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Abstract

While it is generally agreed that social studies is the integrated study of history, social sciences, and the humanities, there is significant debate about what to include and what to emphasize. With social justice increasingly on the Social Studies agenda, the most recent version of the Ontario Social Studies curriculum includes an increase in references to social justice and equity. Such curriculum, however, has yet to be thoroughly examined for how it addresses issues of social justice. As a result, informed by Critical Pedagogy, Critical Race Theory, and the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, I examine the 2013 Ontario Social Studies curriculum for how it addresses social justice issues, such as the Indian Residential Schools, racism, gender, and disability. Findings suggest that, despite its increasing use of vocabulary about social justice, the 2013 Ontario Social Studies curriculum remains dominated by forms of bias that whitewash history and social relations in Canada.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Introduction

My interests in the Ontario Social Studies curriculum are rooted in my experiences as a student and teacher. I have been influenced especially by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC), and its remarkable artwork, such as the Witness Blanket. The TRC’s reports and the testimony of the survivors of the genocidal Indian Residential School system deepen my awareness of the significance of understanding the past and committing to collaborative relations. I am inspired by the work and words of educators such as Dr. Dawn Lavell-Harvard. Following up on the completion of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, Dr. Dawn Lavell-Harvard (2016) spoke in the Legislative Assembly of Ontario in order to advocate for awareness of the Indian Residential Schools and for restoration of traditional leadership roles and balance. “Reconciliation,” she said, "means more than just the restoration of our relationship… This system exposed our children to a cycle of violence that continues today. But we know that violence is a learned behaviour… We can make a change”.

In addition to documenting the policies and practices of the Indian Residential Schools, the TRC also expressed calls to action in regards to child welfare, education, language and culture, health, and the legal system. In its Calls to Action report (2015b), Section 62 calls “upon the federal, provincial, and territorial governments, in consultation and collaboration with Survivors, Aboriginal peoples, and educators, to… Make age-appropriate curriculum on residential schools, Treaties, and Aboriginal peoples’ historical and contemporary contributions to Canada a mandatory education requirement for Kindergarten to Grade Twelve
students” (2015b, p. 7). Inspired by Indigenous activists, allies, and the TRC, I am interested in examining the Ontario Social Studies curriculum for how it addresses social justice issues related to the Indian residential schools, Treaties, and Indigenous peoples’ historical and contemporary contributions to Canada. I am also interested in how this curriculum addresses gender, disability, racism, and inequality.

This study is also an extension of my work as a teacher. From 2003 to 2015, I worked as a teacher, mostly in high schools and at the college level. From 2004 to 2011, I worked with students in Tibetan regions in China. During this time, with the support of local partners, students and I worked together to initiate a number of exciting projects, such as the publication of students newspapers; a cultural preservation project recording local, oral histories; translation teams; original drama performances; outdoor poetry readings; HIV awareness; hikes in the mountains; guest speakers in the classroom; cooking events; dance events; visits with families; a unique multilingual, college-level course called Multi-language Identity Texts (Lambert, 2011); and so on. My work with students and friends in Tibetan regions in China extended my concerns for land claim issues, genocide, the reproduction of racism in society and in schools, and social change.

My experiences as a student and teacher developed my concerns for whitewashing. Whitewashing can be viewed as a form of censorship. It is commonly seen as a metaphor for action or discourse that glosses over or covers up crimes, scandals, abuses, or injustice. Likewise, it can absolve blame by means of a superficial investigation or by the biased presentation of data. Examples of whitewashing include textbook accounts of the civil rights movement that omit and marginalize the contributions of Black activists (Mannie, 2017) and
narratives produced by corporate film media that distort the history of slavery (Giroux, 2010a). In Canada, scholars such as Marie Battiste (2013) have been concerned with schooling that whitewashes Indigenous history and current social relations. Likewise, among my concerns is that the presumption of progress can contribute to a complacency about the present, privilege, and social relations.

As a result of my experiences as a student and teacher, I am interested in examining the elementary Social Studies curriculum of Ontario, where I live and went to elementary school many years ago. While the Ontario curriculum has begun to address social justice and equity, it has yet to be thoroughly examined for how it addresses these issues. Informed by Critical Pedagogy (e.g., Giroux, 1983, 1988, 1996a, 1996b, 2001, 2004, 2010a, 2010b, 2014) and Critical Race Theory (Ladson-Billings, 2003b), I examine the 2013 Ontario Social Studies curriculum for how it addresses issues related to Indigenous people, gender, disability, racism, and inequality.

**Rationale and Purpose**

This study is important because it addresses issues related to social justice, stereotypes, and racism. In the current political climate with re-emerging expressions of racism, particularly in relation to Indigenous people, academic work has serious responsibilities. As described by scholars such as Giroux (2001, 2004), multiple efforts are needed, including the action of “public intellectuals” and the development of a “language of critique and possibility” that connects language with power and contributes to visions of democracy and inclusive community.
As education is a provincial responsibility in Canada, I analyze the social studies curriculum of Ontario. This is significant now, because Ontario recently revised its official social studies guide. Furthermore, it has the largest population among the Canadian provinces, and Ontario has made commitments to equity in general, and specifically in response to issues pertaining to Indigenous peoples (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2013, p. 45). The Ministry of Education (MOE), furthermore, has recently announced that it will make revisions to the curriculum to make Indigenous history and culture mandatory for all students in Ontario; the revisions are to be complete by fall 2018 (Johnson, 2017, Nov. 8). Moreover, as shown by the work of the TRC, curriculum matters because it has significant effects. For these reasons, examining the Ontario Social Studies curriculum for how it addresses issues of social justice is a priority.

**Statement of the Problem**

This study is part of a response to two problems. In terms of academic research, only a small number of researchers (e.g., Bickmore, 1999, 2006; Cavanagh, 2001; Godlewska, Moore, & Bednasek, 2010; Maroney, 2016) have critically examined Ontario social studies curriculum. The 2013 version has yet to be thoroughly reviewed. Although the 2013 curriculum has begun to refer to social justice issues, there has been little by way of thorough examination into the ways in which this curriculum addresses these issues. In terms of politics, the TRC is a significant call to multiple parts of Canadian society to reconsider social relations in order to move toward reconciliation and renewal. Part of this reconsideration includes an examination into how these social relations are constructed and maintained. As social studies is the integrated study of history, social science, and the humanities, it follows that the social studies
curriculum should be seen as a potentially significant factor that impacts social relations and how they are imagined, constructed, and reinforced. As a result, the social studies curriculum especially needs to be examined as a potential source of oppression and emancipation.

**Research Questions and Aims**

This research has four specific questions and one general question. The four specific questions are as follows:

1. How does the 2013 Ontario Social Studies curriculum address issues of social justice?
2. To what extent does the 2013 Ontario Social Studies curriculum provide an accurate and complete account of Canadian history and social issues?
3. How does the 2013 version of the Ontario Social Studies curriculum compare with the 2004 version?
4. How does the 2013 Ontario Social Studies curriculum compare with recent British Columbia Social Studies curriculum that was published in 2016?

The general question underlying these specific questions is about how the Ontario education system positions itself in relation to historical and current inter-group societal power relations.

Guided by these questions, my aims in this research are threefold. At the level of policy, an aim of this study is to provide information that may inform the design of new social studies curriculum in Canada. Educators involved in curriculum design may find the results of this study useful when writing the next curriculum documents. At the level of practice, an aim of
this study is to support teaching practices by contributing to conversation about curriculum, social relations, and change. Specifically, educators using the current and future curriculum may find the results of this study useful when working with students and schools. At the level of theory, an aim of this study is to contribute to critical orientations toward education.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

Literature Review Introduction

The literature review of this study is divided into several parts. Since this study in influenced by the work of the TRC, first I introduce aspects of the Indian Residential School system and the TRC. Next, I discuss themes that emerge within the field of social studies, Critical Pedagogy, and Critical Race Theory.

Indian Residential Schools

In order to more fully understand what is omitted from the Ontario curriculum, a brief introduction to the residential schools is required. The Indian Residential School system represents one of the most egregious violations of human rights in the history of Canada. For over a century, these government funded, church-run schools inflicted multiple abuses and suffering upon Indigenous children (Haig-Brown, 1991; Miller, 1996; Milloy, 1999/2006; Cannon, 2012; Woolford, 2015; TRC, 2015b; TRC, 2015d). Generations of children were forcibly taken from their parents, families, and communities (Milloy, 1999/2006). In 1920, an amendment to the Indian Act made schooling mandatory for Indigenous children ages 7 to 15, and officers were authorized to punish parents if the children did not attend (Grant, 1996). Priests and nuns who operated the schools subjected the children to extreme physical violence and sexual abuse (TRC, 2015b; TRC, 2015d). Children were physically beaten for speaking their Indigenous languages (Haig-Brown, 1991). Indoctrination into the Christian religion, along with hard physical labour such as forestry, agriculture, and domestic chores, was
prioritized (TRC, 2015d; Milloy, 1999/2006). Students faced persistent insults and attacks against their identities and cultures (TRC, 2015d; TRC, 2015a; Battiste, 2013). Harsh daily routines and rules in student dormitories and classrooms were modeled on army training practices (Loyie, 2014). Brothers and sisters at the schools were forced to stay apart (TRC, 2015a; Battiste, 2013). When students ran away from school in order to escape oppression and return to their families, they were pursued by authorities and forced back to school where they were physically beaten or punished (Woolford, 2015; TRC, 2015b). Students were chronically malnourished at residential schools; the schools lacked healthy meals for the children, and even after health officials reported this problem to church and government authorities, the residential schools remained chronically underfunded (Milloy, 1999/2006).

Among the first residential schools, the Mohawk Institute was established in Brantford, Ontario in the 1830s to provide training to Indigenous youth (Loyie, 2014). It had a strict English-only policy, despite petitions, in 1843 for example, from representatives of Mohawk communities to teach reading and writing in Mohawk as well as English (Carney, 1994). The Mohawk Institute served as a model for residential schools across North America (Carney, 1994; Loyie, 2014).

Over 130 residential schools spread across Canada (TRC, 2015e). In total, more than 150 000 Indigenous children attended the residential schools, and over 3000 children died in them, often being buried in unmarked graves without parental notification (Barber, 2015). The impact of the residential schools has included loss of community, identity, confidence, skills, family, culture, language, trust, and so on; according to the Assembly of First Nations and the Nishnawbe-Aski nation, the residential school experience continues to affect families and
subsequent generations of Indigenous people (Sharpe, 2011). Although some reports document that pleasant memories and educational opportunities indeed occurred at the Indian Residential Schools (TRC, 2015b), and experiences at these schools in fact varied greatly (Woolford, 2015), the pattern that emerged at the schools is a case of extreme violence and coercive relations of power.

The Indian Residential Schools did not occur in a vacuum. They were established by the Government of Canada's policy for assimilation of Indigenous communities. This policy was repeatedly made remarkably explicit by Canadian government authorities. Duncan Campbell Scott, for example, who held the deputy superintendent role at Indian Affairs from 1913 to 1932, summed up the official position when he claimed, “Our object is to continue until there is not a single Indian in Canada that has not been absorbed into the body politic and there is no Indian question,” (quoted in Indian and Northern Affairs, 1978). By 1920, amendments to the Indian Act written by Duncan Campbell Scott and the Indian Affairs department made school attendance within the residential school system mandatory for all Indigenous children (Miller, 1996). School officials in the 1950s continued to express assimilationist policy: “The problem of Indian education is not primarily one of giving Indian children the same schooling as all our other children. It is a problem of changing the persevering Indian community into a Canadian community” (quoted in Haig-Brown, 1991).

In addition to imposing assimilation upon Indigenous people, the schools were meant to enforce manual labour and indoctrination into the Christian religion. In 1847, Egerton Ryerson provided advice in regards to the schooling of Indigenous children (Ryerson, 1874). As Chief Superintendent of Education for Upper Canada, he recommended that Indigenous children
should reside together for four to eight years in schools that focus on agriculture and kitchen gardening. According to Ryerson, during the summer months, pupils should labour for 8 to 12 hours a day, having instruction for 2 to 4 hours a day. During the harvest and planting seasons, instruction was to be cancelled for work outdoors. Ryerson suggested paying the students a penny a day for their work and providing them the lump sum upon leaving the school, pending good behaviour.

But Ryerson was especially concerned with religious instruction and conversion. “[T]he North American Indian cannot be civilized or preserved in a state of civilization,” remarked Ryerson, “except in connection with… not only religious instruction and sentiment but of religious feelings” (1847, p. 73). For Ryerson, indoctrination into the Christian religion was to pervade all parts of the residential schools. From 1874 to 1878, Ryerson held the position of President of the Church in Canada.

For years, government and church authorities lamented the outcomes of the residential Schools because graduates did not perform as authorities expected (Milloy, 1999/2006); however, testimony from survivors of these schools demonstrates that the official policy and its goals were thoroughly transparent. Geronimo Henry, who attended the Mohawk Institute in Ontario from 1942 to 1953, shared his impression of residential school life: “They tried to convert me in there. They took away my ceremonies, my rituals and language. They tried to assimilate us” (quoted in Loyie, 2014). This policy of assimilation moreover was established and supported by racism and colonialism. As described by Theodore Fontaine (2010), who recently shared a memoir of his experiences at Fort Alexander Indian Residential School in Manitoba: “The system was designed by the federal government to eliminate First Nations
people from the face of our land and country, to rob the world of a people simply because our values and beliefs did not fit theirs. The system was racist and based on the assumption that we were not human but rather part animal, to be desavaged and molded into something we could never become – white.”

When announcing the near completion of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, the commissioners called the Indian Residential Schools a case of cultural genocide (CBC, 2015; TRC, 2015a). Others have suggested that the residential school system should be seen as constituting genocide as defined by the UN’s 1948 convention on Genocide. According to Staniforth (2015), Woolford (2015), and Palmater (2015), what happened in the Indian Residential Schools meets the UN’s definition of genocide:

– Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group
– Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; and
– Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.

Scholars such as Tove Skutnabb-Kangas (2000) and Skutnabb-Kangas and Robert Dunbar (2010), focusing on the seriousness of mental harm, suggest that schooling that prohibits the Indigenous languages of Indigenous students should be examined as linguistic genocide. In this view, prohibitions can be overt, in the case of killing or torture, but prohibitions can also be covert or indirect, such as when Indigenous languages are not used as the language of instruction in schools or childcare. Likewise, Brown, Hoffman, and Siegel (2017) suggest that the Indian Residential School system may be seen as an example of state crime.
Despite the extreme violence of residential schools, Indigenous people engaged in resistance. Families and parents, for example, removed their children from the residential schools and hid them from authorities searching for pupils (Woolford, 2015). According to Haig-Brown (1991), children who were being starved in the residential schools, stole food from school kitchens, students being beaten became silent in order to frustrate abusive priests and nuns, and students, prohibited from speaking their native languages, spoke their home languages in secret. Likewise, students - such as Jeanette Basile Laloche (TRC, 2015b, p. 57) - directly challenged the school’s abusive suppression of Indigenous language and culture. Indigenous students at these schools and their communities repeatedly demonstrated to school and government authorities that the schools needed change.

Although the last Indian Residential Schools closed during the 1990s, many are concerned that the oppressive conditions at the schools have mostly just changed from one format to another. Scholars such as Raven Sinclair (2007) from the Gordon’s First Nation have identified how the Sixties Scoop - during which provincial adoption programs and policies removed thousands of babies and young children from Indigenous parents and communities and placed them in provincial boarding schools or the houses of middle-class, white, Euro-Canadians - coincides with when the federal Indian Residential School system was being phased out during the 1960s and through the 1980s. In this view, very little had changed with the closing of the Indian Residential School system. More recently, authors such as Nancy Macdonald (2016) have questioned whether Canadian jails have become the new residential schools due to the disproportionate and rising incarceration rates of Indigenous men and women. According to Macdonald’s (2016) statistics, in Canada the incarceration rate of Indigenous
people is 10 times higher than the non-Indigenous population, which is higher even than in South Africa at the height of apartheid.

**The Truth and Reconciliation Commission**

Although several Truth and Reconciliation Commissions have taken place in the world, for example, in South Africa and Rwanda, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada is unique. It is unique because of its background (TRCa, 2015). Survivors of the residential school system persisted in raising awareness about its problems and brought a large class action law suit against the government of Canada, leading to the Indian Residential School Settlement Agreement. This legal agreement (a) declared financial compensation to the attendants of residential schools and (b) announced the launch of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. As a court ordered process, The Truth and Reconciliation Commission travelled for six years across Canada in order to hear from Indigenous people who had been removed from their families and placed in residential schools (TRCa, 2015). The TRC is also unique because it is the first commission that is primarily focused on the experiences of children (TRC, 2015e).

In addition, the TRC is unique because of its legal authority. Specifically, it did not have subpoena power. In contrast, other Truth and Reconciliation Commissions in the world have had the authority to subpoena individuals for criminal acts (Turner, 2013).
The goals of The Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada are also substantially unique. Its mandate, set by Schedule “N” of the Indian Residential Schools Settlement Agreement (Indian Residential Schools Settlement Agreement, 2016), was to:

- create, preserve, and make accessible to the public as complete an historical record as possible of the past regarding the policies and practices of the Indian Residential Schools (2016, p. 1)
- produce a report that includes recommendations to the Government of Canada concerning the Indian Residential School system (p. 2)
- establish a National Research Centre, accessible to former residential school students, their families and communities, the general public, educators, and researchers (p. 10)
- fund and host seven national events in different regions of Canada to share information, and engage and educate the public (p. 7 & 8)
- support community events, designed by local communities and responding to the needs of former residential school students, their families, and their communities (p. 8 & 9)
- guide and engage people in Canada toward healing, reconciliation, and renewal (p. 1)

The Truth and Reconciliation Commission also has specific recommendations for education. Part 62, Section i of the TRC Calls for Action report (TRC, 2015c), for example, calls for all levels of government in Canada to consult and collaborate with survivors, educators, and Indigenous people in order to make age-appropriate K-12 curriculum on the residential schools, Treaties, and Indigenous peoples’ diverse contributions to Canada. As part of
responses to the TRC’s call, this study aims to examine the extent to which the Ontario Social Studies curriculum includes curriculum on residential schools, Treaties, and Aboriginal peoples’ historical and contemporary contributions for Grade 1 to Grade 6. Inspired by the work of the TRC, I also examine the Social Studies curriculum for how it addresses issues related to gender, racism, disability, and inequality.

Social Studies

Social studies, as defined by the 2013 Ontario curriculum (p. 10-11), is an interdisciplinary study that draws upon economics, geography, history, law, and politics, as well as some subjects in the social sciences and the humanities in order to lead to a deeper understanding of the interconnections between social, political, economic, and environmental ideas and issues. Social studies is approached from diverse perspectives (Evans, 2004; Broom, 2011). For example, some approaches emphasize the role of citizenship education. Anna Ochoa-Becker (2007) and Wayne Ross (2006), for example, called for social studies curriculum to become enhanced education for democratic citizenship. While criticizing reforms for “drill” and “memorization” lessons that emphasize standardization and high stakes testing, Ochoa-Becker (2007) and Ross (2006) maintained that schools can make a difference to how democracy is fostered by activating awareness and participation. Anna Ochoa-Becker (2007) promoted an issues-centred approach to the social studies curriculum which dedicates units to different social issues, such as environmental problems or diversity studies, for example. Others such as Ronald Evans (2008) focused on social studies teaching as a reflective practice that requires the development of voice and values, and some scholars such as Joseph Zajda (2009)
emphasized intercultural dialogue as an effective measure in overcoming barriers to
citizenship and inclusion.

Social studies is also approached from a focus on multiculturalism. James Banks and
colleagues (2007), for example, focused on the effect of globalized migration on education
and on the dilemmas tied to domestic multiculturalism and cosmopolitan multiculturalism.
Likewise, scholars such as Luisana Meléndez (2015) promoted teaching multiculturalism in
social studies by using children’s books that highlight cultural diversity. These studies
highlighting multiculturalism call for social studies to take an active role in fostering values
that respect and support cultural pluralism.

