowledge of “proper” pedagogy and what constitutes an effective learning environment lends authority to the history teacher subject; likewise, the authority of the knowledge itself drives the need for governance upon the teacher’s own conduct to perform “proper” teaching. In the quote above, Betty associates the invocation of tragic narratives, such as the Holocaust, with the production of a specific kind of student reaction like discomfort. Representations of race and racism that are tenable in the history classroom, therefore, directly impact the kinds of affect that the history teacher subject desires from students. In this case, the discomfort itself is indicative of a moral characteristic that all students should be able to enact.

Sharing photographs of the Warsaw Ghetto during her lesson, Betty asked students, “Are you looking at the pictures?” When she saw students exhibiting a number of behaviours such as gasping in horror, physically recoiling from their desk, or frowning, she said, “Good, that’s the reaction I want. Sometimes we have to be uncomfortable to learn something” (observation, Nov 24, 2014). In another instance after a student was in tears towards the end of the lesson on the concentration camps, Betty commented to both the student and the class, “Good, she has a heart” (observation, Nov 24, 2014). If the particular pedagogical decision to show such images was to make students uncomfortable in order for learning to happen, then students’ physical reactions pointed to the teacher’s success. Thus these forms of student conduct are desirable for the history teacher. By deeming such reactions necessary to begin with, pedagogy as a way of triggering students’ emotions becomes a form of conduct that teachers enact. The successful implementation of such pedagogy also empirically validates the effectiveness of the history teacher subject. Effectiveness is thus defined as having successfully engaged students in an emotionally triggering lesson on race and racism, as the presence of such emotions point to learning (how to be a better person) having taken place.

Empathy plays a major role in the way that Betty conceptualizes her approach to teaching about race and racism:

Well I think students learn in a deeper way if they can envision themselves in the situations. Just like when you read a book or you watch a movie or something, you probably like it better when you feel that you can relate to it, that you can imagine being a part of it. So playing on imagery and emotion, I just feel like students connect to what is
happening and what is going on more so than if I was teaching just the facts. (personal communication, Dec 17, 2014)

Developing this emotional connection becomes a naturalized part of teaching about race and racism. The use of Mary Kitagawa’s autobiographical tale of her and her family’s experiences as Japanese Canadian internees constructed empathy as the primary goal of the lesson. After reading the story together as a class, Betty asked students three questions that relate to the tale. The first two asked students to describe what part of Mary’s story “surprised” and “disturbed” them, and why. Students’ learning was evidenced by such emotional output, and their ability to complete the third question:

Imagine for a moment that you are Mary. Choose a situation Mary discusses in her story and write a page in a diary describing your thoughts and emotions about the situation you are in. Consider how you would respond if your family were in a similar situation today. (Nikkei National Museum & Cultural Centre, 2011)

Students must then produce a tangible form of their ability to empathize with Mary by situating themselves in her historical position. As a historical document, Mary’s autobiographical account lends itself to a number of different interpretive approaches. Asking students to locate themselves in relation to Mary through the interpretive lens of empathy was a conscious pedagogical decision to value and embrace as truth the notion that students “learn best” when the topic under question is made relatable and relevant to their lives. Such a pedagogical strategy of “feeling the Other,” in this case, enabled students to turn Mary’s negative emotions into opportunities for learning and opportunities to reinforce the necessary moral qualities to combat racism—to empathize with others unlike ourselves. In this way, assumptions regarding pedagogical best practices in the context of history education on race and racism formulate what appear to be the best forms of conduct for teachers and students to achieve successes in teaching and learning.

Just as generating particular forms of student conduct through pedagogical practices can be seen as a positive outcome of teaching, particular forms of student conduct can also be seen as unpredictable, negative outcomes. They are attitudes, behaviours, and speech that are unwanted and undesirable, with the potential to deliberately disrupt what otherwise would be
successful moments of learning. Rather than teacher conduct that anticipate and facilitate student affect to enable learning, teacher conduct in these contexts anticipate and prevent particular forms of student conduct from happening. For example, Betty prefaced the two videos that she used in her lessons on Africville, with the following:

Some of the videos we’re watching… Some of the facts people are saying aren’t necessarily from research, more from their own opinion. Some are just off the cuff, not necessarily what is true. (observation, Dec 12, 2014).

This rather innocuous reminder to students gained considerable traction when it was repeated in the same lesson to the second class:

I’m going to show you a couple of videos today. Some of the videos have a lot of opinions in it, not necessarily factual. I want you to remember that some of the things, especially the MTV ones, may not be grounded in fact. And that can be harmful when you look at some of these things and you may get some of your own emotions and anger involved. (observation, Dec 12, 2014).

The invocation of emotions and anger as “harmful” alongside the elevation of claims “grounded in fact” now framed the original statement as a preventative measure, rather than simply a reminder. Emotion was now positioned in a binary with fact, rather than as mutually reinforcing pedagogical strategies to bring students to a fuller, empathetic, and more moralistic understanding of racism in history. Such a model coincides with the second mode of intelligibility, as preventing undesirable affect still coincides with knowledge of what students most require in order to learn effectively about race and racism.

As in the lessons on the Japanese Canadian Internment, the video titled Stolen from Africville (Logical Ethix, 2007) included personal accounts from former residents of Africville whose narratives provide similar opportunities for students to react and connect to the topic affectively. Unknown Mizery, one of two hiphop artists who flew to Halifax and filmed his interviews with former Africvillians, described how he related to the emotions of those he met:

Definitely since I came here to Africville, as soon as, not really the reunion, but the gathering started, the camp-out whatever you want to call it, I realize that I came here
with the ambition to interview a lot of the people, living members of the direct Africville community. I realize it's really hard to actually interview them because there's still a lot of pain, a lot of anger, a lot of unfinished business, I don't really know what I should call it. But basically it's unfinished, it's unsettled, and I don't know, I overstand the fact that a lot of people don't want to speak so what we've been doing is actually listening to the elders speak to us rather than videotaping it. We've been taking mental notes as well. (Logical Ethix, 2007)

How does this resource differ so drastically from Mary Kitagawa’s autobiographical story that the showing of the film requires a forewarning? What assumptions and truths guided the sensibility of the teacher’s conduct to forestall forms of student behaviour? To whose detriment would the undesired student affect be? Why would the students’ affective reactions to the Africville documentary not be considered a form of affect that represented the proper moral qualities in combating racism? When asked about the impetus behind her statements, Betty explains:

B: I was anticipating some hooting and hollering, and bap bap and like, just, because some of the things that some of those people were saying and presenting sort of feed into some of the negativity that some of the groups of the students in the class already share, and have already expressed some things to me, so I didn't want those students to, you know, act inappropriately, when these people were saying things.

E: Can you share some of them that they've shared with you?

B: Um... well, just, uh... So some of the students have said things about, you know, certain types of people trying to oppress everybody and you know, the government's out to get certain people, that kind of thing...When you're trying to express a sensitive issue or something, there's a way in which you express it, and that sometimes feeding into the stereotypes and the frenzy and negative side of the things is not going to help your cause. So you, like, you need to really be knowledgeable and know your facts when you're speaking about some of these things because if you don't, you're making yourself look bad. And you're making that group look like they're ignorant, and you don't want to do that. (personal communication, Dec 16, 2014)
Here, she details precisely how her beliefs about the “proper” form of expression towards sensitive issues enables her to conduct her own conduct. She perceives her students to lack the ability to resist “feeding into the stereotypes and the frenzy and the negative side of things” based on their comments in the past. In order to prevent responses to the video that she believes to be detrimental to their ability to receive the positive learning benefits from watching the video, she includes the above disclaimers in her introduction of the video. She predicts that based on the content of the video, students may create disruption and negativity through their conduct. Such behaviours, however, would be enacted *in agreement* to what was said in the video. Therefore, her dichotomization of fact and opinion in her opening statements not only serves to govern students’ conduct, it also sets out to discredit the video as a trustworthy source and representation of Africville. In effect, by fulfilling her responsibility as a teacher to produce the best learning experience and environment, she undermines the credibility of the entire resource.

