Looking inward / looking outward: Experiences of White teacher candidates encountering civic education, social justice, and anti-racist pedagogy in two Canadian teacher education programs

Jennifer Bergen

Thesis submitted to the University of Ottawa
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
Doctor of Philosophy in Education

Faculty of Education
University of Ottawa

© Jennifer Bergen, Ottawa, Canada, 2020

Abstract

In teacher education, critical civic education and anti-racist education are often disconnected in practice, despite increasing overlap in theorizing and goals: to resist and dismantle the settler colonial realities of education, to promote working for social justice, and to challenge racist and White supremacist structures. This comparative case study examined how White teacher candidates' civic, social justice, and anti-racist knowledge development during Bachelor of Education foundations courses affected their pedagogical growth. Through surveys, co-researcher observations, and focus groups conducted at research sites in Saskatchewan and Ontario, the study examined how teacher candidates understood their positionalities within societal structures, and how their understandings of structural injustice affected their pedagogical choices. Building from a postcolonial global citizenship education conceptual framework, the study engaged with Critical Race Theory and Critical Whiteness Studies in order to situate the findings in White settler colonial contexts. Findings indicate that the degree to which teacher candidates were aware of their own positionality influenced their understandings of structural injustice, and their confidence (or not) with anti-racist pedagogy. In the areas of civic engagement, racism, and Whiteness, the re-inscription of individualistic discourses and rejection of structural discourses was pervasive, and teacher candidates resisted self-implication in historical and ongoing settler colonialism and White supremacy. However, access to alternative conceptual frameworks for understanding the social construction of identities and structural determinism were somewhat effective at tackling meritocratic discourses. The study affirms the need for scaffolded anti-racist/anti-oppressive education in teacher education programs and discusses the necessity for teacher candidates to understand their own positionalities in context.

Keywords: Civic education, global citizenship education, anti-racism, anti-racist education, teacher education, comparative case study, Critical Whiteness Studies, Ontario, Saskatchewan

Acknowledgements

I would not have been able to navigate these past six years without the love of my family. Kathy, Gary, Jon, and Michelle: you supported me in every way imaginable, and your belief in the importance of education motivated me to complete this journey – thank you.

My sincerest thank you to my advisor, Dr. Lorna McLean: from the beginning of the Interim Report process to the completion of this Ph.D., your unwavering mentorship made this dissertation possible. Thank you for your patience, brilliance, and support through these learning processes. The way that you facilitate projects, research teams, and a sense of community will remain with me throughout my career. Thank you for your commitment and care.

A heartfelt thank you to my dissertation committee, Dr. Cook, Dr. Kane, Dr. Ng-A-Fook, and Dr. Stanley, and course professors Dr. Ibrahim and Dr. Alvi: you pushed my thinking, engaged me in teaching and research, and provided guidance in securing funding. How lucky I am to have met such stimulating and supportive people – thank you.

Thank you also to all those special supports who made this endeavor possible:

The amazing relationships that began in Ottawa; Alanna, Darren, Heather, Jeff, Katrina, R.J., everyone I met through feminist book club, and all the Next Up folks: you inspire me through your passions and commitment to justice, your humour, and your love.

My dear, and long-time friend Karen McIver, for learning with me through the years, challenging me to think critically about teaching, and for your loving and adventurous spirit.

My wonderful pals Krystal, Nathaniel, Annelies, Genevieve, Kristy, Julia, and Sean: you have always included me, inspired me, and made me laugh from afar. I'm so lucky to know you all.

Dr. Marc Spooner, without whom it never would have occurred to me to pursue a Ph.D. Thank you for patiently answering my questions and encouraging me every step of the way.

The colleagues I was fortunate to learn with, especially the Critical Research Collective.

The teacher candidates that made teaching my first courses such a true pleasure, and the research participants that willingly shared their experiences.

All of the queer, trans, and non-binary people I have ever met, for showing me the way.

My neighbors and garden on Hawthorne Avenue, and of course, my wonderful labrador, McCoy, whose shared love of walks and snacks got me through.

Finally, this work was made possible through a Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council Doctoral Fellowship, and many other generous scholarships and grants.

Table of Contents

Abstract ..... **ii**
Acknowledgements ..... **iii**
Table of Contents ..... **iv**
List of Tables ..... **viii**
Chapter One: Introduction **1**
Rationale 3
Politics of Self 6
Critical Race Theory and Critical Whiteness Studies 8
Research Questions 9
Politics of Language 12
Dissertation Structure 16
Chapter Two: Literature Review **18**
Relational Concepts Review 19
Citizenship, Settler Colonialism, and Race 19
Whiteness 24
Racism(s) 25
Civic Education 26
Global Citizenship Education 29
Postcolonial Global Citizenship Education 32
Anti-oppressive and Anti-racist Education 35
Representative Empirical Review 38
K-12 Civic Education Curricula 38
K-12 Civics Classroom Pedagogy 42
Teacher Education 44
Civic / Global Citizenship Education Foundations Courses 45
Anti-oppressive / Anti-racist Education Foundations Courses 51
Chapter Three: Theoretical & Conceptual Frameworks **60**
Philosophical Assumptions 60
Theoretical Orientation 60
Critical Race Theory 64
Critical Whiteness Studies 67
Conceptual Framework 72