As education is a provincial responsibility in Canada, studies have also questioned whether a
national Social Studies curriculum should be implemented. Catherine Broom (2015), for
instance, studied the K-12 Social Studies, History and Geography curriculum of three
provinces: Ontario, British Columbia, and Nova Scotia. Highlighting that the structural forms,
aims, and content of these three curriculum are similar, she explored reasons for differences
based on historical contingencies and regional contexts. In general, this author praised recent
curriculum documents of Canada, suggesting that these documents give teachers
“opportunities to include other groups’ histories and to take a critical look at Canada’s history”
and that the “new guides include more content that is critical of Canadians’ behaviours in the
past.” In conclusion, Broom (2015) suggested that a national Social Studies curriculum is not
needed.
In addition to citizenship, multiculturalism, and nationalism, an emphasis in discussions of social studies curriculum is history. Some scholars, such as Michael Bliss (2002), debated whether or not the purpose of history classes should be to develop a common national consciousness in youth. Other scholars such as Stephane Levesque (2008) addressed what historical thinking is and how it can be fostered in students. More recently, Jason Kenney (n.d.), elected leader of the United Conservative Party in Alberta and previously a prominent member of the federal Conservative Party of Canada, argued that the new, 2017 draft of the Alberta Social Studies curriculum does not do enough to teach “normative Canadian history”, Alberta history, Confederation, and military history. There are a number of problem’s with Kenney’s position on the Alberta curriculum, but fundamentally he failed to differentiate between (a) a series of historical narratives in which he has some particular interest and (b) Social Studies, which is an interdisciplinary approach to politics, economics, history, law, geography, social sciences, and humanities, guided by goals of informed citizenship in a pluralistic democracy. Moreover, his overemphasis on the history of Confederacy and a number of WWII battles in Europe risks marginalizing the diverse histories that exist in Canada, such as histories that involve the Indian Residential Schools and racism. Jason Kenney (n.d.), for example, demonstrates no acknowledgement of racism in Canada and no concern for the Indian Residential Schools.

In contrast to Jason Kenney’s view, social studies is also approached from perspectives concerned with racism and privilege. Henry Giroux (1996a, 1996b), for example, focused on race, gender, and class and emphasized that texts such as history books, curriculum, and film should be examined in order to uncover bias about racism, colonialism, and whiteness. Stanley Aronowitz and Giroux (1991) suggested that postmodern perspectives enable the critical
interrogation of bias in the Western canon promoted by curriculum. They especially criticize Eric D. Hirsch (1987) and Allan Bloom (1987) for perpetuating elitism, rewriting history from the perspective of privilege, and lacking emancipatory perspectives. According to Giroux and Aronowitz, modernist visions of progressive education need to be combined with postmodern criticism so that critical questions can be raised about hegemony, grand narratives, and bias. In this view, postmodernism provides a foundation for engaging with the Other in struggles for emancipation and enables pedagogy to become a political project aiming for critical democracy.

Social Studies, Bias, and Racism

Social studies curriculum has also been criticized from perspectives concerned with bias and racism. Gloria Ladson-Billings and colleagues (2003a), for example, criticized social studies curriculum for being biased against people of colour and visible minorities. In response to Eurocentric bias, Njoki Wane (2004) advocated for improving support for anti-racist education in Canadian schools. George J. Sefa Dei (1996), likewise concerned with the lack of Black identities in curriculum texts, suggested to work toward the development of an inclusive curriculum that highlights Afrocentric knowledge. These scholars showed that social studies curriculum needs to draw from Critical Race Theory and anti-racist approaches in order to expose racism and injustice.

Patience Elabor-Idemudia (2001), likewise, emphasized that curriculum textbooks in general tend to neglect non-white experiences and values while schools are dominated by the perspectives and experiences of White males. As minorities, especially Black women, are
Othered and marginalized, criticism of bias in schools and curriculum is too often downplayed or dismissed. Despite the rhetoric of diversity and inclusion, schools continue to fail certain minorities because curriculum privileges Eurocentric knowledge leading to the perpetuation of racism. This author suggested multicultural education is not enough, that curriculum needs to be seen as an activity and not as the content of a text, and that preservice teachers practice ethnography in order to advance their perspectives and abilities so that they can better improve how they work with diverse students. In this view, despite multiple challenges, schooling can still be a site of empowerment and equity for all students if it realistically confronts issues of race, ethnicity, gender, sexuality, class, age, and ability, while challenging the privilege and power given to some but withheld from others.

In addition to examining bias in curriculum, scholars have also analyzed forms of bias. For example, Myra Sadker, David Sadker and Karen Zittleman (2009) identified seven forms of bias: invisibility, stereotyping, imbalance and selectivity, rose coloured glasses, fragmentation and isolation, linguistic bias, and cosmetic bias. Invisibility refers to the complete or relative exclusion of a group; for example, textbooks published in the United States prior to the 1960s generally omitted African Americans. Stereotyping pertains to a rigid set of characteristics (often negative) to all members of a group, which distort individual attributes and difference (e.g., Jewish people as rich). Imbalance and selectivity occur when only one interpretation of an issue is presented or a complex issue is simplified or distorted by omitting perspectives or groups. For example, textbooks report that women were given the vote but do not discuss the work, sacrifice, and physical abuse suffered by suffrage leaders. Rose coloured glasses gloss over unpleasant facts or events in our history by ignoring prejudice, racism, discrimination, exploitation, sexism, and so on (e.g., with the notion that technology will solve persistent
social problems). Fragmentation and isolation occur when a textbook presents a special chapter or insert, such as a box in the margins of a science textbook that describes “10 Black Achievers in Science”, while ignoring the contributions of Black scientists in the main text. Linguistic bias involves the impact of lexis and grammar on awareness and discussion. For example, a textbook that describes Indigenous people as “roaming” across land while describing White settlers as “travelling” and “settling” on land, associates White people with goal-directed activity, reproduces prejudice, and masks the injustices of colonialism. Lastly, cosmetic bias is when a textbook has an attractive and/or shiny cover that presents a surface appearance of equality (e.g., a multiethnic image), but fails to extend equity across the content of the textbook.

In North America and internationally, social studies curriculum has been criticized for reflecting and reproducing bias. Wang Yuxiang and JoAnn Phillion (2010), for example, analyzed textbooks in China and showed that social studies is biased in favour of Han knowledge and culture at the expense of marginalization and subjugation of the knowledge and cultures of the ethnic minorities. In Turkey, the 1915-1923 genocide that massacred approximately 1.5 million Armenian people is still such a controversial topic that it is mostly only referred to as “the Armenian issue” by Turkish social studies educators. In regards to Japan, Yoshiko Nozaki (2002) outlined the controversies that were generated by biased Japanese social studies textbooks that denied stories about the Nanjing Massacre and Comfort Women. In Canada and internationally, these criticisms show that curriculum repeatedly excludes, marginalizes, or distorts the knowledge, experiences, and perspectives of minorities and Indigenous people.
Social science curriculum is especially criticized when its distortions and omissions clearly align with the reproduction of inequality. In Ontario, for example, people were outraged when a Grade 3 social studies textbook called the *Complete Canadian Curriculum Grade 3*, published in the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area by the Popular Book Company Canada, was identified as whitewashing Indigenous history. "When the European settlers arrived,” this textbook remarked, “they needed land to live on. The First Nations peoples agreed to move to different areas to make room for the new settlements… The First Nations peoples moved to areas called reserves, where they could live undisturbed by the hustle and bustle of the settlers” (quoted in Lee-Shanok, 2017, Oct. 3). As an example of extreme whitewashing, this textbook omits that First Nations in many cases only “agreed” to move to reserves because they were forced to do so or starve. The US Army, for instance, deliberately encouraged the slaughter the plains buffalo in order to weaken Indigenous communities by eliminating main food sources and force them onto reservations (Smits, 1994; CBC, n.d.). In Canada, while federal officials violated treaties and viciously withheld food from Indigenous people until they moved to designated reserves (Daschuk, 2013), John A. Macdonald - who was both Prime Minster and Minster of Indian Affairs at the time –boasted that the Indigenous populations on the plains were kept on the “verge of actual starvation” (quoted in Daschuk, 2013). Likewise, as described by Jennifer Dockstader (in Thompson, 2017, Oct. 3), the suggestion that Indigenous people wanted to escape the “hustle and bustle” of settlers perpetuates negative stereotypes about Indigenous communities. The actual extent of this textbook’s distortion is repugnant. Underlying the Popular Book Company’s misrepresentation of history is the kind of racism that built the residential schools and continues to obstruct reconciliation. Sold in corporate bookstores in Ontario, these textbooks may not have been
approved for use by the Ontario Ministry of Education, but it is not clear to what extent they have been used in Canada and internationally.

Social science curriculum is especially problematic when it whitewashes historical events pertaining to racism. Sierra Mannie (2017), for example, examined how social studies textbooks in Mississippi whitewash the civil rights movement. This writer described how in one Grade 4 textbook only 5 pages out of 100 are devoted to struggles for civil rights. In another textbook, important people and events such as the Freedom Rider activists who travelled by bus to the Southern states to confront Jim Crow laws are completely omitted. In response to these omissions, Mannie highlights how teachers find creative ways to teach what is missing from textbooks. One teacher, for example, organizes debates with students about the ideals of Martin Luther King Jr. and Malcolm X, and another teacher begins teaching about the civil rights movement with lessons about prejudice and bias.

**Social Studies, Bias, and Indigenous History**

Social studies curriculum is also examined for how it represents Indigenous history. Bill Bigelow (1997), for example, studied a CD-ROM used to teach Oregon history via a video game. He found that the CD-ROM is “sexist, racist, culturally insensitive, and contemptuous of the earth.” Concerned with the misrepresentation of women, Black people, and Indigenous peoples, Bigelow demonstrated that the CD-ROM privileged some identities while seriously misrepresenting others. He emphasized that teachers need to engage students in asking questions about social groups that are missing from curriculum, researching and/or imagining
the narratives of marginalized or omitted groups, and inviting Indigenous elders or activists into classrooms to speak to students about concerns and history.

Historically, social studies textbooks in Canada have been explicitly racist toward Indigenous peoples. For example, *History of Canada* - a text book published in 1910 for Ontario Public Schools - included lessons for young Canadians such as the following:

All Indians were superstitious, having strange ideas about nature. They thought that birds, beasts...were like men. Thus an Indian has been known to make a long speech of apology to a wounded bear. Such were the people whom the pioneers of our own race found lording it over the North American continent – this untamed savage of the forest who could not bring himself to submit to the restraints of European life.

(quoted in Rheault, 2011, p. 1)

Social studies textbooks reproduced the image of the “savage” Indian for generations of children both inside and outside of Indian Residential Schools. Lorna Cochrane, in a Statement to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada at a meeting in Winnipeg, Manitoba in 2010 shared her memories of residential school history textbooks.

But I remember what it was like reading history. I think it was social studies that made a huge impact on me. We were studying about the ‘savage Indian.” There was a picture of two Jesuits laying in the snow, they were murdered by these two ‘savages.’ And they had this what we call ‘a blood curdling look’ on their faces is how I remember that picture.

(quoted by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, 2015a, p. 78)
As described by Lorna Cochrane, curriculum matters because it affects what we remember and influences what we think.

Ontario Social Studies curriculum published prior to the 2013 version has been identified as highly problematic. Anne Godlewska, Jackie Moore, and Drew Bednasek (2010) concluded that the 2004 curriculum whitewashes numerous significant elements of history, such as the Jesuits’ initiation of racial injustice via their writings and the extent of Indigenous participation and relevance of the Royal Proclamation, while completely omitting the prejudices of the Indian Act legislation, the white paper of the Trudeau government, and the Indian Association of Alberta’s response to the white paper with the Red Paper, which called for Indigenous self-determination. In this view, the omissions of the Ontario curriculum perpetuates British colonial policies engaged in creating a homogenous society based on French and English cultures. These scholars suggested learning from recent curriculum reforms that integrate Indigenous issues, history, geography, and culture into mainstream curriculum, in collaboration with First Nations, Métis, and Inuit educators.

Despite serious concerns over Canada’s relations with Indigenous people, many people continue to praise Canadian authorities. Fox (2015), for example, in a discussion about trends and issues in language assessment, claimed that “governments at all levels [in Canada] are promoting initiatives that enhance, protect and promote aboriginal and First Nations languages – a complete reversal of the assimilation policies of the past” (p. 2). This claim, however, is flawed on at least two levels. As described by Lambert (2015), Fox supports her claim by referring to the designation of Inuktut as an official language of Nunavut, but this reasoning is flawed because it ignores the possibility that alternatives to Canadian government leadership
led to the designation of Inuktut as an official language. Significantly, Fox (2015) omits the role of Indigenous people, in northern regions especially, that led to an Indigenous language as an official language of a territory of Canada, and Fox (2015) does not provide any evidence that the federal government had any involvement in the territory’s language policy change. Despite this development in language policy, organizations in Nunavut, such as Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated, continue to petition the federal government to correct their ongoing lack of support and to provide equitable funding for Inuit languages and Inuktut (Oudshoorn, 2017, Jun 7). Furthermore, the Fox claim (2015) fails because it seriously mistakes a part for the whole. Canada is an immense country with a vast, complex system of government offices and agencies; one significant change in the territory of Nunavut does not represent what is happening “at all levels” across the country.

Recently, Ontario curriculum has also been examined in relation to Indigenous education. Deanne LeBlanc (2012), for instance, focused on possibilities for emancipatory curriculum in Ontario in two case studies of Indigenous curriculum; one within the provincial education system, and the other federal. This researcher stressed that colonial bias persists throughout school structures and policies in Canada via the acceptance of Eurocentrism. Her studies found that teachers in Canada tend to scramble to add Indigenous content to curriculum and the 2009 MOE toolkit for Aboriginal inclusion does little to help. In conclusion, LeBlanc (2012) emphasized that large-scale reform and ideological change are needed throughout the Ministry of Education and Canada.

The current MOE toolkit for Aboriginal inclusion was last revised in 2009, but it has a number of problems. First, it is clearly marginal to the mainstream curriculum. In the same way that
separate textboxes in the margins of science textbooks list “10 Black Achievers in Science”, this 2009 MOE document seriously marginalizes Indigenous inclusion. It is not even a textbox on the same page as the main curriculum; it is an entirely separate document. In this view, it is complicit in the ongoing marginalization of Indigenous people. Second, the 2009 MOE toolkit mostly consists of some additions in regards to Indigenous people, rather than any significant curriculum change. For example, the Grade 6 component of the toolkit adds the names of Indigenous people such as Douglas Cardinal and Susan Aglukark, but the toolkit documents for use in Grade 1 to Grade 6 fail to refer to the Indian Residential Schools even once. Likewise, these toolkit pages never mention racism. And only once do they refer to “land” in an optional, Grade 6 discussion about land claims: “Identify some present-day issues concerning First Nation peoples that relate to results of early contact (e.g., the effect of new technologies on First Nation cultures; land claims)” (MOE, 2009, p. 3). For these reasons, the 2009 MOE Aboriginal toolkit does little to confront bias and initiate change.

Research shows that bias can have various negative effects. Marie Battiste (1998), for example, criticized the federal government of Canada for forcing First Nation bands to adopt provincial curricula as a minimum requirement to obtain control over education in their communities, because the provincial curriculum was developed far from Aboriginal communities, without Aboriginal input, written in English, and reproduced Eurocentric bias. In this view, the curriculum is a colonial instrument serving the reproduction of Eurocentrism and racism, contributing to the exploitation of Indigenous peoples, their knowledge, and their lands. This researcher advocated for analysis and challenge of Eurocentrism at each of its turns, for support for Indigenous languages in education, for emphasis on Indigenous voices
and Indigenous involvement in curriculum planning, for resistance to making Indigenous content just an add-on to curriculum, and for the decolonization of education across Canada.

Textbook criticism has been a significant part of curriculum analysis. For example, Patrick O’Neill (1987) provided an analysis of three decades of social studies textbooks in the United States. This author found that curriculum analysis in the 1960s to 1980s resulted in scathing reviews of social studies resources. Textbook representations of Indigenous peoples were shown to be distorted, inaccurate, and incomplete. Racism dominated these textbooks, which presented Indigenous people as warmongers, hostile savages, or drunk people. They were repeatedly shown as the bad guys and villains, while the textbooks glossed over negative impacts of White people and colonialism. According to this author, research conducted up to the mid-1980s showed minimal change in textbook bias in relation to Indigenous people. Textbooks in the early 1980s, for example, still referred to Indigenous people as savages, hostile, and fierce. O’Neill (1987) recommended public discussion, direct challenge to stereotypes, and concrete action.

Scholars concerned with bias have also focused on representation of the Indian Residential Schools in curriculum. Glynn Sharpe (2011), for example, described how the 2004 Ontario Social Studies Curriculum failed in its goals to promote a better understanding of Canada’s past because it omits content about the Indian Residential Schools and omits content about the social, cultural, physical, and sexual abuse inflicted upon generations of Indigenous children. Emphasizing that students in Canada are able to study these difficult parts of Canadian history, Sharpe suggested that omitting the residential school from curriculum prevents Canadians from understanding what happened and what must be done to prevent such violations of
human rights from reoccurring in Canada and internationally. According to Sharpe, at the time of his study there was no mention of Indian Residential Schools in any Social Studies textbooks approved by the Province of Ontario.

Sharpe (2011) also examined some reasons why curriculum avoids difficult subject matter. This author suggested that (a) conservatism among practitioners leads to highlighting positive features of society and downplaying possibly controversial issues, (b) the emphasis on breadth marginalizes in depth analysis, (c) teachers who have authoritarian or controlling personalities fail to engage in interaction that allows for deep explanation and discovery, and (d) some teachers lack knowledge and/or do not implement inquiry-based approaches. In response to these problems, Sharpe (2011) suggested that classrooms engage from the beginning policies that prohibit mean spirited comments; engage questions, humour, and reflection; use small groups to maximize collaborative learning; let students know that there is interest in their views; and promote acceptance that reflection can lead to changing one’s mind on issues.

More recently scholars have looked at how Social Studies texts silence genocide. Clifford E. Trafzer and Michelle Loviner (2014), for example, focused on the case of California. During the 1850s and 1860s, White settlers perpetuated genocide against California Indians. While the California State Department denies the genocide, textbook companies stay silent on the attempted genocide of the Indigenous population despite overwhelming evidence. According to these authors, publishers would not allow the word genocide or any study of it. Despite the extreme violence against Indigenous people during the mid-nineteenth century, which included massacres against Indigenous women and children, Social Studies textbooks in California emphasize glorifying the westward expansion of European settlers. By using
passive voice, the textbooks used to teach Californian children conceal the actors that perpetuated documented genocide, rape, kidnapping, and slavery against Indigenous people. Trafzer and Loviner (2014) recommended that social studies teachers use primary source documents, small group activity, journaling, and literature in order to help students in California develop an understanding of California history.

In response to curriculum bias and social issues, scholars also recommend major transformation of educational systems. Marie Battiste (2013), for example, called for the decolonization of education. Highlighting a number of significant problems in schools, this author analyzed how Indigenous voices and stories tend to be positioned in the margins of curriculum, schooling has mostly amounted to a destructive plan for forced assimilation to Eurocentric norms perpetuating the false assumption of settler superiority, schools and literacy are not neutral, and cognitive imperialism gains support from the dominance of English languages and European discourses that damage and discriminate against Indigenous languages, knowledge, and peoples. In the words of Battiste,

> When Indigenous knowledge is omitted or ignored in the schools, and a European foundation is advanced to the exclusion of other knowledges and languages, these are conditions that define an experience of cultural imperialism. Cognitive imperialism is about white-washing the mind as a result of forced assimilation, English education, European humanities and sciences, and living in a Eurocentric context. (2013, p. 26)

In this view, the “add and stir” method of bringing in fragmented components of Indigenous culture into mainstream curriculum has not resulted in more equitable curriculum. What is needed is significant, underlying change.
In response, Battiste (2013) advised that every citizen of Canada should know about the Indian Residential Schools. Emphasizing that all educators need to become aware of systemic challenges to overcoming Eurocentrism, racism, and intolerance, she recommended that educators need to reflect on educational systems in terms of who’s knowledge is being offered, who decides what is included, what outcomes are generated, who benefits, and how these outcomes are rooted in ethically appropriate practices. In addition to recommending that both Indigenous and non-Indigenous educators need to participate in “Indigenist” approaches that nurture Indigenous knowledge, dignity, identity, and integrity by making direct changes in school philosophy, pedagogy, and practice, Battiste (2013) emphasized that “education is the belief in possibility” (p. 175) and teaching is about practical problem solving, knowledge, and values. Highlighting that Indigenous students are diverse learners, scholars such as Battiste (2013) suggest that classroom need to adopt holistic, critical, transformative approaches to education that legitimate the voices of Indigenous people and connect with communities and Indigenous knowledge. Based in her experiences as a member of the Mi’kmaw First Nation, Battiste (2013, pp. 178-190) emphasized support for Indigenous languages in schools and called for the rejection of colonial curriculum. “The key,” according to Battiste (2013, p. 29), “must begin with confronting the hidden standards of racism, colonialism, and cultural and linguistic imperialism in the modern curriculum.”