Betty anticipating that students may feed into the stereotypes or make their racial group look bad during a lesson on racism against black people in Canada demonstrates the racializing politics happening concurrently with educational regimes of practices and the moralizing imperatives of history education inside the classroom space. The rhetoric of individualization versus collectivization appears as rationale for ensuring that correct or acceptable forms of behaviour and emotion are performed by students, the vast majority of whom are black and South Asian:

E: So, raising their awareness about the fact-opinion dichotomy was in anticipation of them responding to certain statements made in the video.

B: In a negative way.

E: Are you referencing the comparisons being made to Toronto?²

---

² In some of our informal conversations after my observations of the Africville lessons, Betty expressed to me her disagreement with various claims made by the hosts in *Stolen from Africville* (Logical Ethix, 2007). One of her points of disagreement was a comparison made between Africville and Regent Park in Toronto. Unknown Mizery identifies the issue of land seizure in the demolition of Africville as an extension of “systemic or colonial principles [that] had been put into play.” He compares such principles to the same underlying motivations to the treatment of various Toronto neighbourhoods, such as the revitalization of Regent Park. He describes, “They
B: Some of that, and just some of the, for lack of a better word of explaining it, some of the hiphop culture stuff, that some of the stuff that they were saying and stuff, I was like, okay my students might, you know, start hooting and hollering and jumping up and down in their seats. Not because they're angry, more in like…

E: More in like, support.

B: Support, and then they're going to miss something that is important because they're going to be so busy showing off. (personal communication, Dec 16, 2014)

The invocation of ‘hiphop culture stuff’ constitutes a form of coded language on race, justifying the “lack of a better word” (Lewis, 2001). It is a euphemization of blackness (Lewis, 2001). Such an assumption, coupled with the negativity associated with statements previously expressed by her students, makes sensible the repeated reminders to pay attention to facts, not to opinions. Her intention was not to discredit the Africville residents who spoke about their experiences, as she found them to be “very well spoken and very knowledgeable and able to speak clearly about what they were speaking about” (personal communication, Dec 16, 2014). Yet, in her attempts to circumvent the potentially harmful impact of using “hiphop culture” to interpret the history of Africville in the video--Betty’s instruction has the effect of discrediting all of the personal narratives and opinions Africville residents expressed in the interviews. Rather than incite emotions as part of a fruitful learning experience on the truth of racism, the Africville lessons involve processes that suppress emotions to enable a search for truth that can only be found as long as students are not “hootling and hollering” and “showing off.”

In these contexts, affect becomes a pedagogical practice. In Peace’s conceptualization of the history teacher subject, affect is an inevitable part of teaching and learning about race and
racism. Betty’s lessons demonstrate how assumptions on the educational value of student affect require careful deliberation from the teacher in order to achieve certain moral effects. Teachers’ conduct of their own conduct is motivated by beliefs that students’ emotional states determine their susceptibility to learning about race and racism and that teachers can orchestrate the presence and absence of student affect in a lesson. Thus, in trying to direct students towards specific forms of understanding, the history teacher subject enables the need and justification for such pedagogical forms.

This demonstrates that the morality discourse is not neutral or objective in its summation of what can be considered “moral.” Morality discourse can equally be a racializing discourse in which certain affects from racialized bodies are constructed as being in direct contradiction to what is needed to be “good.” While the *Stolen from Africville* documentary uses “hiphop culture” (often a euphemization of blackness, as stated earlier) to interpret the narrative of the demolition of Africville, the two hosts of the video (and various others throughout) express clear anti-colonial and anti-racist sentiments. Such sentiments should correlate with the overall moralizing message of the lessons. By discursively constructing the potential affective reactions, of black and non-black students of colour, to the video as “negative” despite being in support of the video, it is clear that what is determined to align with the morality discourse is conditional upon how such messages and affects are expressed. The resistance to the use of “hiphop culture” to express anti-colonial and anti-racist perspectives of the demolition of Africville and to the anticipated (and undesirable) reactions of the students both serve to illustrate how the morality discourse actively protects whiteness. In effect, the morality discourse actively works to sustain education that purports to be anti-racist only when it maintains the universalizing and individualizing discursive practices that obscures how racism operates.

**Pedagogical Failures**

In the previous two sections, I have examined how the history teacher subject becomes meaningful through knowledge production and management of student conduct, and how such practices extend the three modes of intelligibility through the discourse of morality. In the classroom, knowledge undergoes processes of representation and mediation. The framing and presentation of the three topics illustrate how each historical topic come to represent “racism” as
a discourse through language, images, audios, and visuals. Racism can be understood as ideology, policy, experience, and hurt feelings. These lessons, however, still function to ensure students learn moral values that are antagonistic to racial discrimination. At the same time, particular truths about learning require idealized forms of conduct from students—in the case of learning about race and racism, affect becomes the conduit that facilitates or obstructs student learning. Pedagogy must then simultaneously induce specific forms of emotional output from students while preventing other behaviours and emotions deemed unsuitable for learning. Discourses of morality works to produce forms of resistance against racism through education that elevates only certain moral qualities and affects over others in ways that maintain the often invisible workings of whiteness.

The underlying assumption enabling such pedagogical strategies, however, is that teaching and learning constitutes a mono-directional relationship. All three participants speak and enact pedagogy as though their students will understand and receive what they are teaching exactly as it was intended. While the history teacher as a subject position makes necessary the processes of knowledge production and governance of student conduct, my analysis thus far leaves little room to consider the moments in which pedagogy fails. The certainty that the aim of pedagogy will remain true as it “encounters” the students is predicated on the belief that education must be predictable and controllable. The three modes of intelligibility, conceived of as they were from teachers’ perspectives, also rely heavily on frameworks of prediction. For example, while the second mode of intelligibility shows that history teachers are knowledgeable of students’ learning needs when they encounter topics on race and racism, such knowledge only confers authority to the subject position if I assume that such knowledge is “true.” That is, when teachers implement such knowledge, the outcomes are as they claim.

To ask how history teachers teach about race and racism, I believe, requires more than just establishing how the history teacher subject position is legitimized through teaching about race and racism. It requires an examination of what I call “pedagogical misfires.” I use this term to refer to moments in teaching in which teachers develop pedagogical strategies for specific goals and purposes, as I have described throughout this chapter, and the moments in which such pedagogical strategies utterly fail and produce unintended effects upon the teacher, students, and the classroom dynamic. As Kumashiro (2009) so aptly put it, “[w]e can never know exactly what
students are learning” (p. 37). In this section, I interrogate the very efficacy of the pedagogical practices that I have described thus far in this chapter by employing Elizabeth Ellsworth’s (1997) application of mode of address to education. I examine moments in my data that suggest that pedagogical misfires are an integral part of teaching about race and racism, and that only by incorporating the failures of pedagogy into how we approach teaching can we teach ethically.