Chapter Four: Methodology ... 77
Project Design ... 77
Participants and Procedure ... 81
Ontario Site ... 81
Saskatchewan Site ... 83
Data Collection ... 84
Online Pre- and Post-course Surveys ... 85
Online Co-researcher Observations ... 86
Focus Groups ... 87
Document Analysis ... 89
Research Journal for Direct Observations ... 89
Data Analysis ... 90
Validation Strategies ... 94
Chapter Five: Ontario Site Context ... 96
Provincial Discourses ... 96
Provincial Educational Discourses ... 97
Civic Education Discourses ... 101
Research Site ... 103
Chapter Six: Ontario Findings ... 109
Broad Area: Civic Awareness and Action ... 110
Theme 1: Individualistic Understandings of Civic Engagement ... 111
Theme 2: Aspirational Civic Involvement ... 113
Broad Area: Knowledge ... 115
Theme 3: Meritocracy and Social Justice ... 115
Theme 4: Anti-racism and Overconfidence ... 117
Theme 5: Settler Colonialism ... 119
Broad Area: Future Pedagogy ... 122
Theme 6: “If we’re allowed”: Overwhelmed and Unsure ... 122
Theme 7: Perceived Subject Area Restrictions and “that’s just not me” ... 124
Theme 8: “Give me some tools to solve problems” ... 126
Broad Area: Positionality ... 127
Theme 9: ‘Desire-Not-to-Know’ and Maintenance of Innocence ... 128
Theme 10: ‘White Talk’ and Resistance ... 129
Summary of Ontario Site Findings ... 132

Chapter Seven: Saskatchewan Site Context ... 134
Provincial Discourses ... 134
Provincial Education Discourses ... 138
Civic Education Discourses ... 141
Research Site ... 143
Chapter Eight: Saskatchewan Findings ... 147
Broad Area: Civic Awareness and Action ... 148
Theme 1: Systemic Concerns, Individual Actions ... 148
Theme 2: Teaching as Political ... 150
Broad Area: Knowledge ... 152
Theme 3: Social Construction of Identities ... 152
Theme 4: System-based Understandings ... 155
Theme 5: Analytical Frameworks ... 157
Broad Area: Purpose of the Course ... 159
Theme 6: Looking Inward vs. Outward: Desire for Teaching Strategies ... 159
Theme 7: Changing the Way We Think ... 160
Broad Area: Future Pedagogy ... 162
Theme 8: Aspirational Teaching for Social Justice ... 163
Theme 9: "It isn't my place" ... 164
Broad Area: Positionality ... 165
Theme 10: Diversity Discourse: Saying the 'Right' Thing ... 166
Theme 11: Resistance ... 167
Summary of Saskatchewan Site Findings ... 169
Chapter Nine: Discussion ... 172
Conceptual Framework ... 173
Problems that Civic Engagement Should Address ... 174
Justifications for Educational Inequality ... 176
Justifications for Positionality ... 178
Understandings of Race, Racism, and Settler Colonialism ... 180
Beliefs about Whiteness and White Supremacy ... 182
Personal Responsibility ... 184
Summary of Perspectives on the Research Questions ... 186
1. Civic Engagement & Positionality ... 188
2. Anti-racist Coursework, Structural Injustice, and Pedagogy ... 190

3. Education Foundations & Teacher Candidates' Identities 193
Chapter Ten: Conclusion 196
Summary of Project 196
Key Findings 197
Contributions 201
Contributions to Civic and Global Citizenship Teacher Education 201
Contributions to Anti-racist Teacher Education 203
Contributions to Education Foundations 204
Contributions to My Pedagogical Praxis 205
Limitations 206
Further Research 207
Final Thoughts on Process and Content 209
References 211
Appendices 255
Appendix A - Soft versus Critical Global Citizenship Education Spectrum 255
Appendix B - Consent Form 257
Appendix C - Pre-course Survey and Post-course Survey Questions 259
Appendix D - Co-researcher Observation Prompts 262
Appendix E - Focus Group Questions 263

List of Tables

Table 1. Conceptual Framework 76
Table 2. Ontario Site Themes 110
Table 3. Summary of Ontario Site Findings 133
Table 4. Saskatchewan Site Themes 147
Table 5. Summary of Saskatchewan Site Findings 171
Table 6. Summary of Findings by Research Question 186