**Social Studies, Bias, and Gender**

Curriculum is frequently biased against girls and women. The research of Rae Lesser Blumberg (2008), for example, found that gender bias in textbooks is widespread in both
developed and developing countries, affecting and constraining girls and boys’ visions of who they are and what they can become. In particular, females were seriously underrepresented in textbooks; genders were highly gender-stereotyped in terms of division of labour, so women were depicted as accommodating, nurturing, or passive conformists, and boys and men did impressive, noble, exciting tasks and almost no caregiver or traditionally feminine jobs. In this view, the textbooks not only inadequately reflect the range of women’s roles and occupations in society, but their biases also obstruct progress toward gender equality.

In Ontario, teachers such as Lora Maroney (2016) examined representations of gender in Ministry approved Social Studies textbooks. This author found significant bias against women and women’s issues. In an international review of textbooks, Nelly Stormquist (2007) suggested that the Nordic countries are most successful at gender equality because their representations of gender roles appear with greater flexibility, plus explicit anti-stereotyping images and narratives.

Scholars have also examined reasons for the persistence of gender bias in textbooks. Carol Hahn et al. (2007) looked at the US context and tracked a decline in textbook gender equality during the late twentieth century with a general decline in federal funding in education. Furthermore, they suggested that a number of factors have marginalized the gender equality initiatives of the 1960s, such as the high-stakes testing movement, new attention to multiculturalism, the mistaken belief that gender equality has been achieved in society, the mistaken focus on the boy problem in schools, and the increasing male domination of social studies.
These studies use a number of techniques to highlight bias, distortions, and omissions in curriculum. Maroney (2016) and Mannie (2017), for example, compared the number of references to gender in curriculum texts. Bigelow (1997) identified significant omissions in the narratives of the Oregon Trial CD-ROM curriculum resource and showed how these gaps mask inconvenient political truths. In another study, Michael Barbour, Mark Evans, and Jason Ritter (2007) found that social studies curriculum marginalized significant histories by asking more in-depth questions about White people that fostered deeper inquiry and analysis while asking simple questions about marginalized groups. For example, the curriculum instructed students to only “describe” Indigenous experiences while asking students to “analyze” the experiences of European immigrants.

Scholars are also concerned with how school curriculum is biased against LGBTQ2 people. LGBTQ2 is an initialism that stands for lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans, queer or questioning, Two Spirit (Ali-Akow & Bucik, 2017). Margaret Crocco (2002), for example, addressed how curriculum is mostly silent in regards to homophobia and heterosexism. In this view, social studies courses tend to avoid discussions that include the gay liberation movement as part of the civil rights movement and dismiss gay rights issues as controversial subject matter, contributing to cultures of intolerance that contradict the goals of citizenship in a pluralistic democracy. Crocco (2002) suggested that sexual orientation needs to be a topic in teacher education programs and advocated for challenging homophobia in schools. Lance McCready and Mollie Blackburn (2009), furthermore, examined the diverse ways in which LGBTQ2 youth in urban schools assert themselves and work against the homophobia reflected and reproduced by official curriculum. Kathy Bickmore (1999) advocated for the inclusion of conversations about homosexuality in elementary schools and suggested that sexuality is
already present in students’ lives and gender identities are learned early in life. In this view, since curriculum resources and teaching strategies reflect and reproduce biased perspectives that normalize heterosexuality, explicit teaching for inclusion is required in order to challenge homophobia, stereotypes, and risks.

**Social Studies, Bias, Disability, and Inequality**

Curriculum is even more silent about disability and social economic status. Christine Sleeter and Carl Grant (2011) considered textbooks, disability, and class, in addition to gender and race. These authors found that people of colour, Black people, women, and Indigenous people remain underrepresented in textbooks, that Native people are mostly presented as historical artifacts, and that the history of White racism and oppression is glossed over. Furthermore, they emphasized that social class and disability are virtually absent from these materials. “In the [American social studies] books,” according to these writers, “the only disabled person we could find was Franklin D. Roosevelt” (p. 193).

Sleeter and Grant (2011) agreed that some improvements have occurred in textbooks, but expressed concern over possible dangers:

> “Educators also have claimed that attention to White women, Blacks, Native Americans, and other groups is superficial, forced, and occasionally ridiculous… This is sometimes true, because content about these groups is simply added into existing frameworks for organizing content. There is a danger here in the way most books deal with diversity. For example, the math book that depicted a female Native American weighing thumbtacks was clearly orientated around mainstream “middle America”
conceptions of society in which people of color participate as visibly different individuals rather than a members of oppressed and culturally rich groups.”

(Sleeter and Grant, 2011, p. 205)

These authors suggested to orientate more curriculum around real human experiences; to avoid bland, fictitious stories; to teach skills in the context of human experience; and to eliminate the overrepresentation of adventure stories featuring White males. They recommended starting curriculum design with concepts, experiences, and contributions that should be taught about each racial, gender, social class, and disability group and then infusing these throughout the curriculum.

Content analysis of curriculum has also shown the prevalence of gender bias and disability bias. Susan Shaffer and Linda Shevitz (2001) found that female activities are generally reduced to homemaking, following males passively, or being protected by or rescued by males, while boys and men are more active, independent, and creative. Although current texts have less explicit racism and sexism than texts of the 1970s, stereotypes persist, showing men and boys as violent and aggressive, instead of sensitive or caring. Furthermore, these authors found that even the most progressive curriculum materials typically exclude people with disabilities. Shaffer and Shevitz suggested that schools include anthologies and collections in respect of women with disabilities (e.g., Rousso et al.’s (1988) Disabled, Female and Proud), that classes analyze curriculum materials for bias and develop alternative materials, and that educators commit to working toward gender-fairness and inclusive relationships.
Social Studies, Bias, Problems, and Solutions

Research has shown that the Ontario curriculum published prior to 2013 failed on multiple levels. Kathy Bickmore (2006), for example, focused on conflict, diversity, justice, and peace issues, finding that these issues were obscured by neutral discourses invoking multiculturalism and harmony while marginalizing conflict and alternative perspectives. In this view, these discourses allocated injustice in the past or as mainly resolved and, thus, limit opportunities to understand and negotiate conflict and practice peace building.

Research has also examined the history of social studies curriculum. Sheila Cavanagh (2001), for example, suggested that social studies curriculum in Ontario developed in the early 1930s when the Ontario Department of Education tried combining history, geography, and governmental studies with a focus on manners, morals, and civic duties. Reflecting new child-centred approaches and liberal-humanist perspectives, children were no longer primarily perceived as passive recipients of instruction, but considered active, inquisitive, and independent. According to Cavanagh (2001), although this appears to be a significant change from previous modes of teaching and learning, the reality was that Canada maintained alliance to British values and Christian ethics, so social studies curriculum remained centred on Judeo-Christian moral values even during periods of what looked like secularism. In this view, little had changed with the advent of social studies because it worked as a biased technique of surveillance, inculcation, and control. It is suggested by Cavanagh’s (2001) study that significant changes and responses are required in the field of social studies.
Scholars have also examined how teachers respond to the bias of the Ontario Social Studies curriculum. Dolana Mogadime (2011), for example, examined the work of two elementary school educators who were concerned that the official social studies curriculum normalized whiteness, marginalized histories and social relations, and reflected Eurocentric perspectives. This study emphasized that teachers affect the processes of social exclusion. By adopting antiracist and critical multicultural approaches, these teachers responded to the diversity represented in their school by including community members, such as students, parents and grandparents, in the classrooms and using dual-language books. While reflecting on and critiquing the Eurocentric basis of curriculum, they reshaped social studies by acting as public intellectuals.

Research has also provided ideas for how to respond to textbook bias. Addressing bias against Indigenous people in mainstream schooling, Sandra Styres, Celia Haig-Brown, and Melissa Blimkie (2013) suggested possibilities for a Pedagogy of *Land*. In this view, a Pedagogy of *Land* can renew respectful relationships with *Land* and Indigenous people because it focuses on relationships, culture, and subjectivities. As a result, it can lead to greater awareness of Indigenous Knowledge, ongoing colonial occupation, and environmental exploitation.

The conceptualization of and implications for a Pedagogy of *Land* have been further developed in Sandra Styres’ *Pathways for Remembering and Recognizing Indigenous Thought on Education* (2017). Exploring how Indigenous thought and Indigenous educational philosophies can inform anti-oppressive approaches in school contexts dominated by colonial power relations, this author advance awareness of how land impacts experiences and identities. In this view, the reality of land, the impact of land, and Indigenous rights to land
have been seriously marginalized by dominant school systems such as the residential schools. Concerned with social issues such as youth suicide, Styres (2017) outlined an idea for a wampum philosophy of education that acknowledges sovereign Nation-to-Nation relationships and emphasizes the need for decolonizing approaches that disrupt colonial relations and inform school practices.

In summary, as social studies is seen as the integrated study of history, social sciences, and the humanities, discussions about Social Studies focus on a number of themes, including citizenship education, multiculturalism, history, and social issues pertaining to race, class, gender, and disability. Previous versions of the Ontario Social Studies curriculum have been criticized for bias. Social studies can also be analyzed through the theoretical lens of Critical Pedagogy and Critical Race Theory.

**Critical Pedagogy**

One of the first references to Critical Pedagogy was Henry Giroux’s (1983) *Theory and Resistance in Education*. Drawing from Paolo Freire’s (1968/2005) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Critical Pedagogy focuses on the need for education to address forms of oppression in order to contribute to equity, social justice, and emancipation.

Critical Pedagogy is seen as both a philosophy of education and a social movement merging critical theory with education. According to Giroux (2010), it is an educational movement guided by passion and principle and committed to helping students develop consciousness of freedom and understand abuses of authority in order to connect knowledge to power and
constructive action. In this view, Critical Pedagogy focuses on current and historical social inequalities in order to work toward transformation and empowerment.

Among concerns in Critical Pedagogy is what is known as the banking system of education. As described by Freire (1968/2005), the banking system of education misconceives students as passive, empty containers to be filled with instruction delivered by their teachers. This view of education represents students as sponges that absorb facts and concepts later reproduced during testing; however, this perspective has several problems. For Freire (1968/2005), a major concern was that it risks reproducing oppressive relations that especially harm marginalized social groups and degrade humanity in general.

The banking system of education is also flawed because it fails to problematize the nature of knowledge. Both Jacques Derrida (1974) and Michel Foucault (1979) addressed this issue. As described by Cleo Cherryholmes (1988), knowledge is problematic for at least two reasons. Not only is knowledge fundamentally complex and highly unstable, discourses - and hence knowledge - are always located within social institutions and relations of power that are deployed and regulated in order to define and control both knowledge and identities. As a result, views of education that avoid problematizing relations between knowledge and power tend to reflect and reproduce dominant ideologies and oppression.

In contrast to the banking system of education, Freire outlined notions of problem-posing in the pursuit of emancipation. For Freire (1968/2005), problem-posing education emerges as acts of cognition and dialogue overcome traditional student-teacher dichotomies so that teachers and students become responsible together for experience and the creation of
knowledge (p. 79-81). Problem-posing education consists of a “constant unveiling of reality”, an “emergence of consciousness”, and a “critical intervention in reality” (p. 81). Freire emphasized that curiosity has consequences. Questions create challenges, obligations to respond, greater awareness, and the realization of commitment (p. 81). This view of teaching and learning emphasizes the role of dialogue in education.

For Critical Pedagogy, education should focus on real issues or problems that people face with respect to their relations with the world (1968/2005, p. 81-82). “In problem-posing education,” Freire writes, “people develop their power to perceive critically the way they exist in the world... they come to see the world not as a static reality, but as a reality in process, in transformation” (p. 83). To see reality in transformation is to see that conditions need not be as they are. As the banking system of education serves the reproduction of domination and myths that benefit the few, problem-posing education debunks myths (p. 83), affirms the historicity and becoming of peoples (p. 84), and sides with people subjected to domination and struggling for emancipation (p. 86). In this view, problem-posing education is the practice of freedom.

This practice of problem-posing education is highlighted by teachers and scholars such as Angela McLean (2013). In her article, How and why I introduced sensitive First Nation issues to elementary school students, McLean describes how her classroom introduced issues related to the Indian Residential Schools and the Sixties Scoop to young students. In addition to advocating dialogue, this author suggested exploring the therapeutic and edifying effects of music addressing Indigenous issues.
Approaches to education informed by Critical Pedagogy emphasize the role of education in social transformation. Multiliteracies Pedagogy (Cummins, 2004; Cummins, 2009), for instance, distinguishes among transmission, social constructivist, and transformative orientations to teaching and learning. These three orientations are nested within a greater whole, rather than being distinct and cut off from each other. In particular, the aim of transmission is to transmit or deliver information and skills from curriculum or teachers to students. This form of teaching and learning overlaps with what is seen as the banking system of education. Social constructivism orientations, furthermore, combine transmission of information and skills with a broader focus on the co-construction of knowledge in schools, experiential learning, and collaborative inquiry. Transformative pedagogy combines transmission with social constructivism with emphasis on enabling students to understand relations between knowledge and power. In transformative pedagogy, collaborative inquiry and skills are used to discuss, analyze, and act on social realities and challenge coercive relations of power. In this view, transformative pedagogy is not in opposition to transmission, but rather builds upon transmission and constructivism in order to aim for broader visions of teaching, learning, and change.

Multiliteracies Pedagogy is illustrated in a case study of a remarkable book called *The New Country* (Cummins et al., 2005; Cummins, 2009; Cummins & Early, 2011). Created by students in a Grade 7/8 classroom, this bilingual, Urdu-English story book is about moving from one country to another. Illustrated by another classmate, three girls wrote the story together while reflecting on their experiences and concerns during a school unit on migration. This unit integrated Social Studies, language, and the English as a Second Language curriculum. Challenging views of “English Language Learners” that define children in terms
of deficit or lack, the creation and online publication of this bilingual book highlights the intelligence, creativity, and linguistic abilities of the students. Showcasing their intellectual and multilingual talents, these students provide an account of experiences and concerns that challenges the reproduction of dominant discourses.

Orientations such as Critical Pedagogy that take seriously the domination of oppression, racism, and inequality are as relevant in 2017 as they were when Paolo Freire was writing. For example, recent events in Charlottesville (Wright, 2017, Aug. 20) and Quebec (Steuter-Martin, 2017, Aug. 21) highlight the problem of racism in North America. Likewise, the over-representation of Indigenous people in the Canadian criminal justice system reflects ongoing forms of colonialism and genocide in Canada (Milward, 2012). While higher education is under attack from neoliberalism (Giroux, 2014), disparities in the distribution of social goods continue to grow (CBC, 2006, Dec. 6), the effects of climate change and toxic pollution have reached crisis proportions (Suzuki & Boyd, 2008), and the languages of Indigenous peoples and cultural minorities are threatened with linguicism and genocide (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000). With the ongoing marginalization and suppression of Indigenous people and minorities, people face a multitude of social problems that require awareness, decision-making, and action.

In order to confront these social problems, proponents of Critical Pedagogy emphasize the need for collaboration. Freire (1968/2005) addressed the need for teachers to be “with” the oppressed and students, instead of acting “for” the oppressed or teaching “to” students. This form of collaboration is highlighted by the organization of the Lowell Mill women.
In the early 1800s, the Lowell Mill women were workers in the textile corporations in Massachusetts. In response to exploitative work conditions, the Lowell Mill women organized to form the first union of working women in North America (Dublin, 1975). While they protested against deteriorating factory conditions, the Lowell Mill women mobilized specifically against wage slavery:

"When you sell your product, you retain your person. But when you sell your labour, you sell yourself, losing the rights of free men and becoming vassals of mammoth establishments of a monied aristocracy that threatens annihilation to anyone who questions their right to enslave and oppress.

"Those who work in the mills ought to own them, not have the status of machines ruled by private despots who are entrenching monarchic principles on democratic soil as they drive downwards freedom and rights, civilization, health, morals and intellectuality in the new commercial feudalism."

(anonymous Lowell Mill woman writer, quoted in Chomsky, 2003)

As forms of literacy emerged among the Lowell Mill workers, the women built collaborative relations in order to challenge and overcome the exploitation of the factory, creating more respectful social relations with aims for fundamental freedoms.

Another example of the collaborative action emphasized by Critical Pedagogy is Project FRESA (Cummins, 2014). In 1999, two primary school teachers and two classes of students began meeting on a weekly basis to learn about the strawberry fields that surrounded their school. Soon after initial brainstorming sessions, students were asking about the headaches of their family members who worked in the strawberry fields, the fertilizers used on the strawberries, the marketing of the strawberries, the working conditions on other farms, the
strawberry corporations, workers' rights, and political engagement. As described by the Project FRESA teachers, "Students learned that... they have the power to take action and do something about injustices in their lives" (quoted in Cummins, 2014).

Much of the research on critical, collaborative action focuses on teacher-student collaboration, but Critical Pedagogy also influences teacher-teacher and researcher-researcher collaboration. For example, while comparing and contrasting experiences with issues of equity related to language education, immigrant learners, and the diversification of the Canadian teaching profession, Clea Schmidt and Antoinette Gagné (2014) described the supportive influence of Critical Pedagogy on their work.

Scholars such as Roger Simon also emphasize that the title Critical Pedagogy is not as important as what people do with it. In *Teaching Against the Grain: Texts for a Pedagogy of Possibility* (1992), Simon argued that teaching and learning must be guided by visions of what is possible because schools are fundamentally political. “Schooling,” in this view, “attempts to participate in discursive regimes that both frame what might count as a material or social resources and produce, organize, and regulate notions of the possible, sensible, and legitimate” (p. 40). As a result, education is a basic resource in the development of identity, “enabling the enhancement of human freedom as the understanding and transformation of necessity” (p. 22).

Critical Pedagogy also focuses on teachers and students becoming public intellectuals. For Henry Giroux (2004), public intellectuals engage in public discussions with diverse audiences and speak on diverse issues in order to defend the idea of inclusive democracy and the presumption that learning should be used to expand the public good, create a culture of asking
questions, and support democratic social change. This can mean being oppositional, or even utopian, while using knowledge to amplify freedom and justice, creating new ways of doing politics, taking sides, and speaking out against abuses of power. In this view, teachers need to organize collectively and address issues related to human rights and crimes against humanity within and outside of the classroom.

Research shows that teachers can act as public intellectuals in diverse ways. In *Big Ideas for Expanding Minds* (2015) Jim Cummins and Margaret Early introduced the work of students and a teacher at a high school in the Greater Toronto Area. At this school, students researched human rights both in Canada and around the world and published a 24-page magazine that featured brief biographies of human rights activists, criticism of Canada’s treatment of First Nation communities in Ontario, reviews of songs related to human rights themes, and interviews with local human rights activists. As described by the teacher, Hina Kausar-Ahmad, who worked on the magazine with students, this is about “a responsibility to not only educate the minds but the hearts of my students.” In contrast to claims that teaching is about the transmission of knowledge and high stakes testing, Critical Pedagogy maintains that teaching and learning are political acts during which teachers have responsibilities to act as public intellectuals and work toward social change. In this view, action by teachers and students in relation to social justice issues is possible even in contexts of whitewashed curriculum.
Critical Race Theory

Public intellectuals also identify how race operates within and around the curriculum. As emphasized by Ladson-Billings (2003b), the social studies curriculum simplifies and distorts history, as Black people, Indigenous people, and non-European groups are virtually invisible, omitted entirely, or marginalized in schools. “Throughout our history,” wrote Ladson-Billings (2003b, p. 4), “we present an incoherent, disjunctive picture of those who are not White.” In this view, the school curriculum is compounded by the domination of the societal curriculum that operates within and beyond the school and classroom, along with the hidden curriculum underlying official policies and practices. Critical Race Theory, as described by Ladson-Billings (2003b), responds to oppressive relations because it begins with the notion that racism is the norm in society rather than the exception. Examining how racism is made invisible by the curriculum, Critical Race Theory unmask and exposes racism, and emphasizes that White people have been the predominant beneficiaries of civil rights legislation and liberalism.