In Film Studies, modes of address are the ways in which a film projects an imaginary, ideal audience through various cinematographic techniques (Ellsworth, 1997). Throughout a film, it is constantly conveying to an audience who it thinks they are. Filmmakers, however, often embrace the fallibility of modes of address and miss their addressed recipients, as their aim is for their film to appeal beyond their intended demographics. Ellsworth (1997) argues that pedagogy operates similarly, aimed at “shaping, anticipating, meeting, or changing who a person thinks she is. And this is done in relation to gender, race, sexuality, social status, ability, religion, ethnicity, and all those other differences…” (p. 7) In other words, pedagogy is always addressed to a certain type of student. The mode of address is precisely the function of pedagogy that intends to shape, anticipate, meet, or change the intended recipients. Ellsworth (1997) argues that pedagogical modes of address always miss, precisely because “[the student] never ['is'] the ‘who’ that a pedagogical address thinks [she or he is]” (p. 8). Unlike filmmakers, however, teachers “stay up late on school nights trying to plan out [wrong modes of address]…Classroom acts and moments of desire, fear, horror, pleasure, power, and unintelligibility are exactly what most educators sweat over trying to prevent, foreclose, deny, ignore, close down” (p. 46). This anxiety of pedagogical failure makes sensible the desire for pedagogical perfection. The teacher must therefore strive to use language “to mirror…the teacher’s meaning, intent, knowledge (be it already achieved or in the process of being constructed) [and]…using that mirror of language or curriculum to ‘show’ the teacher’s knowledge to the student, which the student can then ‘see,’ and ‘understand,’ and reflect back in measurable ways” (Ellsworth, 1997, p. 78). Thus, education as a field simply does not allow for the messiness of pedagogical misfires, and does everything in its power to prevent it from happening. What happens, however, when we question the efficacy of pedagogical modes of address? How might our understanding of teaching and learning change if we resist the desire to assume that we can predict how our pedagogical modes of address are received? How might we teach differently if we assume pedagogical misfires to be the norm, and not the undesirable exception?
Showing the film, *The Boy in the Striped Pajamas*, was a pedagogical technique that aimed to direct what was assumed to be the movie's mode of address towards particular ends in teaching race and racism. Betty explains:

Okay, so I used the Boy in the Striped Pajamas because I liked the fact that...the whole film is based around these two eight-year-old boys. One is Jewish, one is German, and his father is in charge of the camp that the Jewish boy is at. I think because all of the students have been an eight year old child, they can relate and there's this understanding that when you're young, how innocent you are in a way, and you can see throughout the film the German boy struggling with what the adults were trying to make him understand about Jewish people... And then even watching his mom change in a way because in the beginning she may have had some understanding of what these camps were but as long as it wasn't really close to her and her family, it's okay what was happening. She had bought into a bit of the Nazi propaganda, but then when the violence is almost in her face, and the prejudiced and then the smell of the burning bodies is in the air, she realizes that, no this is not how you should treat people, and the fact that they are people, who are caring individuals and maybe don't deserve to be killed for just being Jewish. I chose that film because I think that it helps the students to really empathize because they can relate to the two eight year olds and then I also like it because the violence is never really seen. (personal communication, Dec 17, 2014)

Although she does not explicitly state it, she describes how she receives the film’s mode of address. Her takeaway is that the film positions the two boys (and their subsequent deaths) to represent the ways in which racism corrodes and eventually destroys innocence. Her desire to mobilize what she perceives to be the film’s mode of address, in order to instruct students on how to empathize, is itself another mode of address. Betty predicts that her students will find the two children relatable due to the common life experience of being eight years old, and come to the understanding that “racism doesn't just affect the victims, it also ends up affecting other people, whether they're participating in the racism or not” (personal communication, Dec 17, 2014).

Although students expressed unhappiness at the end of the film when both the German and Jewish boys unsuspectingly follow a group of Jewish men into a gas chamber, they
expressed resistance to her pedagogical mode of address during various scenes in the film. For example, when the Jewish boy was beaten due to the German boy’s lies (told out of fear of an intimidating and violent Lieutenant), students loudly condemned his actions. Some declared that they would never do what he did, to which Betty eventually responded after the film:

Now that you have watched this movie, a lot of you guys have a strong reaction to Bruno and Schmaul, about their relationship. For example, when Bruno lied to Lieutenant, that upset a lot of you. I’m quite sure when you were eight years old and something was scaring you, you would lie too. I want you to think about why the director wanted to film from the viewpoint of an eight year old child. We’re getting the adults’ opinions through the eyes of a child, and I want you to think about that. (personal communication, Nov 27, 2014)

Students’ adverse reactions to the film became a point of contention here because they spoke against her pedagogical mode of address. Betty engaged students in a dialogue that served to debrief the film; yet it was also necessary to position students vis-à-vis Bruno, the German boy, and reiterate her mode of address through conceptualizing students’ childhoods. In doing so, she narrowed the distance between her pedagogical misfire in that specific moment and the students to whom she aimed the mode of address. Pedagogy became a series of potential misfires and potential fixes, always chasing for the more precise spot to aim. In other words, pedagogy constitutes a chase for the right emotions to elicit and to avoid.

At the end of Mr. L’s lesson on the Holocaust, he used a dialogic mode of address to assess students’ understanding. He describes below how the effectiveness of the lesson in its entirety could be measured by students’ abilities to answer his questions:

First thing I put was a really shocking image. They didn't really know what the image was. It was one of the rooms of the concentration camp. So that was the first shocking effect. And then we go into detail. We talk, it was more of a, give some background information first. You learn some definitions and terms, what is anti-Semitism, what is Aryan. So they had a little understanding of the terms, and then we go into more details about how those terms were carried out, and some numbers, some statistics, some more details. And then we finished the lesson off with a documentary…Overall I think the kids
walked out of here knowing what the Holocaust was about and what was the Holocaust... Overall, it was an effective lesson. Technology, you know, the oral presentation, the lecture, and at the end of it, I asked them questions. And, so it's sort of a, it's like a feedback kind of thing. And most of them knew something about what we learned and didn't go to sleep. That's the important part. (personal communication, Dec 16, 2014)

Mr. L describes the variety of techniques he employs to capture and keep his students’ attention on the topic. He uses the questions he asks at the end of the lesson to gauge whether his pedagogical mode of address reached his intended recipients. The response he receives determines whether he “would’ve had a very successful lesson” (personal communication, Dec 16, 2014). Within his mode of address lies the trust he imparts upon dialogue as a trustworthy pedagogical strategy that can confirm whether a mode of address has been received. Ellsworth (1997) argues that dialogue is “assumed to be capable of everything from constructing knowledge, to solving problems, to ensuring democracy, to constituting collaboration, to securing understanding, to building moral virtues, to alleviating racism or sexism, to fulfilling desires for communication and connection” (p. 49). Mr. L’s questions and his responses to students reflect multiple modes of address. Alongside certain definitions and statistics, several questions ask students to make a judgment. He asked:

1. Write down 3 things you have learned from this presentation

2. Which slide was the most memorable? Why?

3. What is Anti-Semitism?

4. Approximately how many Jews were killed in the Holocaust?

5. Why did Hitler and the German people hate the Jews?

6. Why did the Holocaust happen?

The second question, for example, required students to select a slide using as criteria the degree of memorability of what was shown in the Powerpoint presentation. When he asked the last question in class, a student answered, “Hitler” to which he responded, “Yes, part of the reason, correct. Because humans can be both brutal and compassionate. You can choose to be hateful or
you can choose to be compassionate. What you do will change other people’s lives” (observation, Nov 28, 2014). He not only affirmed their answer, he also repositioned the student within a mode of address that required reflection on the part of the student upon their own behaviour.

Mr. L’s line of questioning, then, becomes a way of confirming understanding, and for that understanding to lead to students’ realizations that “when race and racism goes into extreme, bad things, really bad things can happen. And we have seen that in history, and hopefully they know the severity of [it]…” (personal communication, Dec 16, 2014). Such expectations for modes of address require a conceptualization of dialogue as exchanges that can accurately represent not only reality, but also the social location from which both interlocutors speak and listen. Yet, Ellsworth (1997) asks, “What gets erased and denied, and at what cost, when we act as if it is possible to wipe out, through understanding, the space of difference between a speaker’s text and a listener’s response in dialogue?” (p. 47). Correcting pedagogical misfires and constantly reshaping one’s pedagogical modes of address, as both Betty and Mr. L have done, potentially misses the opportunity to teach with and along the very moments when pedagogy fails. When modes of address fail completely—when the reception to a film is one of yawns and students nodding off, or when a teacher-students dialogue generates agitation or belligerence—what moves into place instead? What does acknowledging the very existence of this unpredictable, uncontrollable third presence “do” to our understanding of pedagogy?

In the following exchange from the focus group interview, Peace and Betty discuss different pedagogical modes of address in the context of the Israeli occupation of Palestine. I believe that it illustrates the fallibility of absolute certainty in modes of address. Peace and Betty present two approaches, each intending to give to students what they think they “want” to know:

P: I think the challenge is taking a balanced approach. Because let's take the situation with Jewish history, right? We're finding now very recently having students from the Middle East coming, right? And so as Betty was saying, it's very important that we definitely talk about anti-Semitism and SS. St. Louis, None is Too Many, and that kind of stuff. But I'm finding the limitations of history. I don't think we've been given clear direction. Because sometimes students will ask me, they've asked me before, what happened to the Jewish people is despicable, it's abhorrent, it's awful, like it should not have happened, it was a
clear case of genocide. But now we're having genocide today, with the Palestinians, right? And in that conflict, it's complicated because Jewish people are dying and innocent Palestinians are dying, but the point is, there are many who ask, there are Palestinians students, Middle Eastern students are saying, how about our experiences, right? But I don't think we have a clear directive, as history teachers, in terms of whether we can quote unquote go there. Talk about the conflicts today and make parallels.

B: Yeah, we are. You're supposed to make connections between the past and the present.

P: But specifically the Palestinian issue, right, because sometimes...

B: I think it depends on how you address it.

P: Yeah, it's tricky.

B: As long as you, I think as long as you address it from a historical point of view, and you're maybe not really trying to tell the students what they should think.

P: Yes.

B: Just give them the variety of information about, you know, Palestine has almost always existed and then after World War II, and then try and think about why is it that the Jewish homeland became the Jewish homeland, and you can even do a little conspiracy theory and stuff too, about, like, what is the real purpose of Israel? Is it really for the Jewish people or is it something that the super powers at the time wanted put in place to keep an eye on things? So that they can then go back and reflect and delve more seriously into that. And then you can kind of connect it a bit to the Suez Crisis and then you can build in the Canadian history part of that and Lester B. Pearson and stuff, so you can kind of play with it a bit.

P: Yeah, that's a good idea.

E: How was your experience, in particular, in this school?
P: No no, I'm thinking it's been tricky. And maybe Betty was saying, maybe we can approach from a, more a historical...It's been tricky, a little tricky, right? Because you could maybe if you're too sympathetic to the Palestinian side, you could be labeled anti-semitic, by some people. So it's a tricky thing.

B: Yeah. (personal communication, Jan 7, 2015)

Betty offers suggestions to Peace as to how he might approach such issues that are deemed controversial. Focusing on the relevance of the topic to students’ historical study, she describes how teachers could present the historical contexts of the “conflict” to students in order to facilitate further analysis and reflection on the topic. Such an approach is, according to Betty, in line with the curriculum document (2013). The expected outcome is that an inquiry-based approach constructs the line of inquiry for students to then take up for themselves. It presumably encourages students to be open to all knowledge on the topic. On the other hand, Peace focuses on his experiences of students personally approaching him to address the topic through a framework of lived experience. By centering in his narrative the students with the most personal investment, Peace also centers his pedagogical mode of address to affirm students’ identities. However, such goals may run counter to his role as a history teacher, who must maintain a “balanced” approach. While he agrees with Betty’s suggestion, he continues to identify accusations of political bias as possible ramifications of even such a “balanced” approach. This struggle highlights the impossibility of political neutrality and he sees the lack of direction from the school board or Ministry of Education as indicative of a site of uncertainty—the “tricky” areas in which any production of knowledge always creates unintended effects. This portion of the interview exemplifies how teaching so often relies on the assumption of impact based on intent.

This exchange, however, is rife with the moralizing discourse that deracializes and depoliticizes the different ways that racism can be addressed. Similarly to the first section of this chapter on the history teacher subject as the moral gatekeeper, historical narratives of race and racism can only become meaningful through the moralizing imperatives of teaching history. For example, Peace articulates the fear of being accused of anti-semitism for appearing to be “too sympathetic to the Palestinian side.” Sympathy for Palestinians or critique of the modern state of Israel becomes morally unacceptable as they become synonymous with anti-semitism. Some of
the suggestions made in the discussion, such as centering Palestinian students’ experiences, using “factual” accounts of history, or engaging in some “conspiracy theory” only serve to reinforce the limitations placed upon the narrative of the “Palestinian-Israel conflict” (a depoliticized, problematic term to be sure) in ways that reduce discursive “space” to name Israeli settler colonialism and anti-Arab racism in modern day Zionism.

Neither Peace nor Betty can offer what students want, because pedagogical modes of address can never predict how such modes are received. When students asked Peace for guidance on the topic, the morality discourse works simultaneously alongside the three modes of intelligibility to produce pedagogical approaches that should meet students’ learning needs. All of these pedagogical modes of address require the teacher and students to be socially located in different ways within the dialogic and social relationship. Rather than the teacher predicting what the students ought to “learn,” both the teacher and student are engaged in “the activity of knowledge construction…from a particular social and political point of view [that are further influence by]…particular kinds of relations of self to self, and between self, others, knowledge, and power” (Ellsworth, 1997, p. 25). Betty’s statement, “As long as…you're maybe not really trying to tell the students what they should think” underscores the saliency of pedagogical misfires in teaching, precisely because the goals of pedagogy must be predetermined before teachers can implement said pedagogy (personal communication, Jan 7, 2014). Pedagogy, as understood by educational institutions, requires teachers to know how students will think by the end of the lesson, unit, or course. In teaching about race and racism, the history teacher subject depends on the extent to which they can aim their pedagogical modes of address—whether that is to produce knowledge or change students’ conduct—with the utmost precision and successfully reach their target. Students subsequently become more knowledgeable and righteous people, who can discuss and resist forms of racism in the most appropriate manners.

Yet, as I have shown, the history teacher subject does not allow for the notion that pedagogical modes of address always misfire. Throughout this chapter, I have repeatedly emphasized that the history teacher subject is predicated on the morality discourse in history education that predetermines how and what historical narratives of race and racism should be taught in order to produce morally righteous students. These lessons always conclude with a universalizing “moral of the story” that enables students to believe, in various ways, that their
personal choices can lead to the end of racism. As long as students know how to be good people, are aware of the injustices enacted against different groups of people, and adequately understand the ways that Canada has atoned for their actions, they are capable of going out into the world to instigate some vague ideas of change that will prevent the past from repeating. I want to suggest, instead, that when we recognize and engage pedagogical misfires in our teaching, we can produce new ways of teaching ethically. In contrast to what it means to teach with moral imperatives in mind, teaching ethically means to constantly interrogate what we think we know in order to make visible what we do not. It is to examine the partiality of knowledge (Kumashiro, 2009) so that pedagogy can no longer be aimed using absolutist, authoritative models of what students “should” or “must” know. Instead, pedagogy remains open, flexible, and always skeptical of what appears normal and commonsense.

**In Summary**

In this chapter, I offer an analysis of the relationship between the history teacher subject and pedagogy through processes of knowledge production, governance, and modes of address. I first situate the history teacher subject as a moral gatekeeper at the centre of Foucault’s power/knowledge nexus, illustrating how relations of power, and production and mediation of knowledge construct race and racism in particular ways that facilitate students’ transformation into agents of change. Looking closely at the three historical topics on race and racism that I observed, I demonstrate how each topic is structured to offer a specific moral lesson. The history teacher subject produces what students can and should know at the same time as it produces what students cannot and should not know along the moralizing imperatives of teaching history.

In the second section, I use Foucault’s governmentality to make visible how normalizations of teaching and learning, such as the process by which teachers shape students into ideal learners, make sensible the teacher’s governance of student conduct and their own. In teaching race and racism, affect constitutes both evidence of learning and evidence of resistance to learning. The teacher’s conduct, as pedagogical practices, must therefore generate desired affect from students and prevent undesired affect from occurring on the basis of teachers’ own understanding of what constitutes effective learning environments for students. In that way, teachers’ conduct their own conduct towards achieving what they perceive to be “true” of
teaching about race and racism. I also show that the morality discourse that undergirds the history teacher subject is not politically neutral nor objective in the production of what is necessary to create “moral” students. The discourses of morality evoked in the teaching of race and racism can simultaneously reinforce what are undesirable forms of anti-racist attitudes and behaviour as performed by racialized student bodies.