Emphasizing awareness and emancipation, Critical Race Theory is a powerful tool in the challenge against racism and oppression. Ladson-Billings (2003b, p. 9) discussed how texts need to be examined for marginalization, omissions, and distortions. This research suggested that although social studies curriculum may include some references to people of colour, Indigenous people, and visible minorities, this inclusion tends to occur only marginally, leaving monocultural, dominant narratives undisturbed and intact. Critical Race Theory, furthermore, raises questions about how curriculum documents are created and how social studies can be changed.
Conclusion

In addition to exploring orientations toward social studies curriculum, this literature review discussed Critical Pedagogy and Critical Race Theory as emerging approaches to education emphasizing agency, problem-posing, dialogue, and commitments to anti-racism. In order to address social issues and support emancipation, critical orientations toward education focus on how oppressive social relations and racism are reproduced in schools. Despite significant attention to social studies curriculum, it appears no studies have examined how the 2013 Ontario Social Studies curriculum addresses issues related to social justice. As a result, in this study I draw from Critical Pedagogy and Critical Race Theory in order to explore to what extent Ontario Social Studies curriculum reflects critical orientations to education and to what extent it reflects the reproduction of coercive relations of power. In particular, while drawing from Ladson-Billing’s discussion about marginalization, omissions, and distortion (2003b, p. 9), I examine the 2013 Ontario Social Studies curriculum for what it marginalizes, omits, and distorts in relation to Indigenous people, racism gender, disability, and inequality.
Chapter 3: Methodology

Introduction

The aim of the research is to examine the 2013 Ontario Social Studies Curriculum. In particular, I ask the following questions:

1. How does the 2013 Ontario Social Studies curriculum address issues of social justice?
2. To what extent does the 2013 Ontario Social Studies curriculum provide an accurate and complete account of Canadian history and social issues?
3. How does the 2013 version of the Ontario Social Studies curriculum compare with the 2004 version?
4. How does the 2013 Ontario Social Studies curriculum compare with recent British Columbia Social Studies curriculum that was published in 2016?

In order to adequately answer these questions, my inquiry is informed by Critical Pedagogy and Critical Race Theory, as these approaches focus attention on racism and forms of oppression, which are significant aspects of the Indian Residential Schools and current social relations in Canada.

Methodology

The research uses interpretive approaches (Creswell, 1998; Richards, 2005) to investigate the issues. I read the curriculum in order to establish initial themes. Next, I reviewed concepts and
concerns of Critical Pedagogy (Giroux, 1983, 1988, 1996, 1997, 2004, 2010a, 2010b), Critical Race Theory (Ladson-Billings, 2003b), the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, and Indigenous activists. Later, I revisited the curriculum while focusing on themes and concerns developed by Critical Pedagogy and Critical Race Theory. In particular, I focused on Gloria Ladson-Billings' discussion of omissions, distortions, and marginalization (2003b, p. 9). This focus led to developing a three-part lens for examining what may be omitted, distorted, and/or marginalized by discourse, as represented in Figure 1. In this view, what is marginalized is what is on the margins, at the boundaries, or excluded from the centre. What is omitted is that which is left out or excluded, and what is distorted is that which is substantially misrepresented, either intentionally or unintentionally. Marginalization is closely related to omission and also refers to instances of when groups of people are blocked from full access and inclusion. For example, as previously noted, science textbooks in the past have marginalized social groups by omitting them from the main parts of the book but including a separate text box, sometimes literally in the margins of the page, called “10 Black Achievers in Science” (Sadker, Sadker & Zittleman, 2009). In this view, marginalization in discourse supports real social exclusion of persons or groups to rights, opportunities, and resources – for example, to education, housing, health care, and so on – that are normally available. This three-part lens is intended to aid the interrogation of bias in texts in order promote awareness and social change.
With this lens, I examined the content of the 2013 Ontario Social Studies curriculum closely, I spoke with people about curriculum and the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, and I reflected on my experiences in schools as a student and teacher. I went back and forth between the 2013 curriculum and critical perspectives, my memories of teaching and schools, and conversations about curriculum in Ontario and Canada. I examined the 2013 curriculum for how it addresses the residential schools, Indigenous contributions to Canada, ethnicity, gender, and disability. The categories that were developed to analyze representation of ethnicity, for example, are simplistic and imperfect. Although these categories may capture general trends of the curriculum, they do not adequately describe real people.
Lastly, I reread the curriculum in order to confirm findings, and compared the 2013 Ontario Social Studies curriculum with the 2004 version (i.e., the previous version) and the 2016 British Columbia Social Studies curriculum. My approach started out with the methods of Catherine Broom’s (2015) comparative study of social studies curriculum. The curriculum in my study is in the public domain and can be found on the Internet and in university libraries and public libraries. Published by the Ministry of Education, the 2013 Social Studies curriculum was authored by anonymous writers.
Chapter 4: Introducing the Ontario Social Studies Curriculum

The Ontario Social Studies curriculum in this study was published in 2013 and is available on the Internet at http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/curriculum/elementary/sshg18curr2013.pdf and in libraries. Prior to this, the most recent provincial curriculum was from 2004. The 2013 Ontario Social Studies curriculum consists of several parts.

The first part of the 2013 Ontario Social Studies curriculum presents an overview of the curriculum and instructions for assessment and evaluation. The preface emphasizes the role of elementary schools in the twentieth-century and emphasizes supporting students’ well-being and ability to learn. The Introduction outlines the vision of the Social Studies curriculum to enable students to be responsible, active, informed, skilled citizens who are critically thoughtful and value an inclusive society. The Introduction also describes the goals of the 2013 curriculum. The goals of the curriculum are to develop skills and abilities relevant to social studies subject matter, to build collaborative working relations, and to use appropriate technology during inquiry and problem solving.

The first part of the 2013 curriculum also introduces the theoretical background of Ontario Social Studies. It suggests that certain tools and strategies, e.g., the Citizen Education Framework and the concept of “Big Ideas” are necessary to help students achieve the vision of Ontario Social Studies. The curriculum outlines the roles and responsibilities of students, parents, teachers, principals, and community partners, e.g., fire departments and “First Nation, Métis, and Inuit Friendship Centres”, in respect to social studies education. Expectations of the curriculum are categorized in terms of overall expectations and specific expectations, and this first part of the 2013 version also outlines how each grade of the curriculum is divided into
two strands: Strand A, which focusses on heritage, identity, and engaging student understanding of personal, cultural, and national identities, both past and present, and Strand B, which focuses on natural environments, built environments, and relations between them and people.

The beginning of the 2013 Social Studies curriculum also includes a discussion on the inquiry process. In this view, social studies inquiry consists of formulating questions, gathering and organizing information and data, interpreting and analyzing the information, evaluating information, and communicating findings. As part of this process, the curriculum stresses the role of visual guides, such as maps, graphs, and globes.

Still prior to more detailed content of the curriculum, there is a discussion on assessment. The curriculum suggests that the purpose of assessment is to improve student learning and enable students to achieve the overall expectations. Ontario Social Studies teachers can report student achievement in terms of “progressing very well”, “progressing well”, or “progressing with some difficulty”.

The curriculum, furthermore, suggests teachers analyze student achievement in terms of four levels using specific qualifiers that correspond with each of these levels. For example, “limited” for level 1, “some” for level 2, “considerable” for level three, and “high degree” or “thorough” for level 4. In this view, achievement at level 3 could be described as “[The student] uses planning skills with considerable effectiveness” (p. 31).
The second part of the 2013 curriculum is called, “Some considerations for program planning”. These considerations include information about instructional approaches, differentiated instruction, lesson designs that use 3-part structures and connect to current events and issues, field trips, special education, accommodations, modified expectations, and English Language Learners. This section about “Some considerations for program planning” also addresses environmental education, healthy relationships, equity and inclusive education, antidiscrimination education, literacy, financial literacy, critical literacy, the role school libraries, the use of information and communication technology, and career/life planning as parts of social studies education.

The third part of the curriculum introduces the content of Social Studies in greater detail. According to the curriculum, Grade 1 students examine roles, relationships, and responsibilities, including how and why they change, along with their connections to identity and culture, while also exploring interrelationships between people, the natural environment, and the build environment of their communities. In Grade 2, students develop a greater understanding of local community and begin to study global communities, including festivals, family structures, and climate. During Grade 3, students focus on Canada between 1780 and 1850, and focus on living and working in Ontario. Grades 1 to 3 have various examples of “Student Talk”, which provide illustrations to Social Studies teachers of what students may say at that grade level. Grade 4 students focus on 3000 BCE to 1500 CE, plus the political and physical regions of Canada. In Grade 5, students study key features of First Nations and European settler communities in New France up to 1713, in addition to the role of government and the concept of responsible government. Grade 6 Social Studies emphasizes the experiences and perspectives of diverse communities in Canada and how they contributed to
developing Canadian identity, while also focusing on Canada’s international relationships. These units make up the 2013 Social Studies curriculum of Ontario.

The fourth part of the document (i.e., pp. 129 to 190) outlines History and Geography curriculum in Grades 7 and 8, which is outside the scope of this study on Social Studies. The fifth part of the curriculum includes a few appendices consolidating material in the curriculum, and the sixth part is a glossary of terms that presents a number of definitions relevant to the curriculum and its subject matter.

Question-posing is a dominant element of the 2013 Ontario Social Studies curriculum. For example, Grade 3 instruction is guided by a series of questions (2013, p. 86):

“What were some differences in the ways First Nations and settlers viewed childhood?” “In what ways might the life of a farmer on a seigneurie in Lower Canada have differed from that of a farmer in Upper Canada? In what ways were the lives of these people similar?” “What are the main differences between your day-to-day life and the life of a child living in Upper Canada in 1800?” “What can we learn from the ways in which First Nations lived in harmony with their environment?” “Where did people get their water? How did they heat and light their homes?”

The curriculum, for Grades 1 to 3, presents samples of possible student answers to these questions. For example, in response to the above questions, the curriculum suggests that a student may say (p. 86): “People didn’t have electricity back then. They had fires for heat, and oil lamps and candles for light. I don’t know what I would do without electricity. I couldn’t watch TV, work on my computer, or play video games.”
This study focusses on this curriculum document published by the Government of Ontario. It does not examine textbooks that teachers, students, and schools use or may use. Informed by the academic literature on social studies, Critical Pedagogy, and Critical Race Theory, I examine in this study the 2013 Ontario Social Studies curriculum for how it addresses issues related to social justice.
Chapter 5: Results

Introduction to Results

Findings in this study indicate that the curriculum is dominated by forms of marginalization, omission, and distortion. The curriculum whitewashes Canadian history and relations between Indigenous peoples and Canada. It omits the narratives of Indigenous people, Black people, visible minorities, and women. It reproduces stereotypes of Indigenous people. In regards to gender, the curriculum perpetuates role stratification and stereotypes. The curriculum also fails to advance the rights of same-sex families, does not seriously challenge racism, and perpetuates discriminatory views of people with disabilities. The curriculum’s expression of critical orientations is modest at best. In what follows, I describe each of these problems in greater detail.

Curriculum that Whitewashes Canadian History

Despite additions about “social justice” (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2013, p. 48, 51) and “antidiscrimination education” (p. 45-46), the 2013 Ontario Social Studies curriculum perpetuates oppressive relations by whitewashing Canadian history. An example of this process pertains to the definition of the Indian Residential Schools provided in the glossary of the curriculum:

“Federally funded, church-run educational institutions for First Nations, Inuit, and Métis children, these schools were particularly numerous in the first half of the twentieth century, although some operated into the 1990s. Aboriginal children were
removed from their families and sent to boarding (residential) schools as part of a government policy of assimilation. Students were deprived of their families, languages, and culture, and some were subjected to physical or sexual abuse.”

(Ontario Ministry of Education, 2013, p. 209)

This definition, however, is problematic because it marginalizes a number of significant aspects of the schools. For example, it emphasizes the role of the federal government while marginalizing the role of the Ontario government. Although the residential schools were officially under federal jurisdiction, over 17 Indian Residential Schools were established in Ontario (Union of Ontario Indians, 2013). The definition also emphasizes that “these schools were particularly numerous in the first half of the twentieth century”, marginalizing the fact that the schools and their systems existed well into the second half of twentieth century and the recent past while continuing to impact the present.

The definition, furthermore, uses passive voice to introduce that children were removed from their families, marginalizing and obscuring the fact that it was police, missionaries, and teachers, acting under government mandate, who took the Indigenous children away from their families and communities. Again, the definition uses passive voice in order to avoid making it explicit that it was the authority figures in these schools that deprived the students of their families, languages, and cultures. Then, in the last clause of the definition, the curriculum’s definition of residential schools repeats its use of passive voice to avoid making it explicit that it was the church and teacher authorities in the schools that abused the children physically and sexually. This multiple, repeated use of passive voice in the second half of the definition marginalizes agency and masks liability, abuse of power, and serious elements of Canadian history. As a form of censorship, it evades blame and glosses over injustices.
This definition about the residential schools, furthermore, uses subordinate clauses in order to marginalize and gloss over significant truths. In particular, the definition refers to “a government policy of assimilation” in a subordinate clause, which is a technique that places information in the background of a larger sentence, marginalizing the focus on its content and access to discussions about it. The emphasis in this sentence is on the main clause “children were removed from their families and sent to boarding (residential) schools”. By placing the comment about Canada’s assimilation policy in a prepositional clause, grammatically the assimilation policy is deemphasized in the sentence. In this way, the curriculum whitewashes social issues in Canada.

In addition to this definition, the Indian Residential Schools are mentioned on only one other page of the 2013 Social Studies curriculum. As shown in Appendix B, this reference is not until Grade 6 in the curriculum, and it is an optional topic (p. 122). As a result, students can pass through Grades 1 to 6 in Ontario without being introduced to the Residential Schools. In contrast, the curriculum highlights a series of imperatives for students and teachers:

- students must develop the ability to reflect on their work throughout the inquiry process (p. 23)

- students must learn how different types of maps, globes, and graphs can represent natural and human characteristics and the relationships between them (p. 24)

- Teachers must consider safety issues before students participate in a field trip. (p. 55)
However, the Indian Residential School system is not a mandatory or required component of the curriculum, despite its significance in Canadian history and in current social relations.

In total, the 2013 Social Studies curriculum only includes three references to the Indian Residential Schools, while the same document has five references to the *coureurs de bois* fur traders. Despite new additions to the curriculum, the 2013 Ontario Social Studies document persists in whitewashing Canadian history. Its omissions, distortions, and focus whitewash inconvenient truths about social relations and obstruct contributions to reconciliation and renewal.

The second reference to the Residential Schools is an optional question (p. 122): “What impact did the residential school experience have on First Nations families and communities?” But this emphasis is problematic. On the one hand, it objectifies First Nation people. This sentence fails to represent the agency of Indigenous people. On the other hand, since it is the only explicit sample question about the residential schools, it contributes to the pathologization of First Nations peoples as sick, disorganized, or dysfunctional, a reoccurring problem in academia, as described by O’Neil, Reading and Leader (1998) (and Reading & Nowgesic, 2002). It is true that the residential school experience seriously and negatively impacted First Nations families and communities, and it is true that this question about impact has a place within broader discussions about the residential schools; however, when this question is the only question offered to elementary classrooms in six years of social studies curriculum, it does more to risk perpetuating stereotypes than generating awareness that may lead to social change. The curriculum does not ask how Indigenous people resisted residential
schools, for example. Taken in context, this question reflects the misrepresentation of Indigenous people in Canada and the reproduction of oppressive relations.

This question about the residential schools can be compared with other questions presented by the curriculum. In Grade 3, the curriculum suggests the following sample question about China and foot binding (p. 101): “What does foot binding of women in China tell you about the status of women and social organization in that society?” This is a complex question about structural inequalities in society. Significantly, the Ontario curriculum does not ask this kind of question about the residential schools. It does not ask: “What do the Indian Residential Schools tell you about the status of Indigenous people and social organization in this society?” In this way, the Ontario curriculum whitewashes awareness of the inequality and oppression inflicted upon Indigenous peoples and obscures significant social problems in Canada. The curriculum’s focus on foot binding in China as opposed to the Indian Residential Schools in Canada is especially unsettling given that foot binding virtually disappeared from China by 1949 (Stewart, 2014) and the residential schools remained open in Canada until the mid-1990s (Rheault, 2011).

Likewise, the Ontario curriculum’s question about foot binding mistakenly associates the country of China with foot binding. On the one hand, the current nation state of China did not exist until 1949 when foot binding had already virtually stopped. On the other hand, most ethnic groups in China did not practice foot binding, which was mostly a Han tradition; historians agree that Manchu, Mongol, and Hakka women in general did not bind their feet (Elliot, 2001; Davis, 2005). Foot binding should certainly be seen as an oppressive practice
against women, but the curriculum’s question about it is flawed because it expresses bias against foreign nations while obscuring domestic issues.

The curriculum’s question about foot binding, furthermore, manages to address the practice as if it is occurring in the present. “What does foot binding of women in China tell you about the status of women and social organization in that society?” (2013, p. 102). While using present tense grammar, the curriculum fails to indicate that foot binding had mostly been eliminated over 60 years ago. But when the curriculum addresses residential schools, it locates practice and effects in the past, using past tense grammar (p. 122): “What impact did the residential school experience have on First Nations families and communities?” It does not ask, “What impact *does* the residential school experience have on First Nations families and communities?” In this way, the Ontario curriculum reflects and reproduces serious bias. By mistakenly positioning residential school issues in the past, it fails to acknowledge ongoing problems in Ontario while distorting Canadian history and social relations in favour of the status quo.

Despite representing an underlying cause of the Indian Residential School system and being a significant problem in contemporary society, racism is referred to by the curriculum only once in relation to First Nations peoples, as an optional topic. The curriculum fails to explicitly identify the *Indian Act* as racist legislation and it omits the role of racism in the 1969 White Paper. Ontario students can pass through the elementary Social Studies curriculum without even one introduction to racism directed at Indigenous people.
The curriculum also explicitly reproduces the marginalization of Indigenous students. When introducing critical thinking and critical literacy, the curriculum proclaims the following:

“Students approach critical thinking in various ways. Some students find it helpful to discuss their thinking, asking questions and exploring ideas. Other students, including many First Nations, Métis, and Inuit students, may take time to observe a situation or consider a text carefully before commenting; they may prefer not to ask questions or express their thoughts orally while they are thinking (p. 51).”

On the one hand, Indigenous students are defined uncritically in this passage in terms of what is Other. On the other hand, there is no reason to single out Indigenous students as “taking time” and “preferring not to ask questions or express their thoughts”. It may be true that some students demonstrate some of these behaviours sometimes but labelling Indigenous students as such risks reproducing a number of harmful stereotypes about silence, passivity, and thought. Singling out Indigenous students as the “Other students” who “take time”, do not ask questions, do not express thought perpetuates stereotypes and reflects the misrepresentation of Indigenous people and the coercive relations of power underlying the Indian Residential Schools.

These patterns continue in how the curriculum repeatedly whitewashes the issue of colonialism, as it is set in the subordinate clauses of sentences and/or addressed with euphemisms. For example, a sample question in the Grade 2 curriculum includes the following (p. 77): “Which First Nation lived on this land before your community was established?” First, colonialism is positioned in the subordinate clause, beginning with the word “before”, which removes the content from the foreground and centre; and second, settler colonialism is
misrepresented as “community was established”. The curriculum neither names colonialism for what it is, nor does it make colonialism the centre of discussions. Likewise, the curriculum fails to address land disputes and Indigenous rights to land.