Both of these conceptualizations of the history teacher subject reflect the three modes of intelligibility in Chapter 5. They demonstrate the ways that the modes work in non-linear, interrelated patterns to enable the history teacher subject to perform the task that justifies its existence through the morality discourse. At the centre of the subject position’s intelligibility is the discursive construct of history education as a field of study in secondary education that is especially well suited to the task of imparting moral lessons to students. The first mode of intelligibility enables the second and third to operate together to guide the implementation of lessons on race and racism. The practices of the moral gatekeeper and the conductor of student conduct are powered by the authority of knowing what pedagogies produce inspired, active students and what are tenable conceptualizations of race and racism in history education. Both modes require both the participants, as teachers, and myself, as researcher, to trust in the predictable outcomes of such practices.

It is precisely this reliability on prediction that forced me to take a step back from the construct of the history teacher subject to examine the promises of pedagogy itself. It is through pedagogy that the history teacher subject becomes knowable. Yet, there were moments in the data that resisted the assumption of equilibrium in the teacher-student pedagogical relationship. I use Ellsworth’s (1997) take on mode of address to explore the underlying assumptions of pedagogy. Throughout this chapter, I have shown how the desire of the history teacher subject to produce inspired, active students engages pedagogical modes of address that include emphases on various good qualities of “good” Canadian citizens (such as apology as a reparative strategy to an persecuted racialized community) and proper affective responses to racism (such as empathy). Yet, such a reliance on the assumed success of pedagogical modes of address ignores the pedagogical misfires that are far more likely to occur. Teachers’ constant need to correct their “aim” when delivering a pedagogical mode of address, rather than pointing to the success rate of
their pedagogy, illustrates instead that pedagogical misfires are an inescapable part of teaching. Kumashiro (2009) insightfully notes:

We [teachers] need to be examining our lessons and lenses, their political implications, and possible alternatives. Ironically, we need to put front and center the very things we do not want in our teaching, the very things we do not even know are in our teaching. (p. 41)

I believe that what Kumashiro suggests here is what constitutes an *ethical* approach to teaching, as opposed to a moralizing one. I end this chapter with the hope that incorporating the notion of pedagogical misfires into our teaching can create new possibilities in teaching about race and racism in history education.
Chapter 7: Conclusion

This Master’s thesis project explored the possibilities of subject formation in the role of the history teacher in teaching about race and racism. I began with asking the following research question: How does a history teacher subject position emerge from the discursive practices of history teachers teaching about race and racism in Canadian history? Rather than use a critical humanist paradigm to approach this question, I engaged with a poststructural framework in order to resist authorizing identity and voice as the sole frames through which to collect and examine my data. The invocation of a subject position points to the focus on discursive constructs of teaching about race and racism, rather than to the authentic self. To decenter the self, I applied three of Foucault’s theoretical approaches: subject formation, power/knowledge, and governmentality. Each approach served its purpose in enabling me to trace how the history teacher subject became viable through discursive and material processes enacted by the history teachers with which I engaged. I was therefore able to explore how the history teacher subject manifested in a variety of contexts, and how such forms of thinking and conduct became constituted as rational pedagogical models when teaching about race and racism.

In Chapter 5, I present each set of data through organizing them by form rather than participant. In doing so, I hoped to unsettle expectations about how we come to know of what and how we think and do, rather than as who we are. I identified patterns of thought and conduct across participants in the first interviews, the observations and teaching materials, and the second and focus group interviews. In the first interviews, I found that participants sought to make their work meaningful in the context of society’s moral progress. They used three modes of intelligibility that gave purpose, responsibility, and authority to the subject position of history teacher. Participants described how they aimed to develop students’ moral characters and capacities to affect change in the world. They outlined the various ways in which they engaged students on race and racism that demonstrated their expertise in pedagogical knowledge, and they determined how race and racism should be presented in the curriculum. These discursive techniques made the history teacher subject understandable as a necessary presence in the history classroom, where they facilitate the moral transformations of students into good, compassionate citizens. Rooted in the discourse of morality, which predetermines the kinds of qualities that lessons on race and racism must reinforce, the three modes activate various pedagogical
strategies undertaken by teachers to fulfill the moral goals of history education and renders the history teacher subject visible.

In my field notes of classroom observations and the teaching materials I collected, I noted closely how each historical topic that I observed in lessons—the Holocaust, the internment of Japanese Canadians, and Africville—were presented. I paid careful attention to them as representative of both individual lessons on a specific historical moment and of race and racism in Canadian history more generally. I found that the three topics were framed as tragic narratives of varying degrees compared to each other. There were two conditions identified in teachers’ reflections of these lessons in the ways that they presented these topics in relation to tragedy. First, the number of deaths in each historical event made racism more concrete and understandable as undesirable to students. Secondly, the order of events based on chronology enabled such lessons on race and racism to create a shocking impact. This meant that the Holocaust was positioned as meeting both conditions, leading to the use of what I called the “spectacularization of death” through statistics, photographs, audio effects, and film. The presentation of the lessons also necessitated the discretization of historical events on race and racism, creating in effect “stand alone” narratives that make possible the fulfillment of educational goals of assessment and transference of knowledge.

In the second and focus group interviews, I focused on how participants made palatable the study of race and racism. Not once did participants express reluctance to teach about race and racism. In fact, they were eager to discuss the various methods and strategies they used to teach about race and racism. By identifying, for example, racial stereotypes as a popular avenue through which to discuss racism with students, participants negotiated what it meant to teach about race and racism and to meet students’ needs for interesting, engaging material. Similar desires arose when participants spoke with me and with each other about possible resources. Student boredom was a mental state that had to be averted; one way of doing so was to select materials that entertained. Another strategy was to engage students’ empathy, ensuring that students came to a deep emotional understanding of the experiences of victims of racism. Such methods and strategies communicated participants’ values and beliefs about race and racism to students.
In Chapter 6, I extended my conceptualization of the modes of intelligibility by conducting the analytical work of mapping the history teacher subject position using Foucault’s theories of power/knowledge and governmentality. I wanted to trace what Foucault (1982) calls the relations of power that enable the formation of the subject on both the levels of the discursive and the material. The history teacher subject emerged through two such processes that I characterized as moral gatekeeping on the one hand, and conducting students’ conduct through affect on the other. Through the lessons on race and racism, I determined how the history teacher subject embodied the role of moral gatekeeper by locating the history teacher subject at the centre of the power/knowledge nexus. Rather than see the history teacher subject as an authentic identity that can be taken up, the history teacher subject works instead as the vehicle through which power/knowledge becomes visible. I analyzed the three lessons on race and racism to identify how the mediation and production of knowledge worked to shape students’ access to such information. I also used the work of other scholars to explore how the presentations of the historical topics worked to limit other alternative representations of race and racism. In determining how moral lessons, such as the rectification of past injustices through forgiveness and progressive rhetoric, are reinforced by the lessons being taught, the history teacher subject’s role in producing and regulating how students knew of race and racism became clear. Through such practices, power/knowledge define “the forms and possible domains of knowledge” in history education through the history teacher subject (Mills, 2003).

I examined how the history teacher subject makes the workings of governmentality visible in the classroom. In particular, I focused on the mobilizations of affect employed by the history teacher subject to reinforce normative assumptions of appropriate student behaviour. I traced how the conduct of both teachers and students regulate each other synergistically. Most notable is how affect played such a crucial role in the teaching of race and racism. Not only was inducing different forms of affect in relation to the material framed as a critical part of pedagogy on race and racism, instituting preventative measures towards students’ expressions of other forms of affect was also necessary. I used the Holocaust lessons to demonstrate how a participant carried out a number of instructional strategies in order to develop discomfort in her students. The understanding that learning about race and racism must lead to feelings of immense discomfort made sensible the showing of potentially triggering resources, such as images of bodies piled high in Nazi concentration camps. I also used the viewing of a resource titled, Stolen
From Africville (Logical Ethix, 2007), to illustrate an example of how the history teacher subject used the dichotomy of fact and opinion to remind students not to place too much credence on what the documentary’s hosts were saying. This was done to prevent students from becoming overly emotional in a negative way in response to the video, to the extent that such negative emotions would actually be unproductive to students’ development. This desire to achieve a perfect, idealized classroom for teaching about race and racism propels the history teacher subject to enact pedagogy in specific ways, whereby the teacher’s conduct is conducted through conducting the conduct of students. Yet, the racializing strategy of the morality discourse was in full display, as the affective reactions of black and South Asian students were governed in anticipation of their potential support of a hiphop-influenced articulation of anti-colonial and anti-racist sentiments. This cyclical process operates within power relations to entrust the responsibility of creating the ideal, yet depoliticized classroom to the history teacher subject, which further justifies its existence.

Finally, I took a step back from the history teacher subject to examine pedagogy as a taken-for-granted teaching model. I complicated my own analytical authority by placing under suspicion the idea that discursive and material practices—enabling the formation of the history teacher subject—are always carried out as intended and that their successful implementation further sustains the viability of the history teacher subject. Using Ellsworth’s (1997) mode of address, a theory borrowed from Film Studies, I explored the potentiality of moments in teaching about race and racism where pedagogy always fail—moments that I refer to as “pedagogical misfire”. I used the implementation of various resources and teaching strategies, such as a fictional film on the Holocaust, to demonstrate in what ways pedagogy can misfire and the urgency with which teachers must subsequently correct their pedagogical aim. I concluded my analysis with the recognition that the formation of the history teacher subject, as mapped in this thesis, assumes that the techniques of power used by the subject are carried through to their predictable conclusion. This predictability is embedded within the moralizing discourses that enable the history teacher subject to perform in the classroom. Acknowledging the failures of pedagogy in the teaching of race and racism constitutes a more ethical approach to teaching because such pedagogy always resists the relations of power that determine what can be known.
Limitations

There were three major limitations in my methodology that I had to negotiate as I completed this project. Given the scope of the project as a Master’s thesis, I could only engage with three teachers at one school in the duration I had to complete my data collection. While I used a range of research methods with the hope that they would enable me to gain rich and diverse forms of data, it does not mitigate the fact that only a small number of participants within a single institutional context were used to make visible patterns of teaching practices employed. As well, my collaboration with teachers during the process of data collection was heavily weighted towards one teacher, Betty. Perhaps because she taught CHC2D, the academic version of “Canadian History Since World War I,” I had far more opportunities to observe her teaching lessons on race and racism because of the speed with which she could cover the topics over the course of the semester. Because of this reason, Betty occupies central role in my analysis in both Chapters 5 and 6 as it is more informed by her statements and teaching practices overall. Therefore, I make no attempts to understand and establish how every history teacher in every secondary school in Ontario teaches by tracing the formation of the history teacher subject. The history teacher subject as presented here is fully contextualized and represents only the possibilities of what teaching about race and racism could entail for secondary history teachers.

Furthermore, the timeline of the execution of this project and the timeline of the school year did not align as well as it could have. This project was completed in a school that had two semesters, one in the fall from September to January, and one in the winter from February to June. In order to ensure that my participants were teaching CHC2D/P for the duration of their participation, all of my data collection had to be completed in the first semester. I could not, however, begin contacting schools regarding their interest in participating in my project until the school year had already started. This meant that I was not in the school until two months had already passed, during which I corresponded with schools and the school board. For example, all of the participants were adamant about the topic of residential schools as one they felt was representative of race and racism in Canadian history. By the time I gained access to the research site, however, they had already taught the lessons on residential schools to their students and moved onto the next unit on World War II. The absence of the histories of indigenous communities in this project is especially glaring given how the formation of Canada as a nation
state was predicated on processes of colonization and the genocide of indigenous peoples. This project would have benefited from a fuller coverage of historical topics that were taught in the classrooms that I observed.

The absence of students in my study constitutes the final limitation. For a Master’s thesis, I centered my focus on teachers due to my own positionality as a history teacher with priorities rooted in social justice and equity. The study, however, would have benefited greatly from including students as sites of analysis. For this project, I investigated the ways in which the participants in my study constituted a history teacher subject through their teaching about race and racism. Similarly, my study could have included the emergence of a history student subject in the ways that history students negotiated their learning in the classroom. In other words, if the history teacher subject were situated on one end of the pedagogical mode of address as described in Chapter 6, then a study of how students learn about race and racism would provide the opportunity to explore how such modes “fail”. The scope of this project, as mentioned above, was too limited to include students. Logistically speaking, gaining approval from the school board through their ethics protocol would have proven far more difficult as well. In the end, I decided against including students in this study in the hopes that this project would create the opportunity for further research to be conducted with students learning about race and racism in history education or, more generally, learning for social justice and equity in history education.

**Implications for Research**

*For History Education*

Participants discussed at length about the effectiveness of history education to change students’ understanding of racism and to mobilize them towards effecting change in the world. The nature of history as morally instructive, by using narratives of the past to demonstrate what not to do in the future, was an oft-repeated construct. History education was seen as being particularly suitable to teaching about race and racism in ways that impart some semblance of moral wisdom upon students. Currently, much of the literature on the nature of history education focuses on the development of historical consciousness—how to train students to think historically and how to train teachers to effectively teach such skills. As well, research on teachers’ perceptions of history education focuses on their sense of self-efficacy regarding their abilities to teach
historical thinking. My work departs from this literature by locating the history teacher subject amidst the patterns of discursive practices performed by history teachers united in their goal to teach about race and racism. Along with the critical approach to history education, my project foregrounds the need to center justice in our pedagogical strategies in order to resist the colonizing imperatives of normative historical narratives. The findings of this project, that of the constitution of the history teacher subject as moral gatekeeper and conductor of conduct, require far greater emphasis in the field. Further research is needed to examine the various ways in which teachers operationalize these discourses about history education to teach about race and racism, or other forms of oppression through a historical lens.

My project situates teachers as the primary subjects of inquiry. Much of their pedagogical knowledge was centered on their understanding of what students need to learn about race and racism in history. Positioning their teaching as being responsive to students necessitates an examination of the students as an essential part of the pedagogical relationship. I explored the failures of pedagogical modes of address, for example, but could only discuss how teachers managed them. History students were the absent presence that were mostly unseen and unheard throughout this thesis, but remained constant as a crucial part of the entire data collection and analytical processes. The field of history education needs to center students as subjects that also stand at the nexus of power/knowledge and enact their own techniques of power and resistance within the classroom and without. It is necessary to resist the deficit perspective of teachers imparting anti-racist values upon students whom are assumed to otherwise be willfully ignorant. For example, how do secondary history students conceptualize and implement their learning of race and racism in Canadian history education? Such questions resist the notion of students simply receiving their teachers’ pedagogy. Instead, students also engage with fields of possibilities that are produced along relations of power. They, too, think and do their learning into existence. It would be worth exploring how learning about race and racism takes on meaning for students and how they negotiate the pedagogical modes of address enacted by their teacher.

For Teacher Identity

Using a poststructural framework for this project enabled me to think of the teacher figure herself in different ways. I resisted the desire to reify the teacher self as an authentic presence in
the classroom. Instead of centering teachers along a continuum of authenticity—for example, the more true to herself she is, the better she is as a teacher—I shifted away from the self to focus on discourses and practices that enable us to think of the teacher as a ‘self.’ Since my interest was in the teaching of race and racism, my analysis isolated the teaching of such topics as sites of contention in which power relations constantly circulate. I located the history teacher subject within such power relations. The necessity of implementing various techniques of power, in order to make meaningful and to teach about race and racism, produces as effect the history teacher subject.