Another example of this trend in the curriculum is from Grade 3:

“students will… communicate the results of their inquiries using appropriate vocabulary… and formats (e.g., … a diary entry from the perspective of a Mohawk child detailing the family’s relocation in response to settlers’ encroachment on their land…)” (p.88).

Significantly, the curriculum uses euphemism to address colonialism in this passage as “settlers’ encroachment on their land” and marginalizes this issue by locating it in parenthesis. This is like when the previous Prime Minister of Canada, Stephen Harper, remarked that Canada has no history of colonialism (Shrubb, 2014). Notably, the curriculum does not ask, “What are consequences of colonialism in Canada?” or “How was colonialism maintained and supported by the churches, missionaries, and residential schools?” or “What has been the role of Canadian legislation and the criminal justice system in the maintenance of colonialism?” or “In what ways does colonialism continue in Canada today?”

This marginalization of Indigenous people is repeated in the Ontario curriculum. On page 41, Indigenous students are represented in terms of being limited:

“Some First Nations, Métis, or Inuit students from remote communities in Ontario may also have had limited opportunities for formal schooling, and they also may benefit from ELD instruction” (my emphasis).
In contrast to the curriculum’s own vision of seeing all students in terms of having “a rich diversity of background knowledge” (p. 40, 35), Indigenous students are defined in terms of having “limited opportunities”, reflecting a set of negative stereotypes of Indigenous people as behind or lacking. Instead of seeing the value of informal education or problematizing “formal schooling”, the curriculum reproduces the marginalization of Indigenous people via negative representation. This whitewashing of social relations is a reoccurring issue of the curriculum. The curriculum, for example, does not address how White people in Canada have had “limited opportunities” to understand Indigenous history or concerns due to oppressive policies, media, and school practices.

The curriculum, moreover, makes omissions by leaving out Indigenous people, people of colour, and non-European immigrants from the story of Canada. In particular, the Grade 1 to 6 Social Studies curriculum refers to individual people who come from European backgrounds 18 times. Most of these people were British or French, such as Elizabeth Simcoe and Catherine Parr Traill (p. 87); Cabot, Cartier, de Mons, Étienne Brûlé (p. 110), and the Queen (e.g., p. 123). Henry Hudson is referred to twice on page 110. Champlain is referred to three times (p. 109, 110). In addition to these figures are the curriculum theorists who are quoted on pages 9 to 11, such as Fraillon, Schulz, Yell, and Seixas. The curriculum, however, only refers to one individual Indigenous person: Louis Riel (p. 121). In other words, from Grade 1 to Grade 6 only one individual name of an Indigenous person is referred to in the curriculum. Furthermore, the curriculum does not refer to any single individual Black person, person of colour, or individual non-European immigrants, as shown in Figure 2.
Despite the curriculum’s introduction noting diversity and inclusion, the extreme omission of individual people who are Indigenous, Black, of colour, or non-European immigrants reflects underlying coercive relations of power in Canadian society that need to be changed.

The names of people such as John Cabot, Jaques Cartier, Degua de Mons, and Samuel de Champlain are celebrated as foundational figures in the history of Canada. For example, John Cabot is seen as providing the first “discovery” of the North American coast since the Viking
trips during the 11th century, but the focus on these figures omits the presence of Indigenous people on the land and omits the contributions of Indigenous communities. For example, the curriculum omits the role of Iroquois Chief Donnacona in saving Jacques Cartier and his crew during their second voyage to Canada in 1535 when they had to stay the winter in a fort on the banks of the St. Lawrence. The Europeans became dangerously ill because of scurvy, but Chief Donnacona and his people showed them how to prepare medicine from Cedar trees (Biggar, 1924).

The Ontario curriculum makes similar omissions in regard to de Mons and Champlain. In 1605, de Mons and Champlain needed the assistance of Micmac Chief Panounias and his wife during their expedition of the Cape Cod area; the Chief’s wife was especially essential during the expedition because she could speak the language of the people there (Grassman, 2017). Indigenous people such as Chief Panounias and his wife, however, are not included in the 2013 Social Studies curriculum. Whitewashing Canadian history and social relations, the curriculum focusses on White Europeans at the exclusion of Indigenous people and minorities.

In addition to such omissions, the distortions of the 2013 curriculum amount to whitewashing inconvenient truths. For example, on page 77 the curriculum offers the following narrative about powwow events:

A long time ago, the government said First Nations couldn’t have powwows. The law has changed and there are big powwows again.

First, the statement omits that it was the government of Canada that prohibited the cultural events of First Nations. Second, focussing on what government “said”, the statement consists
of revisionist history by omitting the seriousness of the Canadian government’s actions to outlaw Indigenous ceremonies and cultural events, such as powwows, via amendments to the *Indian Act* from 1884 to 1914 (Avery & Fichter, 2008). In other words, the actions of Canadian authorities were much more serious and destructive than just saying, “First Nations can’t have powwows”. Third, the curriculum’s statement omits that Indigenous people continued to hold ceremonies and powwows despite, and in resistance, to Canada’s oppressive legislation (Avery & Fichter, 2008). Fourth, the curriculum, via its use of passive voice when addressing change (i.e., law has changed), omits that it was the persistence and activism of Indigenous people that led to changes in the law (Avery & Fichter, 2008). These omissions amount to a serious distortion of historical relations and the reflection of oppressive relations.

The curriculum also continues to over-associate Indigenous people with the past, reproducing harmful trends that present Aboriginal people as historical artifacts. When the 2013 curriculum is examined for how ethnic groups are associated with verbs, Indigenous people are disproportionately represented in the past. About 83 percent of verbs depicting the actions of Indigenous people (including “to be” verbs) represent Indigenous people in the past, the remaining 17 percent pertain to the present. For example, “The Wendat,” according to the curriculum, “lived in large villages while the Anishnawbe lived in small groups of only a few homes” (my emphasis, 2013, p. 20) In contrast, about 62 percent of verbs depicting the actions of White/European identities pertain to the past, with about 28 percent using present tense. About 4 percent of verbs depicting the actions of White/European identities indicate future activity. For instance, as an example of Student Talk, the curriculum asserts, “I’m going to learn Italian too.” This is a statement about the future, but the curriculum does not say, “I’m going to learn Mohawk too”, even though about 590 people in Ontario have Mohawk as their
mother tongue (Craggs, 2017, Oct. 3). In the curriculum, I could not find any sentences or questions about the future explicitly referring to Indigenous people in Canada. Interestingly, about 6 percent of the verbs that indicate action of White/European use hypothetical constructions; for example, “What might a child’s responsibilities be in a backwoods settlement?” (p. 89), while these constructions are not used with explicit references to Indigenous people. Furthermore, about 63 percent of verbs depicting the actions of visible minorities and black people pertain to action in the past, compared to about 37 percent that pertain to the present. As indicated by Figure 3, the 2013 Ontario Social Studies curriculum over-represents Indigenous people as actors in the past, rather than as people in the present or the future.

This trend to disproportionately associate Indigenous people with the past is problematic. Curriculum has a pattern of representing Indigenous people and culture as historical artifacts (Sleeter & Grant, 2011). As assimilation and extermination of Indigenous culture was explicit policy in Canada until only very recently, social studies curriculum needs to resist relegating Indigenous people to the past.
In summary, remarkably little has changed in regards to how the Ontario Social Studies curriculum approaches Indigenous people. Despite a general introduction to social justice and “antidiscrimination education”, plus a number of new references to Indigenous people in general and some interesting questions, the 2013 curriculum predominantly whitewashes
significant elements of Canadian history and social relations. It omits significant aspects of the Indian Residential Schools, marginalizes discussion of the residential schools, marginalizes racism directed at Indigenous people, reproduces stereotypes of Indigenous people, omits significant Indigenous contributions to Canada, and distorts history. These problems with the curriculum contribute to whitewashing how Canada is represented to elementary school students and are obstacles to reconciliation, renewal, and social change.

**How the Curriculum Addresses Gender**

The 2013 Ontario Social Studies curriculum’s failure to address relations between Canada and Indigenous peoples is repeated in how it addresses gender. The chart in Appendix A shows how the curriculum addresses the roles of women and men. The left column lists how the curriculum refers to women and girls, the centre column lists when the curriculum refers to both male and female people within the same sentence, and the third column lists how the curriculum refers to men and boys.

Although the second half of this social studies curriculum asks questions about gender, roles, and the position of women society, the first half of the curriculum clearly reproduces gender stereotypes. While dichotomizing the identities of men and women, the curriculum repeatedly associates women and girls with domestic life. For example, mom makes dinner (p. 66), grandmother cooks kheer (p. 76), an aunt cooks bannock (p. 78), and grandmother makes the same food that her mother made (p. 77). Men are never represented as cooking in the curriculum. In contrast, male identities protect others in the lunchroom at school (p. 67), show photographs (p. 67), play with children (p. 67), buy candy (p. 76), kill turkeys (p. 77), play
music and teach the fiddle (p. 78), hunt (p. 89), and hit a deer with a motor vehicle (p. 91).

Men are associated with violence. In contrast, women are represented in terms of domesticity. Mom, for instance, provides child care (p. 66 & 67), grandma resides in the same home as the grandchildren (p. 66 & 78), grandma didn’t have electricity at home (p. 76), and girls and women gather nuts, berries, and vegetables (p. 89). These representations amount to a distortion of the diverse identities and positions of women, men, and people. As these distortions reproduce role stratification and stereotypes, they perpetuate oppressive social conditions.

Likewise, of the 19 individual names referred to by the 2013 curriculum only 3 of them refer to women. The curriculum refers to Cabot and Champlain, but omits Mary Ann Shadd Cary, who was a Black woman, the first woman publisher in Canada, and also a teacher of children of former slaves arriving in Canada. Likewise the curriculum omits Kateri Tekakwitha (from the Mohawk First Nation) who was sainted by the Roman Catholic religion over 300 years after her death. Furthermore there is no mention in the curriculum of Chow Quen Lee, a Chinese-Canadian woman who fought for justice over the Chinese Head Tax of Canada (Off & Douglas, 2017, Oct. 24). The distortions and omissions of the curriculum reflect and reproduce unequal social relations.

The curriculum, furthermore, does very little to advance the rights of same-sex partners. For example, the Grade 2 curriculum suggests the following (p. 78):

“identify and describe different types of families (e.g., families with one parent, two parents, no children; same-sex families; blended and multi- generational families;
immigrant families; families where the parents come from different religious or ethnocultural groups)."

This suggestion is followed by examples of “Student Talk” (p. 78): “I have my dad and my stepdad. My stepdad has other kids too… My best friend’s dad is from Jamaica, but her mother was born in Toronto. My friend’s grandmother lives with them too.” These examples of Student Talk include blended families, multigenerational families, immigrant families, and two parent families, and other sections of the curriculum refer to one parent families and parents who come from different religious or ethnocultural groups; however, the curriculum steers away from any Student Talk that explicitly acknowledges same-sex families. For example, Student Talk in the 2013 curriculum does not include any comments such as, “My friend has two dads and no mom. The three of them live together.” On the one hand, identifying and describing same-sex families is only an option among many in the curriculum. Students can pass Grade 1 to Grade 6 in Ontario without any introduction to same-sex families or homosexuality. On the other hand, except for this general note in Grade 2 about same-sex families, the 2013 curriculum fails to provide any specific references to same-sex relations at all. While reproducing heterosexism and bias, the 2013 curriculum - contrary to its aims at equity and inclusiveness - fails to take the opportunity to advance LGBTQ2 rights.

How the Curriculum Addresses Racism

Not unlike how the Ontario Social Studies curriculum addresses issues pertaining to the Indian Residential Schools and gender, it also marginalizes issues related to racism. The word “racism” is used only four times in the document: once in regards to the years 1780 to 1850, twice in reference to the Black Loyalists, and once in reference to First Nations people. This
sparse concern for racism marginalizes discrimination directed at Chinese immigrants during the years that Canada imposed a head tax and at people of Japanese descent during the Canadian detention camps during WWII. As previously mentioned, racism is only once referred to in regards to Indigenous people. Plus, no individual Black or visible minority people are referred to by the curriculum.

The curriculum has 19 references to White people of European decent, such as Henry Hudson and de Mons; but it does not include recognition of Mathieu Da Costa, who was a Black interpreter employed by de Mons, and it does not include Josiah Henson, who was a Black man in Canada who had escaped slavery in 1830 and then devoted the rest of his life to helping others to freedom. In addition to Black women such as Mary Ann Shadd Cary mentioned previously, it omits Dr. D. P. Pandia, who worked toward the recognition of the rights of East Indians in Canada during negotiations with Canadian immigration authorities in the 1940s despite the prevalence of discrimination. Not only does the curriculum lack a concern for racism, it is unable to refer to the name of even one Black person.

**How the Curriculum Addresses Disability**

Despite general remarks about “inclusive” learning environments (p. 3) and “inclusive society” (p. 6), the 2013 Social Studies curriculum refers to disability on only three pages. One of these references occurs in the glossary in a definition about human rights (p. 204). Human rights, according to the curriculum are: “Rights that recognize the dignity and worth of every person, and provide for equal rights and opportunities without discrimination, regardless of race, ancestry, place of origin, colour, ethnic origin, citizenship, creed, sex, sexual orientation,
age, marital status, family status, disability, or other similar factors.” But the curriculum does not include the names of any people disabled people. It fails to include the names of people such as Rick Hansen, Terry Fox, or Colette Bourgonge.

The other two pages that refer to disability suggest that discussions about disabilities are optional. For example, in Grade 6, a “Sample Question” among many questions is the following: “What actions have been taken by individuals or by organizations such as L’Arche to improve the status and the quality of life of people with disabilities in Canadian society?” Students in Ontario can pass through Grades 1 to 6 without any explicit introduction to disabilities. Moreover, the curriculum does not explicitly refer to discrimination against people in regards to a disability, a wheelchair, or being Blind. While emphasizing what students need to be able to do, the curriculum fails to acknowledge the domination of ableism in Canadian society.

The curriculum is also highly problematic in the way it indirectly references students who may identify as Deaf or Hard of Hearing. According to the curriculum: “Oral communication skills are fundamental to the development of social studies, history, and geography literacy and are essential for thinking and learning” (p. 48). Instead of emphasizing the benefits of sign language and emphasizing diversity, the Ontario curriculum suggests Deaf and Hard of Hearing students lack fundamental skills “essential for thinking and learning”. In contrast to identifying the discrimination against Deaf people (CAD, 2015), the curriculum reproduces the marginalization of vulnerable children and discriminatory views.
How the Curriculum Addresses Inequality

Inequality, for the 2013 curriculum, is a foreign problem or a problem in Canada's past. For example, when the curriculum addresses life in Africa, Africa is represented in terms of inequality in the present (p. 126): “What impact has climate change had on desertification in Africa? What other factors might contribute to desertification in this region? In what ways does the aid directed at this region attempt to address this issue? What else do you think needs to be done?” The curriculum sets up an image of global inequality where Africa is in need of foreign aid from Canada. However, for the 2013 curriculum, domestic inequality in Canada is a thing of the past. For example, on page 88 the curriculum asks, “How did some Black people in Nova Scotia respond to racism in that colony?” Notably, the curriculum does not acknowledge racism in Canada in the present. It does not ask, “How do people in Canada respond to racism today? What else to you think needs to be done?”

Canada needs to improve its human rights record. In 2012, a set of United Nations reviews all found that Canada has serious human rights violations against Indigenous people (Amnesty, 2012). According to this report:

By every measure, be it respect for treaty and land rights, levels of poverty, average life spans, violence against women and girls, dramatically disproportionate levels of arrest and incarceration or access to government services such as housing, health care, education, water and child protection, Indigenous peoples across Canada continue to face a grave human rights crisis…

(Amnesty 2012, p. 9)
In addition to these concerns in relation to Indigenous people, the report emphasized that Canada needs to improve domestically in regards to women’s human rights; corporate accountability and trade; the rights of refugees and migrants; economic, social, and cultural rights; reductions in space for advocacy and dissent; and engagement with international human rights systems. In response, authorities in the federal government dismissed the criticism. “We find it strange,” replied a spokesperson of John Baird, who was minister of Foreign Affairs minister in 2012, “that the United Nations Special Rapporteurs are devoting their scarce resources to countries like Canada, instead of countries like Iran and Syria…” (quoted by Cross, 2012, Dec. 19).

The 2013 Ontario curriculum repeatedly marginalizes awareness of the inequality and oppression in Canada while focusing on similar problems in the societies of others. This marginalization of our own inequality at the emphasis of the inequality of others is repeated in the curriculum’s discussion of Financial Literacy. “In geography,” the curriculum pronounces, “students investigate the importance of natural resources to the global economy. In addition, they learn about global economic disparities and their impact on the quality of life in different countries around the world” (p. 47). Significantly, the curriculum does not examine local economic disparities; it does not examine why or how over twenty percent of children in Ontario live in poverty; it does not address how disparities in the distribution of wealth are growing in Ontario; it does not address how communities in northern Ontario have serious problems with inadequate housing, boiled water advisories, or youth suicide; it is not concerned with the serious overrepresentation of Indigenous people within the criminal justice system. Instead, it offers a superficial remark about “global economic disparities”, which
amounts to the marginalization of attention toward local inequity and the obstruction of social change.

The curriculum’s representation of Canada’s foreign relations are problematic on several levels. In addition to ignoring domestic inequalities during the focus on foreign inequalities, the curriculum fails to explore underlying causes of global inequality. As, shown in Appendix B, when addressing financial and environmental problems in Africa, the curriculum does not connect these problems with the imposition of several hundred years of European imperial expansion into the African continent and the slave trade. As described by historians such as Ashley Jackson (2013), colonial land policies in Africa were exploitative and brought widespread environmental destruction. Likewise, the curriculum reproduces the myth of Canada as a benevolent international force, participating in tree-planting campaigns in Africa (p. 127) and changing the status of women in developing countries (p. 126), for example, but neglects to mention controversial elements of its foreign policy, such as the exploitative involvement of its mining companies in Latin America (Gordon & Webber, 2016), Canada’s controversial role in the 2002-2014 Afghan war (Walkom, 2014, March 12), or Canada’s unfortunate withdrawal from the Kyoto agreement (Taft, 2017). In addition to omitting domestic inequality, the 2013 Social Studies curriculum masks the problematic elements of its foreign policy and programs.

Comparing the 2013 Ontario Curriculum with the 2004 Ontario Curriculum

The 2013 Ontario Social Studies curriculum is considerably different than its 2004 version. Some of the changes are significant improvements to the curriculum. The 2004 version, for
example, does not refer to the Indian Residential Schools even once. In general, aspects of Indigenous culture and history appear to be included more frequently in the 2013 version, but these often appear as additions to the 2004 curriculum, rather than significant changes. For example, each grade of the Ontario Social Studies continues to be divided into a Strand A and Strand B (2004, p. 8; 2013, p. 21), but the Indian Residential Schools are only included in parenthesis as an optional topic or in an optional question (p. 122) in the 2013 curriculum.

Likewise, the Introduction of the 2013 curriculum does not begin to include Indigenous people until about page 17 in a section called, “Some Considerations for Program Planning in Social Studies, History, and Geography”. Instead of putting Indigenous people at the centre of the Ontario Social Studies curriculum and infusing Indigenous perspectives across the course, Indigenous people and perspectives tend to be appear in parenthesis, as “some consideration for program planning”, or marginal to the reproduction of the dominant narrative of Canada.