Scholarship on teacher identity continues to employ interpretive or critical paradigmatic lenses to understand and/or to change the decision-making processes of teachers. Such approaches are important because they honour and value teachers’ individual voices and labour both inside and outside the classroom. They also suggest that teachers can become better teachers by reflecting on their intentions and their personal experiences of privilege and/or marginality. However, this project suggests methodologically that important insights can be gained when we consider what and how we think and do to become a certain subject. Rather than reflecting on our knowledge as an intrinsic part of our selves and that such knowledge can be fully represented in the material world through our roles as teachers, it was in the sites of uncertainty where teachers can never be sure of how their pedagogy plays out that generated the most analytical nuance of what it could mean to teach about race and racism. How might teachers and teacher candidates negotiate such sites without desiring predictability and control? Is it possible for such sites to co-exist with the mandates, governmental policies, and hierarchization of bureaucracy necessitated by the institutionalization of education? These are questions that require further exploration because they interrogate what we assume to be sensible and normal in education while remaining generative of the possibilities when we imagine alternatives to such normalizations.

For Teaching about Race and Racism

Participants expressed throughout the project their desire to use history education as a vehicle through which to educate students on the horrors of racism and to engage students in making a difference with the knowledge they gained. Yet, as I have shown, pedagogical models that
purport to teach for social justice goals can themselves be limiting and regulatory in the productions and mediations of knowledge, and the management of student conduct. My project suggests that not only can such discursive and material practices in teaching about race and racism be counterproductive to the larger goal of fighting racial injustice, it can equally perpetuate the very same oppressive teaching strategies. Kumashiro (2009) explains:

In fact, “good” teaching often means that crisis is averted, that lessons are doable and comfortable, that problems are solved, that learning results in feeling better, that knowledge is a good thing. This is the case even within some approaches to teaching that aim to raise awareness of oppression through rational discussion and analysis. (p. 55)

Our desires for pedagogy to achieve what we desire from our students, such as training their antiracist mindset or activating students’ motivation to create change, ignore the problematic of pedagogy as a series of modes of address that always misfire. Given the conclusions I have drawn from this project, I have no desire to recommend forms of teaching with proven records of being effective in the classroom for teaching about race and racism. The reason is because there is never any guarantee that such forms of teaching are free of the very discourses that they are meant to resist, or that their implementation by teachers will be received by their students in exactly the ways they were intended. I harken back to what I quoted of Foucault (1981) in Chapter 3 regarding critique, and that is the work of “seeing…what type of assumptions, of familiar notions, or established, unexamined ways of thinking the accepted practices are based…Criticism consists in uncovering that thought and trying to change it” (p. 172). What this project does suggest to educators who aim to teach or are already teaching about race and racism, as well as researchers whose work examines the act of teaching about race and racism, is to use as ethical position this very conceptualization of critique in order to examine more closely what we hold dear in the teaching of race and racism and what can be done to disrupt what we consider normal and sensible.
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Appendix A: Information Letter to School Principals

Teaching Race and Racism in Canadian History Project

(on OISE/UT letterhead)

November 2014

To Secondary School Principals at [School Board],

I am a Master’s candidate in the Department of Social Justice Education at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto. My M.A. thesis project will look at how teachers address race and racism in the grade 10 course, “Canada Since World War I,” and will contribute to development on how anti-discrimination education can be incorporated into high school curriculum and teaching. This study aligns with the [School Board’s] Board Improvement Plan in the area of [removed for anonymity]. [School Board’s] Research Review Committee has approved this project, and I have attached the [Committee’s] approval letter for your reference.

I am requesting to seek participants from the History (Canadian and World Studies) department of your school.

Given [School Board’s] initiatives and values, my project is a great opportunity for the board and participating schools to begin highlighting and documenting what teachers are already doing in the classroom regarding race and racism. Schools are where diverse student populations learn values of respect and acceptance of difference, especially in our increasingly multicultural Canadian society. By participating in this project, we are contributing to a much-needed dialogue in our increasingly globalized present.

I am looking for four participants to participate in my research study. To qualify, teachers must be: (1) working at [School Board], (2) certified teachers with at least five years of long-term occasional or permanent teaching experience, (3) teaching CHC2D and/or CHC2P in the 2014-2015 school year, and (4) self-identify as teachers who address issues of race and racism in their teaching of history.

This project will involve three parts. Participants will be interviewed twice, observed in classrooms, and asked to submit resource and lesson materials for analysis. Data collection will take approximately 2.5 hours for each participant. During the data collection stage, I will make every effort to decrease interference to the day-to-day tasks of students, teachers, and administrators. No student will participate or be observed in the study. All participating teachers will be provided with informed consent forms, including their rights as research participants. Pseudonyms will be used to represent participants and schools in all data collected and future publications. No identifying information of participating schools and school board will be included in the data and future publications.
Participation in the project is voluntary, and participants have the right to withdraw at any time. To withdraw, participants can contact me by email, phone, or in person regarding their wish to discontinue their involvement, and any information that they have shared with me up to that stage will be destroyed.

Only I will have access to interview data (interview transcripts and audio recordings), observation notes, and lesson materials. I will keep the data safe in a password-protected computer and a locked filing cabinet, both accessible only to me. The data will be retained for five years, after which all paper-based documents will be shredded and digitized files permanently deleted.

For questions about participant rights and University of Toronto’s approved ethics review of this project, please contact the University of Toronto Office of Research Ethics by phone (416) 946-3273, fax (416) 946-5763, or regular mail (McMurrich Building, 12 Queen’s Park Crescent West, 2nd Floor, Toronto, ON M5S 1S8).

I have attached the recruitment letter for history teachers and the informed consent form for your reference. If you have any additional questions or concerns, feel free to contact me at any time. Thank you for considering my request for your school to participate in my study, and I look forward to hearing from you.

Best regards,

Eunice Chow, MA Candidate  
Principal Investigator  
Department of Social Justice Education  
OISE University of Toronto  
eunice.chow@mail.utoronto.ca  
[Phone number]

Roland Sintos Coloma, Ph.D.  
MA Thesis Supervisor  
Former Professor/Faculty Affiliate  
OISE University of Toronto  
Chair and Professor  
Department of Teacher Education  
Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, USA  
colomars@miamioh.edu  
[Phone number]
Appendix B: Recruitment Letter to History Teachers

Teaching Race and Racism in Canadian History Project

(on OISE/UT letterhead)

December 2014

To History Teachers at [School Board],

I am a Master’s candidate in the Department of Social Justice Education at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto. My M.A. thesis project will look at how race and racism is being addressed in the grade 10 course, “Canada Since World War I.” This project is an opportunity for secondary history teachers to reflect on and examine how their teaching can begin and continue to incorporate values of equity and social justice in history education.

I am looking for four participants to participate in my research study. To qualify, you must be:
(1) working at [School Board], (2) certified teachers with at least five years of long-term occasional or permanent teaching experience, (3) teaching CHC2D and/or CHC2P in the 2014-2015 school year, and (4) self-identify as teachers who address issues of race and racism in their teaching of history. If more teachers than required express their interest, final selection of participants will be based on equal representation (2:2) of gender (male and female) and race (white and non-white).

This research study has three parts. The first part is an interview where I will discuss with you about pedagogical and content knowledge of race and racism in history curriculum. The interview will take about an hour, and will take place at a day, time, and location that is convenient for you. I will audio record and transcribe the interview.

The second part is classroom observations. With your permission, I will observe you as you teach self-selected lessons about race and racism in your classroom. I will observe three to five lessons. During these observations, I will record field notes. I will be seated at the back of the classroom, and will not participate nor interact with students during the lesson. No student will participate or be observed in the study. After the classroom observations, there will be a follow-up interview where we will reflect on the lessons together. This interview will also be audio recorded and transcribed by me. Both sets of transcripts will be sent to you for your approval and requested revisions or deletions. The two interviews will take approximately two hours.