Despite several improvements between 2004 and 2013, there are also problems with its changes. In 2004, the Ontario curriculum referred to individual people about 11 times. Six of these references identify individuals from European backgrounds (i.e., Marco Polo (p. 28, Cartier (twice on page 32), Champlain (twice on page 32, and Magellan (p.32). Five of these references identify individuals from Indigenous backgrounds, such as Iroquoian Chief Donnacona (p. 32), James Bartleman, Jordan Tootoo, Douglas Cardinal, and Susan Aglukark (p. 33), as shown in Figure 4.
In both the 2004 and 2013 Ontario Curriculum, there are no references to individual people who are Black or from immigrant communities that are not European. The 2013 curriculum, furthermore, provides no explanation to why Chief Donnacoma (p. 32), James Bartleman, Jordan Tootoo, Douglas Cardinal, and Susan Aglukark (p. 33) (i.e., the Indigenous figures) were removed from the document.
Problems with the 2004 Ontario curriculum reoccur in regards to gender. The 2004 curriculum refers only twice to the name of women (p. 33). In contrast, it refers to the names of about 10 men. This trend reappears in the 2013 Ontario curriculum, which has references to 15 men and 3 women. Despite Ontario’s discussion on equity and inclusion, little has changed in Ontario Social Studies curriculum documents between 2004 and 2013.

**Comparing the 2013 Ontario Social Studies Curriculum with the 2016 British Columbia Social Studies Curriculum**

Since British Columbia also recently revised its Social Studies curriculum, this study compares the 2013 Ontario Social Studies curriculum with the 2016 British Columbia curriculum (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 2016). The British Columbia Social Studies curriculum is significantly different. For example, in contrast to Ontario, the British Columbia curriculum begins in Kindergarten and continues until Grade 9. The British Columbia curriculum, furthermore, more fully includes Indigenous people and perspectives across the document. Significantly, First People communities are referred to on the first page of the 2016 British Columbia curriculum; the 2013 Ontario curriculum does not refer to Indigenous people specifically until page 17.

Likewise, the Indian Residential Schools is a reoccurring issue in the British Columbia curriculum. The residential schools are studied in Grade 4 (p. 20, 22), Grade 5 (p. 23, 24, 25, 26), and Grade 6 (p. 31). In British Columbia, furthermore, residential schools are not an optional topic. In Grade 5, “Students are expected to know… past discriminatory government policies and actions, such as the Chinese Head Tax, the Komagata Maru incident, residential schools, and internments” (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 2016b). In contrast to the
2013 Ontario curriculum, which refers to the residential schools only twice, once as an optional topic in parenthesis and once in an optional question, the British Columbia curriculum includes a greater focus on this significant chapter of Canadian history.

This greater inclusion of Indigenous people and perspectives occurs on several levels of the British Columbia curriculum. For example, the introduction to the BC curriculum includes a greater emphasis on working with First People communities, which is lacking in the Ontario 2013 document. The goals of the 2016 BC curriculum explicitly include “developing an understanding of the history and culture of Canada’s First Peoples”, while the goals of the 2013 Ontario document do not refer to Indigenous people at all. Likewise, the Curriculum Overview of the BC curriculum emphasizes that Aboriginal educators were involved in writing of the document, and it emphasizes that the BC curriculum embeds Indigenous content explicitly and implicitly across the courses. The Ontario curriculum, in contrast, has no indication of how it was written.

The 2016 British Columbia Social Studies curriculum, however, is not perfect. Like the 2013 Ontario curriculum and the 2004 Ontario curriculum, its references to individual people have issues. In total, there are about 25 references to individual people in the BC curriculum, but only 1 of these is a woman. Furthermore, this is a reference to Melinda Gates, a White American born in Dallas, Texas. Remarkably, the 2016 British Columbia Social Studies curriculum does not refer to any specific Canadian women or Indigenous women.

Likewise, as indicated by Figure 5, about 19 of these references are to individuals with European backgrounds: Vancouver, Cook, Cabot, Frobisher, Hudson, Cartier, Champlain (p.
20), Simon Fraser, Alexander Mackenzie, David Thompson (p. 21), Bill Gates, Malinda Gates (p. 32), Julius Caesar (p. 37), Gavrilo Princip (p. 46), Baldwin, Lafontaine, and Papineau (p. 47). John A. MacDonald is referred to three times (p. 46, 48, 49). In contrast, only two individual Indigenous people are referred to in the 2016 British Columbia document: Louis Riel (p. 48) and Chief Maquinna (p. 20).
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Figure 5: References to individuals in the 2016 BC Social Studies curriculum

As reflected by Figure 5, European personalities dominate Canadian Social Studies.
In addition to these figures, the curriculum also refers to John Douglas (p. 19), Emperor Chin (p. 37), Ibn Battuta (p. 43), and Zheng He (p. 45), but it is not clear where these four figures may be categorized by Figure 5. Even if these four historical figures were included in the graph, the picture reproduced by the BC curriculum is dominated by White perspectives.

Likewise, despite referring to John A. MacDonald three times, the 2016 British Columbia Social Studies curriculum fails to identify his role in building the Indian Residential School System. In 1883 in the House of Common, he addressed his plan for education in Canada:

> When the school is on the reserve the child lives with its parents, who are savages; he is surrounded by savages, and though he may learn to read and write his habits, and training and mode of thought are Indian. He is simply a savage who can read and write. It has been strongly pressed on myself, as the head of the Department, that the Indian children should be withdrawn as much as possible from the parental influence, and the only way to do that would be to put them in central training industrial schools where they will acquire the habits and modes of thought of white men.

(John A. MacDonald, quoted by TRC, 2015d)

The BC curriculum refers to John A. MacDonald three times, but it fails to associate him with the construction of the Indian Residential Schools. The curriculum’s omissions illustrate and reproduce patterns of bias that obstruct understanding, social change, and social justice.

**Conclusion**

In summary, this analysis of the 2013 Social Studies curriculum is informed by Critical Pedagogy, Critical Race Theory, and the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. With a
concern for marginalization, omissions, and distortions, this analysis indicates that the 2013 Ontario curriculum has a number of problems. While whitewashing Canadian history, it fails to fully advance social justice issues pertaining to Indigenous peoples, gender, same-sex families, racism, disability, and inequality. Although the 2013 Ontario curriculum made significant improvements over the 2004 edition, it still has significant problems. In the next section of this study, I make several recommendations based on my analysis.
Chapter 6: Recommendations and Discussion

Introduction

In light of the previous analysis of the 2013 Ontario Social Studies curriculum, this Discussion and Conclusion chapter makes several recommendations. Although the 2013 curriculum made improvements over the 2004 curriculum, it is a deeply flawed document because it reproduces gender bias and bias against Indigenous people, visible minorities, people with disabilities, and LGBTQ2 communities.

In terms of policy and practice, the following recommendations pertain to improving inclusion of Indigenous peoples and visible minorities to Canada, including storybooks that address social issues, hiring diverse teaching staff, supporting teacher education, responding to TRC Calls to Action, and advancing critical orientations to teaching and learning. Ontario curriculum writers, furthermore, could benefit from learning from the experiences of curriculum writers working with Indigenous communities in British Columbia. Lastly I outline several questions for future research.

Including Indigenous People

The omissions of the 2013 Ontario Social Studies curriculum are extreme. As previously discussed, despite referring to groups of Indigenous people and First Nations in general, it refers to only one individual Indigenous person, reflecting the coercive relations of power that
underpin the Indian Residential Schools and many social relations in Canada. It does not refer to any individual Indigenous women, Black people, people of colour, or non-European immigrants.

The curriculum should include more individuals other than White males. It can include the names and stories of Indigenous people such as Tom Longboat (from the Onondaga First Nation) who ran a record Boston Marathon race in 1907, Hiawatha (from the Onondaga First Nation) who was a founder of the Iroquois Confederacy, E. Pauline Johnson (from the Mohawk First Nation) who was a poet and performer, and Deskaheh (from the Cayuga First Nation) who led efforts to obtain recognition of Indigenous rights and brought concerns to the League of Nations in the 1920s. As suggested by Justice Murray Sinclair (2017, Aug. 29), Canada needs to do better at recognizing the contributions of Indigenous people, such as Chief Peguis (of the Saulteaux First Nation) who in the early 1800s granted land to Lord Selkirk’s settlers in a region of what is now Manitoba and provided them vital support during their first winters. The curriculum, moreover, need not only include Indigenous people directly involved in the history and politics of Canada; it can include international Indigenous leaders such as Rigoberta Menchú from Guatemala, for example. The curriculum furthermore should be written in partnership with Indigenous educators.

But the Ontario Social Studies curriculum needs to do more than include more Indigenous history and culture. It needs to be significantly revamped so that it does not reproduce gender bias, racism and forms of discrimination. It should not reproduce stereotypes about women and men. It should do more to include the narratives of Black people and visible minorities. It
should do more to include education about LGBTQ2 rights and about disabilities.

**Including Story Books that Address Social Issues**

The 2013 Social Studies curriculum primarily promotes a form of pedagogy that emphasizes question-posing and answers, but learning can take place in multiple forms. Narrative, for example, can contribute to awareness of social conditions and mobilize action. As described by Meléndez (2015), multiculturalism can be taught in social studies by using children’s books that highlight cultural diversity. These children’s books can include Faith Ringgold’s *Tar Beach* (1991) and Na'ima bint Robert’s *The Swirling Hijaab* (2002). Children’s books such as bell hook’s *Skin Again* (2004) confront racism, Carmen Tafolla and Sheryl Tenayuca’s (2008) *That's Not fair! Emma Tenayuca's Struggles For Justice* advocates for worker rights and activism, and Valentine’s (2004) *One Dad, Two Dads, Brown Dad, Blue Dad* emphasizes the diversity of families and challenges homophobia and heterosexism. Nicola I. Campbell’s (2008) *Shin-chi's Canoe* is about experiences in the Indian Residential School system.

Explicitly including these story books in the curriculum can engage conversations, empathy, understanding, and action on social realities. Not only do these story books have a place in the Social Studies curriculum, these recommendations extend to the Language Arts, especially since many of these books are published as dual-language books supporting the inclusion of students’ home languages in classrooms. As a tolerance of multiculturalism and diversity is not enough, anti-racist commitments should be integrated across the curriculum. Social Science curriculum, for example, can profile non-White Canadian explorers, scientists, artists, and activists.
Hiring Diverse Teaching Staff

Despite over three decades of multicultural policy in Canada, the Ontario Social Studies curriculum remains dominated by the perspectives of White privilege. For example, from Grade 1 to Grade 6 the Social Studies curriculum does not refer to even one Black individual person. As described by scholars such as Ladson-Billings (2003a, 2003b) and Villegas, et al. (2012), efforts need to be made within the field of education to hire and retain educators who bring and model diversity in classrooms. Schools should hire and retain more people who identify with diverse backgrounds, including people who identify with Indigenous, Black, coloured, non-European, and LGBTQ2 communities.

Supporting Teacher Education

The Ministry of Education should work with faculty in Teacher Education programs across the province to ensure that new teachers develop critical orientations to curriculum through which they are sensitized to omissions, distortions, and bias in relation to Indigenous communities and other vulnerable or marginalized groups. Students in Ontario have been able to pass from Grade 1 to Grade 7 presently without any introduction to the Indian Residential Schools. Likewise, the 2013 curriculum does not include any mandatory curriculum advancing the inclusion of same-sex families, despite Supreme Court of Canada rulings in support of diversity and tolerance (e.g., Chamberlain v Surrey School District No. 36, 2002). The 2013 curriculum emphasizes the role of teachers in the success of students, but teachers also need
the support of teacher education, which requires funding and social supports, in order to
develop the capabilities, critical awareness, and critical skills to navigate curriculum
documents and complex social interaction.

Teacher education is engaged in changes called for by the Truth and Reconciliation
Commission. For example, the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of
Toronto has mandatory Indigenous education courses for pre-service teachers (OISE, n.d.a).
Primary, Junior, and Intermediate teacher candidates in the OISE Master of Teaching program
are required to take a course called Curriculum and Teaching in Social Studies and Aboriginal
Education. Likewise, Intermediate and Senior Teacher Candidates have a compulsory course
called Indigenous Experiences of Racism and Settler Colonialism in Canada. Indigenous
professors such Dr. Sandra Styres (OISE, n.d.b) have led the development of impressive, new
courses at the University of Toronto, such as “Introduction to Aboriginal Land-centered
Education: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives” and “Literatures of Land: Narrative,
Storying and Literature”.

Teacher education also provides diverse supports to in-service teachers and pre-service
teachers in order to share educational resources. For instance, TeachOntario.ca is an online
community of educators in Ontario sharing Indigenous Education Resources that bring
attention to ideas, questions, and perspectives about Indigenous education, learners,
Indigenous protocols, Indigenous language, and so on (TeachOntario, n.d.). There are also
creative events available to teachers in Ontario, such as the Ministry of Education’s
Community-Connected Experiential Learning sessions (TeachOntario, 2017, May, 12).
These teacher education initiatives have considerable support from the new Ontario Ministry of Education’s Indigenous Education strategy. According to a recent announcement (Ontario, 2017, Nov. 8), the new curriculum is being developed with Indian Residential School survivors and First Nations, Métis, and Inuit partners in order to focus on grade-appropriate learning opportunities about residential schools, treaties, and Indigenous peoples’ historical and contemporary contributions to Canada. In response to the TRC Calls for Action, mandatory components of the revised curriculum will include learning about the impact of colonialism and learning about rights and responsibilities in order to understand shared histories and to work toward reconciliation. According to this announcement, revisions will be made to Social Studies Grade 4 to Grade 6 by the end of 2018 and learning about the Indian Residential Schools is now a mandatory part of teacher training in Canada. As described by the Ontario College of Teachers (2017, p. 33), Teacher Education accreditation in Ontario now requires pre-service teachers be enabled to acquire knowledge and skills pertaining to “the colonial experiences of Indigenous peoples, such as residential school experiences.” Along with these changes, Teacher Education in Canada has begun to include a greater inclusion of Indigenous perspectives and insights in respect of education, teaching, and learning (Styres, 2017).

Ontario is also developing initiatives in support of these goals. For example, since the fall of 2016 each school board has a position to implement the 2007 Ontario First Nation, Métis, and Inuit Education Policy Framework (Ontario Ministry of Education, n.d.). Likewise, conferences such as the No Lang Indigenous Language Symposium have been held in support of Indigenous languages and education (Ontario Ministry of Education, n.d.).
according to recent reports (Ontario, 2017, Nov. 8), is also committed to revising Social Studies Grade 1 to Grade 3. These initiatives look promising but they also have challenges. For example, according to Katherine Samuel (2017), although the Ministry of Education provided funding for the position to implement the First Nation, Métis, and Inuit Education Policy Framework, they offered few guidelines for the position and no mandatory training.

**Listening to the TRC**

In 2015, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada made recommendations for education across Canada in its *Calls to Action* report (2015b). Section 62 calls “upon the federal, provincial, and territorial governments, in consultation and collaboration with Survivors, Aboriginal peoples, and educators, to… Make age-appropriate curriculum on residential schools, Treaties, and Aboriginal peoples’ historical and contemporary contributions to Canada a mandatory education requirement for Kindergarten to Grade Twelve students” (TRC, 2015b, p. 7); however, the present Ontario Social Studies curriculum does not even refer to the Indian Residential School System until Grade 6 when the inclusion of education on the residential schools is optional.

Not only should education on the Indian Residential Schools be mandatory; due to the seriousness and the extreme impact of the Indian Residential Schools, this mandate should not be reduced to one lecture and/or true-false quiz in one semester of the Social Studies curriculum. The topic of the residential schools should emerge regularly in classes from Grade 1 to Grade 6, and be discussed across subjects, including Mathematics and Language Arts. The Ontario curriculum, furthermore, should be clear that the Indian Residential School
system was an integral part of an explicit policy of cultural genocide, as described by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (2015a, p. 57). The curriculum should explicitly use the term.

As recent media announcements from the Ministry of Education have indicated that curriculum revisions will make Indigenous history and culture mandatory by the fall of 2018 (Ontario, 2017, Nov. 8; Johnson, 2017, Nov. 8), these initiatives should be followed up on and checked. Likewise, education about racism, anti-racism, LGBTQ2 rights, and disability should be made mandatory in the Social Studies curriculum.

**Advancing Critical Orientations such as Critical Pedagogy and Critical Race Theory**

Underlying these suggestions is the need for teaching and learning to be more infused with critical orientations such as Critical Pedagogy and Critical Race Theory. Teaching and learning needs to address the problems and questions in the lives of students and their communities. Teachers need to recognize students as smart, curious, and capable and build on background knowledge and experiences. Teaching and learning requires questions and engagement with living experience, problems, and action toward solutions and change.

The curriculum should be better infused with anti-racist perspectives. In addition to focusing more explicitly on racism and discrimination, it should do more to include individuals who are Black, people of colour, non-European. For example, the curriculum can explicitly include the
names and stories of people such as Mary Ann Shadd Cary, Josiah Henson, Mathieu da Costa, and Dr. D. P. Pandia discussed previously. The inclusion of these individual’s names and narratives could help counter some of the omissions of the 2013 Social Studies curriculum.

Teaching and learning needs to continue to move beyond transmission orientations and social constructivism toward more transformative approaches. Addressing social issues such as racism and interrogating relations of power, students and teachers need to examine what is under the surface of texts, and consider bias, alternatives, and consequences, while siding with struggles against oppression. In this view, education is informed by a vision of distributive justice and what is possible. It engages critique, and contributes to action transforming social relations so that social justice can become realized. As described by scholars such as Giroux (2004), teachers need to act as public intellectuals who speak out against abuses and work toward social change.

**Learning from British Columbia Curriculum Experiences**

As the 2016 British Columbia Social Studies curriculum provide greater infusion of Indigenous content, curriculum writers in Ontario could learn from British Columbia. The 2016 British Columbia Social Studies curriculum can be studied in greater detail for how it includes Indigenous perspectives across its courses. Likewise, curriculum writers in Ontario could benefit from learning about how Aboriginal educators were included and consulted during the last revision of British Columbia Social Studies. Although the 2016 British
Columbia Social Studies curriculum is not perfect (e.g., it only refers to racism twice from Kindergarten to Grade 9 - i.e., once as a “Sample topic”), collaboration among the provinces can provide benefits in schools and for the future.

**Directions for Future Research**

The previous seven suggestions are mostly relevant to educational policy and the practices of schools and classrooms. In this last section, I outline possibilities for future research. First, studies could compare the 2013 Ontario Social Studies with the previous 2004 Ontario Social Studies curriculum in greater detail and examine what caused changes. Second, future studies could compare the 2013 Ontario Social Studies curriculum and the 2016 British Colombia Social studies curriculum with the Social Studies curriculum of other Canadian provinces, such as Alberta, Nova Scotia, and Quebec. How and why are these curriculum documents different? What can educators, curriculum writers, teachers, and students learn from these differences? Third, future research can try to apply the three-part lens used in this study that focuses on Marginalization, Omissions, and Distortions. Based on the Critical Race Theory work of Ladson-Billings (2003b), this lens can be applied to the curriculum of other provinces and subjects, and other texts, such as newspaper articles and legal documents. Fourth, as this study focused very little on social class in the Social Studies curriculum, future studies could do more to examine how the Ontario Social Studies curriculum addresses social class and classism. Fifth, as this study likewise did not examine textbooks approved for use in Social Studies classroom, future studies could examine the new textbooks for bias and for how they address social justice.
In addition to these research questions, new resources about the Indian Residential Schools are gaining support from the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. One such possible resource is Martha Troian’s (2017, Dec. 3) CBC Radio documentary in which she traces her mother’s residential school experiences. The documentary follows Martha Troian as she learns more about her mother’s story and as she speaks with her young son about his grandmother and the residential schools. Featuring moving testimony by her mother’s friend, Lucy Angeconebe, who is also a residential school survivor, the documentary is a powerful demonstration of the awful brutality of the residential school system, the long-term consequences of the schools, and the agency and resistance of its students and Indigenous communities. Such authentic resources could be used instructionally with elementary and older students in the Social Studies curriculum. Students and teachers can listen to this radio documentary, or sections of it, and discuss together Grade 1 Social Studies questions, such as, “Who might you talk to to find out about some of your family’s stories?” or “How do you think a child feels when he or she is bullied?” (MOE, 2013, p. 67). Martha Troian’s documentary is also relevant to Social Studies, Grade 2 curriculum questions, such as, “Why is it important to have an understanding of your family’s past?” and “Why should we respect the diverse cultures and traditions in the communities in which we live?” (2013, p. 74). The documentary, furthermore, is entirely relevant to analyzing and/or constructing maps, and to the creation and presentation of the visual arts. Significant changes to the Ontario Social Studies curriculum are required, but in the meantime there is space in the curriculum to include new resources such as Martha Troian’s documentary. Classrooms, moreover, need to do more than just add these new resources to mainstream curriculum as part of another “mix-and-stir” event. Adequate space
needs to be created in classrooms so that these new resources can be at the centre of conversations, attention, and reflection in order to counter legacies of racism and colonialism in Canada.