The third part is analysis of lesson and resource materials used in the lessons, provided to me at your discretion. I will make photocopies of paper-based materials and request to be sent digitized copies whenever possible.
Data collection will take place in the fall semester of 2014-2015. All participating teachers will be provided with informed consent forms, including their rights as research participants. Since your board requires all external researchers to contact school principals during the participant recruitment process, complete anonymity to your principal and immediate colleagues cannot be guaranteed. However, pseudonyms will be used to represent participants and schools in all data collected and future publications. School boards will be generically referred to as a school board in southern Ontario. No identifying information of participating schools and school board will be included in the data and future publications.

Although this project has been reviewed and approved by the [School Board’s Research Review Committee] and your school’s principal, participation in this research is voluntary and you have the right to withdraw at any time. To withdraw, you can contact me by email, phone, or in person regarding your wish to discontinue your involvement, and any information that you shared with me at any stage of the project will be destroyed.

Only I will have access to interview data (interview recordings and transcripts), observation notes, and lesson materials. I will keep the data safe in a password-protected computer and a locked filing cabinet, both accessible only by me. The data will be retained for five years, after which all paper-based documents will be shredded and digitized files permanently deleted.

Research findings will be published in a Master’s thesis, future potential scholarship, and other means for dissemination (such as an Executive Summary to be submitted to the school board, and potential information sessions/workshops at the request of participating schools).

For questions about your rights as a research participant, please contact the University of Toronto Office of Research Ethics by phone (416) 946-3273, fax (416) 946-5763, or regular mail (McMurrich Building, 12 Queen’s Park Crescent West, 2nd Floor, Toronto, ON M5S 1S8).

If you have additional questions or concerns, feel free to contact me at any time. Thank you for considering my request to participate in my study, and I look forward to hearing from you.

Best regards,

Eunice Chow, MA Candidate
Principal Investigator
Social Justice Education Department,
OISE University of Toronto
eunice.chow@mail.utoronto.ca
[Phone number]

Roland Sintos Coloma, Ph.D.
MA Thesis Supervisor
Former Professor/Faculty Affiliate
OISE University of Toronto
Chair and Professor
Department of Teacher Education
Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, USA
colomars@miamioh.edu
[Phone number]
Appendix C: Information Letter to Parent(s) and/or Guardian(s)

(on OISE/UT letterhead)

February 2015

To Parent(s) and/or Guardian(s),

This letter is to inform you that I will be making multiple visits to your child’s History classroom during the second semester of 2014-2015. I am a Master’s candidate in the Department of Social Justice Education at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto. For my M.A. thesis project, I will be working closely with your child’s teacher in their classrooms.

My involvement includes several visits where I will be observing the classroom and the lessons being taught. I will be sitting at the back of the classroom. **No student will participate or be observed in the study.** I will make sure that my presence does not interfere with the day-to-day tasks of students.

If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me by email or telephone (both listed below).

Thank you.

Best regards,

Eunice Chow, MA Candidate
Principal Investigator
Department of Social Justice Education
OISE University of Toronto
eunice.chow@mail.utoronto.ca
[Phone number]

Roland Sintos Coloma, Ph.D.
MA Thesis Supervisor
Former Professor/Faculty Affiliate
OISE University of Toronto
Chair and Professor
Department of Teacher Education
Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, USA
colomars@miamioh.edu
[Phone number]
Appendix D: Informed Consent Form for Interviews and Classroom Observation

Teaching Race and Racism in Canadian History Project

(on OISE/UT letterhead)

By signing your name here, you acknowledge that you have read and understood the information provided in the Recruitment Letter for History Teachers, and give your informed consent to participate in the Teaching Race and Racism in Canadian History Project. You also consent to the data collected from your participation in the study be used in the submission of a Master’s thesis, future scholarly publications, and other means to disseminate research findings.

Your participation in this research is voluntary, and you have the right to refuse to answer any questions or withdraw at any time. To withdraw, you simply contact me by email, phone, or in person regarding your wish to discontinue your involvement, and any information you shared will be destroyed. Your signature below indicates authorization to participate in the study.

Participant Print Full Name: ________________________________________

I give consent for my interview to be audio recorded: □ YES □ NO

I give consent for my teaching to be observed: □ YES □ NO

I have received a copy of this consent form for my records. □ YES □ NO

Only your pseudonym will be used. Please provide a preferred pseudonym: ______________________

Participant Signature ________________________________

Date: ______________________________________

Eunice Chow, MA Candidate
Principal Investigator
Social Justice Education Department, OISE,
University of Toronto
eunice.chow@mail.utoronto.ca
[Phone number]

Roland Sintos Coloma, Ph.D.
MA Thesis Supervisor
Former Professor/Faculty Affiliate
OISE University of Toronto
Chair and Professor
Department of Teacher Education
Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, USA
colomars@miamioh.edu
[Phone number]

Please note: At no time will your identifying information (for example, your name, personal details, and details of your school) appear on your responses to this study. This is done to ensure that your information remains anonymous. Should you wish to withdraw from the study, you can contact me, and simply say, “I no longer wish to participate in this study.”
Appendix E: First Interview Guide

Teaching Race and Racism in Canadian History Project

1. When the word ‘race’ comes up, what comes to mind?

2. When the word ‘racism’ comes up, what comes to mind?

3. Why teach about race and racism in Canadian history education?

4. What are important considerations for secondary history teachers when teaching about race and racism?

5. Describe how you use the curriculum document for CHC2D/CHC2P when teaching about race and racism in those courses.

6. Tell me about your process of planning and teaching a lesson on race and racism in Canadian history that you’ve taught in the past.

7. At the beginning of this interview, I asked you how you understand race and racism. Can you explain how you developed those understandings?

8. How does your understanding of race and racism affect your teaching of race and racism in Canadian history education?

9. Describe different understandings of race and racism that you have come across in your own learning, your teaching, or in the curriculum. Where did you encounter them?

10. How were race and racism addressed in your teacher training? In professional development workshops/sessions provided by your board and/or your professional organizations?
Appendix F: Second Interview Guide

Teaching Race and Racism in Canadian History Project

1. Tell me, from your perspective, what happened in the lessons that I observed.

2. What did you hope students were able to get from the lessons? Do you think you succeeded in achieving your goals?

3. In the first interview, I asked you how you think your understanding of race and racism affects your teaching about race and racism. Do you remember? Tell me how your understanding of race and racism affected your teaching of the lessons that I observed.

4. Walk me through an assessment of the lessons I observed. What criteria would you use? What would be your final verdict?

5. I noticed this during observations… It aligned with our first interview in these ways… How did you come to this? What processes did you use to decide to include these things over others? What are some ideas you discarded? Why did you discard them?

6. What are some things you would do differently? Why?

7. What are some things you would keep? Why?

8. Take me through some of the resources you used. Why did you use them? Why them and not others?

9. Take me through some of the lesson materials you created for these lessons. Explain what your pedagogical goals were. Were they effective?
Appendix G: Focus Group Interview Guide

Teaching Race and Racism in Canadian History Project

1. In your opinion, what topic of race and racism should be mandatory to teach in a Canadian history course and why? Which do you think is really critical to understanding Canadian history and why?

2. Describe what you see as an effective history lesson or education on race and racism. What needs to be there and what can be achieved through such a lesson?

3. Have you come across any effective resources for teaching about race and racism in Canadian history that you’d like to share? Why are they effective?

4. How might you, or have you ever, engaged students’ own experiences with race and racism in the lesson? In what ways have you tried that? Can you think of ways where you might be able to do that?

5. What factors must be considered when teaching about race and racism?

6. What has been your experience teaching history education, specifically on race and racism, in this school?

7. Is there anything we should’ve discussed but did not?