Social Studies classrooms can also learn from educational events happening in schools such as Summerside Intermediate School in P.E.I. (Harding, 2016, May 13). While studying Indian Residential School experiences, students at Summerside participated in a remarkable blanket ceremony. Led by Indigenous educators such as Gilbert Sark, these students stood on a number of blankets. As they learnt about Indigenous history, the blankets were slowly folded up and the space where students stood on the blankets became smaller and smaller, in order to help students understand the impact of losing land, culture, dignity, and respect. At the end of the event, the blankets were reopened and spread out to signify hope for renewal. Students remarked that they learnt about history, struggle, discrimination, and moral choices. With appropriate guidance, activities such as the blanket ceremony could provide assistance to the current Social Studies curriculum. The blanket activity, for example, is directly relevant to Grade 5 Social Studies questions, such as, “Why is it important to understand that people have different perspectives?” or “Why is it important to cooperate with others?” (2013, p. 106).

Despite significant challenges and obstacles, the work of educators such as Martha Troian and Gilbert Sark can be supportive of the development of awareness and critical change.

Underlying new research questions and educational projects is a serious need in Canada to have greater understanding of the role of race and colonialism in the history of Canada and contemporary social relations. In order to significantly challenge racism and injustice, multiple
efforts are needed, along with significant change. As described by the authors of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (2015a, p. 364):

Reconciliation calls for federal, provincial, and territorial government action.
Reconciliation calls for national action.
The way we govern ourselves must change.
Laws must change.
Policies and programs must change.
The way we educate our children and ourselves must change.
The way we do business must change.
Thinking must change.
The way we talk to, and about, each other must change.
All Canadians must make a firm and lasting commitment to reconciliation to ensure that Canada is a country where our children and grandchildren can thrive.
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## Appendix A: Representations of gender in the 2013 Ontario Social Studies curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentences that refer to women and girls</th>
<th>Sentences that refer to both male and female people</th>
<th>Sentences that refer to men and boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p. 45: “By drawing attention to the contributions of women, … teachers enable students from a wide range of backgrounds to see themselves reflected in the curriculum.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 46: “In later grades, students explore concepts of peer and exclusion, learning about the living conditions of different groups of people in the past and present, including women…”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 66: “My mom works in an office with lots of other people. Her boss decides what she works on. She picks me up after school. We go home and she makes supper. I help set the table. She reads to me before I go to sleep.”</td>
<td>p. 66: “Do you have any brothers or sisters?”</td>
<td>p. 66: “I have a baby brother.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 66: “My grandmother moved in with us this spring.”</td>
<td>p. 67: We went to visit my aunt and uncle in Montréal last summer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 67: “How might you compare your role as a friend to your role as a big sister?”</td>
<td></td>
<td>p. 67: “My big brother helped me in the classroom that day.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 67: “My mom does a lot for me.”</td>
<td></td>
<td>p. 67: “I got a bunch of photographs from my dad that show special people and places in my life.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 67: “When my sister was born I felt happy.”</td>
<td></td>
<td>p. 67: “And I got mad too, because my dad didn’t play with me as much.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>“I talked to the woman who works in the park. She told me that they put in special plants that butterflies like.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>“I helped my mom take in the garbage cans.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>“When it snows, my older sister shovels the sidewalk but the city clears the road.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>“My mom’s family didn’t do that.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>“My mom is from Quebec.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>“And other times I stay with my mom.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>“My grandmother always makes kheer for Eid.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>“My grandma says that her parents put candles on their tree because they didn’t have electricity. At home…”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>“My big sister had her bat mitzvah last month.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>“Now my mom buys ours [turkey] at the store. That’s different.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>“My grandfather told me how he helped kill the Thanksgiving turkey.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>“My mom speaks Italian when she visits my nonna.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>“I have my dad and my step dad. My step dad has other kids too.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>“I helped my aunt make bannock for a community dinner.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>“My uncle lives in Nova Scotia. He says they have parties called ceilidhs. He is going to teach me how to play a Scottish song on the fiddle.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 77: “We eat the special dinner that my grandma makes. It’s the same as what her mother made.”</td>
<td>p. 78: “My grandpa came from Ireland when he was a boy and lived in Newfoundland. My dad was born in Kingston, Ontario.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 78: “but her mother was born in Toronto. My friend’s grandmother lives with them too.”</td>
<td>p. 78: “My best friend’s dad is from Jamaica…”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 78: “I like the caps the girls wear.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 79: “My mom comes from Ethiopia and had to get water from a well when she was my age.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 86: “describe some similarities and differences… of selected groups… e.g., men and women… the roles of men, women, and children…”</td>
<td>p. 87: “This painting shows a man wearing snowshoes that are really big and have netting.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 89: “the division of labour between men, women, and children”… How did men and women in some First Nations work together to ensure the survival of their families?”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 89: “intermarriage between First Nations women and men…”</td>
<td>p. 89: “What happened to families if the husband/father died or was seriously ill?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 89: “How would settlers have divided the chores between men and women, boys and girls?”</td>
<td>p. 91: “My dad said he hit a deer there before.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>“the status of women…What were some of the differences in the position of women in ancient Greece, medieval societies, Haudenosaunee society?”</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“compare aspects of daily life of different groups: e.g., women of different castes in medieval India… a man and a women in medieval China, or Mohawk society…”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>“Why was the “Three Sisters” so important to some early societies in North America?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>“describe the social arrangement of some early societies… and the role and status of … women…”</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>“Filles du Roi… Who were the Filles du Roi? Who sent them to New France?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>“aspects of the interactions among and between First Nations and Europeans in Canada prior to 1713, from the perspective of… Filles du Roi, First Nations women…”</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>“What role did women play in decision making?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>“What role did First Nations women play in the fur trade?”</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>“explain how various groups have contributed to the goal of inclusiveness… e.g., the efforts of women’s rights… organizations…”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>“What was the role of women’s groups in ensuring that gender was included in the Charter…?”</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>“identify some… interactions between Canada and other regions of the world, describe some ways in which they affect those regions… e.g., change in status of women as a result of education projects in a developing region…”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Representations of ethnicity in the 2013 Ontario Social Studies curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indigenous peoples</th>
<th>European peoples</th>
<th>Visible minorities and Black people</th>
<th>Multiple groups together</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p. 9: “Julian Fraillon” (Australian)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p. 9: “Wolfran Schultz” (Australian)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p. 10: “Mike Yell” (American)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p. 11: “Peter Seixas” (Canadian, BC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p. 12: “Gilbert M. Grosvenor” (American)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p. 12: “Charles Gritzer” (American)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 20: “The Wendat lived in large villages while the Anishnawbe lived in small groups of only a few homes. The Anishnawbe moved each season; the Wendat did not.”</td>
<td>p. 20: “In what ways might the life of a farmer on a seigneurie in Lower Canada have differed from that of a farmer in Upper Canada? In what ways were the lives of these people similar?”</td>
<td>p. 20: “describe some of the similarities and differences in various aspects of everyday life (e.g., housing, clothing, food, religious/spiritual practices, work, recreation, the role of children) of selected groups living in Canada between 1780 and 1850 (e.g., First Nations, Métis, French, British, Black people; men and women)”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 20: “What can we learn from the ways in which First Nations lived in harmony with their environment?”</td>
<td>p. 20: “What are some of the differences in the ways First Nations and settlers viewed childhood?”</td>
<td>p. 20: “identify some key concepts of Canadian identity (e.g., bilingualism, multiculturalism, founding nations, religious freedom)”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 21: “Grade 5: First Nations &amp; Europeans in Few France and Early Canada”</td>
<td>p. 27: “teachers use practices and procedures that: … support all students, including those with special education needs, those who are learning the language of instruction (English or French), and those who are First Nation, Métis, or Inuit…”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
p. 41: These children generally come from countries where access to education is limited or where there are limited opportunities to develop language and literacy skills in any language. Some First Nations, Métis, or Inuit students from remote communities in Ontario may also have had limited opportunities for formal schooling, and they also may benefit from ELD instruction.

p. 45: “By drawing attention to the contributions of women, the perspectives of various ethnocultural, religious, and racial communities, and the beliefs and practices of First Nations, Métis, and Inuit peoples, teachers enable students from a wide range of backgrounds to see themselves reflected in the curriculum.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 46</th>
<th>“Special outreach strategies and encouragement may be needed to draw in the parents of English language learners and First Nations, Métis, or Inuit students, and to make them feel more comfortable in their interactions with the school.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Page 46</td>
<td>“In later grades, students explore concepts of power and exclusion, learning about the living conditions of different groups of people in the past and present, including women, First Nations, and people in developing countries.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 46</td>
<td>“There are numerous opportunities to break through stereotypes and to learn about various religious, social, and ethnocultural groups, including First Nations, Métis, and Inuit people, and their distinct traditions.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 47</td>
<td>“They study the role of trade in establishing and cementing relationships between First Nations and early Europeans in Canada.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 51</td>
<td>“Other students, including many First Nations, Métis, and Inuit students, may take time to observe a situation or consider a text carefully before commenting; they may prefer not to ask questions or express their thoughts orally while they are thinking.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 58</td>
<td>“Why are the temples at Angkor Wat or mosques at Timbuktu such important archaeological sites?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 59</td>
<td>“What were the major consequences for the Wendat of contact with the French?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 59</td>
<td>“What farming techniques used by the Mayans and the people of ancient India are still practised by Canadian farmers?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 60</td>
<td>“What were some differences in the ways First Nations and settlers viewed childhood?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>“How can we use satellite images of the First Nation reserve to help us create maps and locate familiar features that we use?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>“When we visit my grandparents, they have a real Christmas tree.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My dad buys special sweets for Diwali because he remembers eating them in India.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My family went to see the dragon dance on Chinese New Year. What do you do for the New Year?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“My big sister had her bat mitzvah last month. Some day I will do that too. When you get older, will you do something like that or something different?” “My grand- mother always makes kheer for Eid. Does your family have special food for holidays?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>influenced by practices around Christmas, some Jewish families now give presents at Hanukkah; when some of their spiritual or cultural traditions were outlawed, First Nations people developed different practices, but now some traditional practices are returning”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
p. 76-77: “Why were First Nations people unable to have powwows at one time? What reaction did First Nations people have to this law?”

p. 77: “A long time ago, the government said First Nations couldn’t have powwows. The law has changed and there are big powwows again.”

p. 77: “Our neighbours hang lights up on their house for Diwali and keep them up for Christmas.”

p. 77: formulate questions to guide investigations into some of the past and present traditions and celebrations in their own family and the communities to which they belong (e.g., *simple questions related to past and present practices associated with Christmas, Yom Kippur, Eid ul-Fitr, Diwali, or Kwanzaa*).

p. 77: “What does your family do at Hanukkah? Are those the same things that your grandparents did? What is different?” “Does your family eat special food at Eid ul-Fitr? Are those foods the same as those your grand-parents used to eat?”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p. 77: “How might interviewing an Elder help you find out about seasonal celebrations in the local First Nation community and the ways these celebrations have changed?”</th>
<th>p. 77: “My opa tells me stories of Christmas when he was young.”</th>
<th>p. 77: “What did you find out about the differences between traditions related to the New Year (Hanukkah, Eid ul-Fitr, a powwow) now and in the past?”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p. 77: Which First Nation lived on this land before your community was established?”</td>
<td></td>
<td>p. 78: “I go to South Asian dance classes”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p. 78: “describe some significant traditions and celebrations of their families, their peers, and their own communities, as well as of some other communities in Canada (e.g., fall fairs; faith holidays such as Easter, Passover, Eid ul-Fitr; special days such as Remembrance Day, Canada Day, National Aboriginal Day, Kwanzaa, Earth Day; religious ceremonies”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p. 78: “Diwali comes after Thanksgiving and Hallowe’en. Those are all before Christmas. Then comes New Year’s Day. Chinese New Year is later.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
p. 78: “I helped my aunt make bannock for a community dinner.”

p. 78: “I went to a Portuguese festival in the summer. I liked the food and music.”

p. 78: “My uncle lives in Nova Scotia. He says they have parties called ceilidhs. He is going to teach me how to play a Scottish song on the fiddle.”

p. 78: “I danced the hora at my cousin’s bar mitzvah.” “My mom speaks Italian when she visits my nonna. I’m going to learn Italian too.”

p. 78: “Identify some ways in which heritage is passed on through various family celebrations and practices (e.g., celebrations around Christmas, Eid ul-Fitr, Hanukkah, Diwali, Kwanzaa; traditions related to rites of passage.”

p. 79: “Why might some children in central Africa or in the Amazon region of South America never have played a video game or watched TV? In what other ways is their lifestyle different from that of children in Canada?”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>“Inuit people hunt seals and whales from the ice. They sometimes travel by dog sled or snowmobile because you can’t drive a car on the ice.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>“I put pictures of skiers and skaters in Canada and northern Europe. I put pictures of pineapples and bananas near the equator.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>“In Canada and Russia, there’s a lot of hockey and skating in the winter because it’s cold and there is ice and snow. It doesn’t get cold in Hawaii, so people swim and surf.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>“The Wendat lived in large villages while the Anishnawbe lived in small groups of only a few homes. The Anishnawbe moved each season; the Wendat did not.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>“In what ways might the life of a farmer on a seigneurie in Lower Canada have differed from that of a farmer in Upper Canada? In what ways were the lives of these people similar?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>“What can we learn from the ways in which First Nations lived in harmony with their environment?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>“What are some of the differences in the ways First Nations and settlers viewed childhood?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>“Identify some key concepts of Canadian identity (e.g., bilingualism, multiculturalism, founding nations, religious freedom)”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 86-87: “describe some of the ways in which communities that were in Canada around the early 1800s have had an impact on Canadian identity (e.g., with reference to Canada’s official languages, cultural contributions, place names, observances such as National Aboriginal Day or Black History Month)”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 87: “What are some place names in Canada that derive from First Nations languages?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 87: “[Place names] That reflect the background of settlers from Great Britain?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 87: “Who are the Métis? How are they different from First Nations? What are some ways in which both groups have contributed to Canadian identity?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 87: “formulate questions to guide investigations into some of the major challenges facing different groups and communities in Canada from around 1780 to 1850 (e.g., isolation; climate; lack of access to doctors, law enforcement, or manufactured goods in isolated communities; encroachment of European settlers on traditional First Nations territory; racism facing First Nations peoples and Black Loyalists)”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 87: “What challenges faced settlers living far from towns? What challenges faced people living in developing towns?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 87: “What types of challenges were particular to First Nations people or African Canadians?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 87: “What do the journals of Elizabeth Simcoe, Catharine Parr Traill, or other settlers tell us about settlers’ dependence on First Nations medicine? About settlers’ responses to the natural environment?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 87: “compare a map showing traditional precontact territories of First Nations to a map showing reserves in 1850”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Question/Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>How could analysing a climate map contribute to your understanding of the challenges that settlers faced during winter in Lower Canada? “As you plot the settlements on your map, what pattern is emerging?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>The map I read helped me see that the Quebec winters are colder and longer than in southern Ontario. It would have been hard for settlers in Lower Canada to stay warm and keep enough food for the winter. “My map shows that many farms and villages are beside lakes or rivers.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Why do you think all these settlements are located along waterways?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>What are some adaptations that settlers made in response to the lack of manufactured products available in isolated settlements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>What functions did a barn-raising or quilting bee serve?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Use timelines and maps to help them determine how European settlement affected the location and size of First Nations and/or Métis communities.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 88: “How did some Black people in Nova Scotia respond to racism in that colony?”</td>
<td>p. 88: “communicate the results of their inquiries using appropriate vocabulary (e.g., First Nations, Métis, Upper Canada, Lower Canada, settler, refugee, Loyalist, allies, land grant, seigneurie, habitant, slave, hardship, isolation) and formats (e.g., a booklet entitled “How to Survive in Upper Canada”; a comic book that shows settler life before and after the construction of roads; a diary entry from the perspective of a Mohawk child detailing the family’s relocation in response to settlers’ encroachment on their land; a poster that shows how people adapted to the climate; a map showing how European settlement affected First Nations territories”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 88: “identify various settler communities in Canada during this period (e.g., French along the St. Lawrence River; English and Irish in Kingston, Bytown, and York/Toronto, Upper Canada; African Canadians in Grey County, Upper Canada; Scots in Nova Scotia and the Red River Valley; Mennonites in Waterloo County, Upper Canada; United Empire Loyalists in Upper and Lower Canada; Black Loyalists in Nova Scotia)”</td>
<td>p. 88: “identify various First Nations and some Métis communities in Upper and Lower Canada from 1780 to 1850, including those living in traditional territory and those who moved or were forced to relocate to new areas in response to European settlement, and locate the areas where they lived, using print, digital, and/or interactive maps or a mapping program (e.g., *the traditional territories of the Anishnawbe around Thunder Bay; Chippewa land in southern Ontario; new Mohawk settlements in the Bay of Quinte area; the tract of land that the Six Nations gave the Mississauga; Métis communities around Lake Huron”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 88: “Look how far west the Scottish settlement in Red River is. I didn’t think settlers lived out there then.”</td>
<td>p. 88: “identify some of the main factors that helped shape the development of settlements in Canada during this period (e.g., the establishment of trading posts based on trade routes and the knowledge of First Nations peoples; navigable lakes and rivers for trade and transportation; climate; proximity to natural resources; the origins of settlers)”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 88: “Why are there a lot of settlements along the St. Lawrence River and the Great Lakes?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 88: “Why would wealthy British settlers want to live near ports and towns?”</td>
<td>p. 88: “What impact did European settlers’ desire to have the best land for their farms have on the location of reserve lands?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 88: “What types of challenges did settlers face as a result of the climate in Upper Canada?”</td>
<td>p.88: “How were the Black Loyalists treated in Nova Scotia?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 89: “describe the impact of some different kinds of settlements (e.g., seasonal settlements of semi-nomadic First Nations, trading posts)”</td>
<td>p. 89: How might a new settlement in the middle of a First Nation’s territory affect how the First Nation used the land during different seasons?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 89: “Who was living in Lower Canada when British Loyalists were given land grants there? What effect did the new settlers have on existing peoples?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 89: “How did men and women in some First Nations work together to ensure the survival of their families?”</td>
<td>p. 89: “What might a child’s responsibilities be in a backwoods settlement?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 89: “How would settlers have divided the chores between men and women, boys and girls?” “What happened to families if the husband/father died or was seriously ill?”</td>
<td>p. 89: “How did settlers in Nova Scotia view the arrival of Black Loyalists?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 89: “Anishnawbe men and boys would hunt. Girls and women gathered nuts, berries, and vegetables. Men, women, and children built the wigwams.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| p. 89: "I think the First Nations people really helped the settlers. They taught them about things like how to make maple syrup and how to make medicine from plants."

| p. 89: “I think the First Nations learned important things from the European settlers. They learned how to use metal for pots and containers, and how to use spices in their cooking.”

| p. 91: “What natural resources are available in the local First Nation community? How have they affected that community?”

<p>| p. 98: “compare social organization (e.g., social classes, general political structure, inherited privilege, the status of women) in two or more early societies (e.g., a slave-owning and a feudal society; a matriarchal First Nation and a society in medieval Asia)” |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p. 98: “What differences were there in the education of men and women in ancient Greece?”</th>
<th>p. 98: “In what ways were the lives of a serf, samurai, and shogun in feudal Japan different? What do those differences tell you about the social organization of that society?”</th>
<th>p. 98: “What were some differences in the position of women in ancient Greece, medieval France, and Haudenosaunee society?”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p. 98: “In what ways were the lives of a serf, samurai, and shogun in feudal Japan different? What do those differences tell you about the social organization of that society?”</td>
<td>p. 98: “compare aspects of the daily lives of different groups in an early society (e.g., the work, family life, education, food, dress, and/or housing of a slave and senator in ancient Rome, women of different castes in medieval India, a serf and lord in feudal England, a man and a woman in medieval China or Mohawk society, or a merchant and noble in Renaissance Italy), and explain how differences were related to the social organization of that society (e.g., the caste system in India; the matriarchal organization of some First Nations; classes in imperial Rome or in feudal societies in Europe or Asia; the emergence of a wealthy merchant class in Renaissance Italy)”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 99: “What agricultural practices did the ancient Greeks use?”</td>
<td>p. 98: “What were some of the games and sports played by the ancient Mayans, ancient Greeks, or precontact First Nations in Canada?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 99: “What were some Celtic seasonal celebrations?”</td>
<td>p. 99: “What farming techniques used by the Mayans and the people of ancient India are still practised by Canadian farmers?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 99: “How would a city in medieval Britain or ancient Rome have dealt with sewage and garbage?”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 99: “Analyse a climate map to determine the climatic challenges facing early settlements”</td>
<td>p. 99: “Which civilization – those along the Nile, those in Mesopotamia, or First Nations in what would become Canada – had the greatest impact on its environment?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 99: “What do the creation stories of a local First Nation tell you about their traditional relationship with the land and with all living things?”</td>
<td>p. 99: “What role did religion play in the daily life of the early Haida or Norse, or in ancient Egypt? In what ways was it connected to the society’s view of and relationship with the environment?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“What do the murals at Bonampak tell us about the life of the Maya?”</td>
<td>“What do the Elgin Marbles show us about ancient Greece?”</td>
<td>“What did you find out about religious beliefs/practices in medieval Japan?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Why did the Wendat make their combs out of bone? What type of bone did they use? Why?”</td>
<td>“What can we learn from the Book of Kells about the importance of religion to the Celts?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“How did the Cree travel during different seasons?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“What types of clothing was worn by the Incas?”</td>
<td></td>
<td>“[What type of clothing was worn by the] medieval Chinese?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Why were the ‘Three Sisters’ so important to some early societies in North America?”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“How did seasonal migration of buffalo affect the lives of plains First Nations in precontact North America?”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 100: “What techniques did the Aztecs develop to allow them to farm on the sides of mountains and hills?”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 100: “What use did early Haida people make of cedar trees?”</td>
<td>p. 101: “describe how two or more early societies were governed (e.g., early democracy in Greece or Haudenosaunee society; city states on the Swahili Coast; emperors in China; the roles of nobles, priests, and the military in Aztec society, of kings, nobles, and knights in medieval France, or of chiefs in the Haida nation)”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 101: “How was the head of the government in ancient Athens chosen?”</td>
<td>p. 101: “What was the role of the emperor or empress in Heian Japan? How did the aristocracy help the emperor rule?”</td>
<td>p. 101: “describe some attempts within early societies to deal with conflict and to establish greater cooperation (e.g., democratic developments in ancient Greece; establishment of religious rights in medieval Islam; matriarchal practices among some North American First Nations…””</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
p. 103: “gather and organize information and data from various sources to investigate issues and challenges associated with balancing human needs/wants and activities with environmental stewardship in one or more of the political and/or physical regions of Canada (e.g., spatial technologies and satellite images showing physical features; print and digital thematic maps showing land use or population; climate graphs for various regions; writer views with peers from different regions using electronic communications; an interview with a First Nation or Inuit Elder or a Métis senator”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p. 104: “In what ways are the powers and responsibilities of a municipality similar to or different from those of a First Nation band or Métis council?”</th>
<th></th>
<th>p. 104: “identify Canada’s provinces and territories and their capital cities, and describe them with reference to their location and some of the peoples who live in them (e.g., New Brunswick, which is in Atlantic Canada, is the only bilingual province and has a large Acadian population; Toronto, which is the capital of Ontario, has a large immigrant population, which includes people from China, South Asia, Europe, and Latin America as well as Aboriginal Canadians; the majority of people in Nunavut, in Arctic Canada, are Inuit)”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p. 104: “identify various types of political regions in Canada (e.g., provinces, territories, municipalities, First Nations bands and reserves), and describe some of their basic similarities and differences (e.g., the powers of a province versus those of a territory)</td>
<td></td>
<td>p. 104: “describe significant opportunities and challenges related to quality of life in some of Canada’s political regions (e.g., job opportunities in Alberta’s booming resource sector; loss of jobs in the fishing industry in Newfoundland and Labrador; pollution generated in the Alberta oil sands; challenges related to employment and housing on First Nations reserves)”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 104: “In what ways are the powers and responsibilities of a municipality similar to or different from those of a First Nation band or Métis council?”</td>
<td>p. 105: “identify Canada’s provinces and territories and their capital cities, and describe them with reference to their location and some of the peoples who live in them (e.g., New Brunswick, which is in Atlantic Canada, is the only bilingual province and has a large Acadian population; Toronto, which is the capital of Ontario, has a large immigrant population, which includes people from China, South Asia, Europe, and Latin America as well as Aboriginal Canadians; the majority of people in Nunavut, in Arctic Canada, are Inuit)”</td>
<td>p. 104: “In Grade 5 social studies, students will learn about key characteristics of various First Nations and European settler communities in New France up to 1713.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 106: “analyse some key short- and long-term consequences of interactions among and between First Nations and European explorers and settlers in New France prior to 1713”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
p. 106: "use the social studies inquiry process to investigate aspects of interactions among and between First Nations and Europeans in Canada prior to 1713 from the perspectives of the various groups involved"

p. 106: describe significant features of and interactions between some of the main communities in Canada prior to 1713, with a particular focus on First Nations and New France"

p. 108: “analyse some key short- and long-term consequences of interactions among and between First Nations and European explorers and settlers in New France prior to 1713”

p. 108: “use the social studies inquiry process to investigate aspects of the interactions among and between First Nations and Europeans in Canada prior to 1713 from the perspectives of the various groups involved”
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p. 108: “describe significant features of and interactions between some of the main communities in Canada prior to 1713, with a particular focus on First Nations and New France”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p. 108: “describe some of the positive and negative consequences of contact between First Nations and Europeans in New France (e.g., with reference to the impact of European diseases on First Nations, the role of First Nations in European exploration, European claims to First Nations territory, intermarriage between First Nations women and European men, the fur trade, competition for land and resources, alliances, European weapons, missionaries), and analyse their significance”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 108: “What were the major consequences for the Wendat of contact with the French?” “If you look at the consequences of interactions between First Nations and Europeans in New France, which were of greatest significance to Europeans? To First Nations? Which are most significant to Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal Canadians in the twenty-first century?” “Why does the assessment of the significance of an event or development depend on the perspective of the group you are considering?”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 108: “analyse aspects of early contact between First Nations and Europeans in New France to determine the ways in which different parties benefited Nations people’s knowledge of medicine, geography, and modes of transportation appropriate for local conditions; the imperial government in France alliances with First Nations, who aided them in their new materials and some of the technologies introduced by Europeans)”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 108: “What are some First Nations items that were adopted by Europeans? What are some European items that were adopted by First Nations?” “What were some of the short- and long-term benefits of the fur trade for both First Nations and Europeans?”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 109: “explain some of the ways in which interactions between and among First Nations and Europeans in New France are connected to issues in present-day Canada (e.g., land claims, treaty rights, environmental stewardship, resource ownership and use)”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 109: “In what ways might the TEK of today’s First Nations, Métis, and/or Inuit people be relevant to an environmental issue such as climate change?”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What were the differences between First Nations and Europeans in New France with respect to views on land use and ownership? How have these differences led to some conflicts in present-day Canada?

Formulate questions to guide investigations into aspects of the interactions among and between First Nations and Europeans in Canada prior to 1713, from the perspectives of the various groups involved (e.g., interactions between groups such as settlers, coureurs de bois, missionaries, Filles du Roi, First Nations women, warriors, and/or shamans, from the points of view of these groups).
p. 109: “In what ways might the relationship between First Nations people and voyageurs or coureurs de bois be different from the relationship between First Nations people and European settlers? What factors might account for some of the differences?” “How did various First Nations people view the European newcomers? What factors might account for the differences in their views?” “How did Europeans tend to view the spiritual belief and practices of First Nations people? Would the view of a coureur de bois ‘up country’ likely be the same as that of a nun or priest in Montreal? Why or why not?”

p. 109: "Gather and organize information on interactions among and between First Nations and Europeans during this period, using a variety of primary and secondary sources that present various perspectives (e.g., treaties, paintings, maps of trade routes, artefacts and their replicas, traditional First Nations and European stories relating to similar themes/events...)"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p. 109: “Where would you locate information about the alliance between Champlain and the Wendat?”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p. 109: “analyse and construct maps as part of their investigations into interactions among and between First Nations and Europeans (e.g., thematic maps showing physical features that or the habitat of animals that sustained the fur trade; historical maps that show First Nations territory at the time of contact or the expansion of New France)”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 109: “What type of map could you construct to show alliances between different First Nations and Britain and France?”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
p. 109: “interpret and analyse information and evidence relevant to their investigations, using a variety of tools (e.g., use a graphic organizer to compare First Nations and European views on nature and resource use; examine the content of journals or diaries to determine how Europeans reacted when meeting and working with First Nations peoples”

p. 109: "What does this account suggest about how Jesuit missionaries viewed the Wendat? About how the Wendat viewed the missionaries?” “How could you use a comparison chart to help you determine differences in the ways various First Nations interacted with Jesuit missionaries?” “How could you use a fishbone organizer to help you analyse information on economic, military, and cultural interactions between the British and the Haudenosaunee?”
p. 110: “evaluate evidence and draw conclusions about aspects of the interactions between and among First Nations and Europeans during this period, highlighting the perspectives of the different groups involved”

p. 110: “From your research, what can you conclude about the relationship between French missionaries and various First Nations? What was the goal of the missionaries? How did they tend to view First Nations people? How might a shaman have viewed the Jesuits? Why?”
p. 110: “identify major First Nations in the Great Lakes–St. Lawrence region and Atlantic Canada at the time of contact with Europeans (e.g., Great Lakes–St. Lawrence region: Abenaki, Algonkin, Haudenosaunee, Ojibwe, Ottawa, Potawatomie, Wendat, Weskarini; Atlantic Canada: Beothuk, Innu, Mi’kmaq, Passamaquoddy, Wolastoqiyik), and describe key characteristics of selected nations (e.g., with respect to language; religious/spiritual beliefs and practices; political organization; food and clothing; roles of men, women, and children)”

p. 110: “communicate the results of their inquiries, using appropriate vocabulary (e.g., Elder, shaman, wampum, pictograph, missionary, charter, coureur de bois, seigneur, Filles du Roi) and formats (e.g., a poem, song, or story that describes the founding of Quebec from two distinct perspectives; an annotated map that shows different perspectives on the growth of the fur trade and resulting settlements; a collection of images they have created themselves, downloaded from websites, and/or taken from printed sources, showing different perspectives on the work of missionaries)”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p. 110: “What was the Haudenosaunee form of government? What role did women play in decision making?” “What types of crops were grown by the Wendat?” “What materials did the Mi’kmaq use to make their garments and moccasins?” “What were some of the spiritual practices of Algonkin people?” “What natural resources did the Innu rely on?” “How did the Potawatomie educate their children?”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p. 110: “describe some significant interactions among First Nations before contact with Europeans (e.g., trade, alliances and treaties, instances of cooperation and conflict)”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 110: “What types of crops were grown by the Wendat?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 110: “describe the main motives for Europeans’ exploration in early Canada and for the establishment of permanent settlements (e.g., with reference to the Norse in Newfoundland and Labrador; the voyages of Cabot, Cartier, and Hudson; settlements founded by de Mons and Champlain; exploration by Étienne Brûlé; the fur trade)”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 110: “What were the differences between Haudenosaunee and Ojibwe housing?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 111: &quot;How did climate and the availability of resources affect the way the Innu lived?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 112: “assess the effectiveness of actions taken by one or more levels of government to address an issue of national, provincial/territorial, and/or local significance (e.g., <em>the effectiveness of the Far North Act in addressing concerns of Inuit and First Nations about development in northern Ontario</em>)”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 113: “What types of policy and action are needed to address the problems facing communities affected by erosion and the melting permafrost in Nunavut?”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
p. 113: “gather and organize a variety of information and data that present various perspectives about Canadian social and/or environmental issues, including the perspective of the level (or levels) of government responsible for addressing the issues (e.g., with respect to the issue of climate change, gather data on sources of carbon dioxide emissions affecting Canada, photographic evidence of melting polar ice and its impact on Inuit (culture) and Arctic wildlife“

p. 114: “describe the jurisdiction of different levels of government in Canada (i.e., federal, provincial, territorial, municipal, First Nation, and Métis governance; the Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami)”

p. 114: ““Why must different levels of government cooperate in addressing Native land claims?”
p. 115: “explain why different groups may have different perspectives on specific social and environmental issues (e.g., why oil industry representatives, farmers, environmentalists, and the Alberta government might differ on development of the oil sands; why the federal government and First Nations band councils might have different perspectives on housing problems on reserves)”

---

p. 120: “evaluate some of the contributions that various ethnic and/or religious groups have made to Canadian identity (e.g., the contributions of First Nations to Canadian art, of French and English communities to the development of Canada as a bilingual country, of the British to the Canadian parliamentary system, of Chinese labourers to the construction of the transcontinental railway, of Irish and Italian workers to the development of canal systems on the Great Lakes, of various communities to Canada’s multicultural identity)”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Question/Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>“Who are the founding nations of Canada? For whom is the concept of ‘founding nations’ troubling? Why?” “In what ways is the Canadian system of government similar to that of Great Britain? What accounts for the similarities? Do you think Canada’s status as a constitutional monarchy is important to our identity as Canadians? Why or why not?” “In what ways have South Asians or East Asians contributed to Canada and Canadian identity?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>“What are some of the actions that have been taken by First Nations individuals or organizations to improve the status of First Nations people in Canadian society?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>“explain how various groups have contributed to the goal of inclusiveness in Canada (e.g., the efforts of women’s rights, civil rights, First Nations, or labour organizations, or of advocacy organizations for immigrants, disabled people, or various religious or ethnic groups)”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 121: “Why did some people think Louis Riel was a hero while others thought he was a traitor?”</td>
<td>p. 121: “Why was the Chinese head tax created? What was the thinking of the government that imposed it? How did the policy affect Chinese immigrants to Canada and their families in China?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 121: “What type of information can you gather from the petitions and letters of First Nations, Métis, and Inuit people about their experience of and perspectives on being relocated to reserves and/or new settlements? What other types of sources should you consult for information on the perspectives of these people? For other people’s perspectives?”</td>
<td>p. 121: “Why might photographs be a good source if you are investigating the internment of Japanese Canadians?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 121: &quot;analyse and construct print and digital maps as part of their investigations into different perspectives on the historical and/or contemporary experience of communities in Canada relocation of First Nations, Métis, and/or Inuit communities...&quot;</td>
<td>p. 121: “What does this thematic map tell you about the land granted to Black Loyalists?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 121: “interpret and analyse information and evidence relevant to their investigations, using a variety of tools (e.g., use a graphic organizer to help them determine differences in perspectives of participants in the Red River Resistance or North-West Rebellion”</td>
<td>p. 122: “What do the Grand Pré paintings tell you about the expulsion of the Acadians? Whose perspective do you think is conveyed in these paintings? Why?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 122: &quot;identify the main reasons why different peoples came to Canada (e.g., political or religious freedom; political allegiances; available land; economic opportunity; family ties; poverty, famine, or political unrest in their country of origin; forced migration of slaves and “Home Children”)”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 122: “What reasons did various people have for immigrating to New France?” “Why did so many people from Ireland come to Quebec and Ontario in the middle of the nineteenth century?” “Who were the ‘Home Children’? Why did they come to Canada?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 122: “How did the system of land ownership in France influence land-owning practices in New France/Quebec?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 122: “What are the sources of traditional folk music in Atlantic Canada?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 122: “identify various types of communities that have contributed to the development of Canada (e.g., the founding peoples – First Nations, Inuit, and Métis, French, British; later immigrant groups such as Chinese, Germans, Scandinavians, South Asians, Caribbean peoples; religious communities; economic communities such as resource towns; workers and labour organizations; rural and urban communities)”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>“What impact did the residential school experience have on First Nations families and communities?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>“What was Africville? What impact did its demolition have on its residents?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>“Describe significant events or developments in the history of two or more communities in Canada (e.g., First Nations: arrival of European explorers and settlers, the fur trade, the reserve system, the Indian Act, residential schools; French Canadians: expulsion of the Acadians, loss of the Battle of the Plains of Abraham; Japanese: forced relocation during World War II, the apology for this action from the federal government in 1988; Germans: religious freedom for Mennonite immigrants, the renaming of Berlin, Ontario, to Kitchener during World War I) and how these events affected the communities’ development and/or identity”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
p. 122-123: “describe interactions between communities in Canada, including between newcomers and groups that were already in the country (e.g., trade among precontact First Nations; cooperation between First Nations and the French and British; Protestants in Ontario or white and Asian residents in British Columbia; racism directed at Black settlers in Nova Scotia and southern Ontario; responses of local businesses...”

p. 123: "How did white residents of Canada tend to view the arrival of immigrants from Asia in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries?"

p. 123: “In what ways are Queen Elizabeth II and the monarchy connected to Canada and Canadian identity?”

p. 123: “identify key differences, including social, cultural, and/or economic differences, between two or more historical and/or contemporary communities in Canada (e.g., differences in gender roles between First Nations and French settlers in early Canada...”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p. 124: “explain why Canada participates in specific international accords and organizations (e.g., the North American Free Trade Agreement [NAFTA]; World Health Organization [WHO]; the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO]; the United Nations [UN], including the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People and/or the Convention on the Rights of the Child)”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p. 125: &quot;gather and organize information on global issues of political, social, economic, and/or environmental importance, including their impact and responses to them, using a variety of resources and various technologies (e.g., use spatial technologies, satellite images, and/or online image banks as part of their investigation into the diminishing of ocean reef life; gather accounts by Inuit and northern First Nations witnesses to the effects of climate change)”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
p. 126: “describe Canada’s participation in different international accords, organizations, and/or programs (e.g., the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, the WHO, NATO, the Blue Flag Program, UNICEF, NAFTA)”

p. 126: describe several groups or organizations through which Canada and Canadians are involved in global issues (e.g., NGOs such as Doctors Without Borders, Free the Children, Ryan’s Well, World Wide Fund for Nature; multinational corporations; intergovernmental organizations such as the UN, la Francophonie, the Commonwealth…

p. 126: “describe the responses of the Canadian government and some NGOs to different disasters and emergencies around the world (e.g., the 2010 earthquake in Haiti; the 2004 tsunami in the Indian Ocean; the AIDS pandemic in sub-Saharan Africa or another health crisis; poverty and drought in the Horn of Africa)”

p. 126: Stephen Lewis (Canadian)

p. 126: identify some significant political, social, and economic interactions between Canada and other regions of the world, and describe some ways in which they affect these regions (e.g., the stabilization of regions resulting from Canada’s peacekeeping efforts; the development of maquiladoras as a result of trade agreements, change in the status of women as a result of education projects in a developing region)
| p. 127: “What are some of the countries that are members of the Commonwealth of Nations and la Francophonie?” | p. 127: identify and locate on a map countries and regions with which Canada has a significant interrelationship, and use longitude and latitude to locate cities in these countries/regions (e.g., Washington, D.C., London, Beijing, Tokyo, Mogadishu, Nairobi, Tripoli, Mumbai, Kabul, Port-au-Prince) | p. 127: identify countries/regions with which Canada has a significant economic relationship (e.g., the relationship with the United States and Mexico through NAFTA; trade relations with China; sources of tourists to Canada and/or destinations of Canadians travelling internationally; Canadian investments overseas; recipients of Canadian aid)” |
p. 127: “describe some ways in which Canada’s interactions with other regions of the world have affected the environment (e.g., the impact of Canada’s participation in the African tree-planting campaign of the United Nations Environment Programme; the proliferation of invasive species in the Great Lakes as a result of international trade/transportation; over-farming and loss of production for local markets as a result of Canadians’ desire for cheap cotton, sugar, cocoa, and tea)”