Chapter One: Introduction

The rise in interest and research concerning civic education in Canada and internationally (Evans et al., 2019; Hébert, 2002; Hughes et al., 2010; Sears, 2014) has been accompanied by research and advocacy for global, critical, postcolonial, and social justice-oriented forms of civic education (Abdi et al., 2015; Andreotti & de Souza, 2012; Johnson & Morris, 2010; Leonardo & Vafi, 2016; Pashby, 2012; Peterson et al., 2016; Stein & Andreotti, 2016). Civic education is often cited as one of the primary rationales for publicly funded schooling in so-called Western democracies, where students learn about civic responsibility and, in particular, about the values required to promote self-determination amongst a nation's citizens (Dewey, 1916; 1938). Many justice-oriented, anti-oppressive, and anti-racist scholars and educators, however, are critical of the ways that public schools in Canada continue to uphold and promote uncritical engagement with White supremacist, settler colonial government structures (Battiste & Semaganis, 2002; Leonardo, 2002). Educators and theorists ask what civic education could look like that resists and dismantles the settler colonial legacy of education (Abdi et al., 2015; Andreotti & de Souza, 2012; Battiste, 2013; Pashby, 2012; Pashby et al., 2020), promotes social justice in civic education (Leonardo & Vafai, 2016; Peterson et al., 2016), and challenges White supremacist educational and societal structures during this process (Leonardo, 2002; 2013).

Normative goals of civic education have long been debated, as citizenship and civic engagement are themselves evolving concepts (Osborne, 2003; 2006). However, the proliferation of debates during the last two decades (2000-2020) in the civic education field have been attributed to a number of external factors. While some argue that increased attention is the result of the rise in globalization (Yemini, 2017), others contend that the rise in interest in civic education is the result of increased rhetoric in democratic nations over the perceived decline in

civic participation, particularly amongst youth (Hughes et al., 2010). These rationales are both pieces of the larger puzzle, symptomatic of the primary impetus for increased debates over the role of citizens and civic education – the neoliberalization of capitalist economies, and the monetization and extension of profit-driven logics to both conceptualizations of citizenship (Isin, 2008) and public education (Chomsky, 2018; Giroux, 2002). Under neoliberalism, the diminished role of citizens in political decision making necessarily accompanies the individualistic emphasis facilitated through increasingly consumer-driven spaces, where citizen action is conflated with consumer action (Peters, 2012). In addition, changes in the way that resources are distributed under neoliberal policies, including through decreased federal and provincial public education funding, and through the increased imposition of profit-models and capital-based metrics to higher education institutions (Spooner & McNinch, 2018) and to teacher education (Phelan et al., 2020), have uneven effects on particular groups of people – notably those who are already experiencing the oppressive effects of economic, educational, and political systems. Lund and Carr (2018) emphasize that "neoliberalism enhances racial (and other) cleavages that are necessary for *economic growth* and *wealth accumulation* for the few at the expense of the many" (p. 194, emphasis in original). As a result of policies of underfunding, the way that schools teach about civic engagement, the discourses and practices of teachers, how teachers are trained, and how civic education curricula are conceptualized and produced are deeply affected by this economic/ideological shift (Kennelly, 2009; Kennelly & Llewellyn, 2011; Phelan et al., 2020; Wilkinson, 2007).

Advocates of postcolonial and social justice-oriented civic education stress that in order for civic education to address its White supremacist roots, and to respond to the increasing inequality caused by neoliberalism, educators must move beyond these economic- and state-

centered forms of engagement; instead of asking if students *should* be engaging with issues of social justice, they argue that civic education should be asking *how* students could engage with pressing social and environmental justice issues (Andreotti, 2006; Peterson et al., 2016; Shultz, 2018). Reid et al. (2010) assert that there are three components to discussing this question: the structure, funding, and supports accorded by the state for civic education; the formal civics curricula (including the knowledge skills, and values assumed needed for participation); and the culture and processes that teach these curricula (pedagogical choices, relationships between students and teachers, classroom and school structures). When looking at formal civics curricula, some social studies and civic education curricular documents in Canada have become somewhat more critical over the years (Bickmore, 2006; 2008; Sears, 1994; Sears & Hughes, 1996; Watters, 2007), yet others continue to contain contradictory conceptions of social justice (Bergen & McLean, 2014; Shultz, 2007; Young, 2010), and privilege Eurocentric knowledge through marginalizing representations of Indigenous histories (Butler et al., 2015). In practice, teachers also continue to emphasize state-centered procedural knowledge (Evans, 2006; Llewellyn et al., 2010; Watters, 2007) and engagement *within* existing political and social structures.

Rationale

The release of the Calls to Action of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) of Canada stressed the need for teachers, in particular, to interrogate historical and ongoing settler colonialism in educational contexts (TRC, 2015b, p. 331). Educators, and the post-secondary programs that train new teachers, are being called to take seriously their responsibility to teach, and prepare to teach, in anti-racist and anticolonial ways, including about the history of the attempted and ongoing genocide of Indigenous Peoples in ‘Canada’ (NIMMIWG, 2019; Starblanket, 2018), and this task is increasingly “emerging as a priority for the Canadian

education system" (Brandt-Birioukov et al., 2020, p. 40). Speaking about these Calls to Action, Lamoureux (2018) reiterated that the process of reconciliation is not 'for' Indigenous Peoples, but that reconciliation is a path for *non-Indigenous* people: to learn the true history of 'Canada' and to endeavor to repair relationships, through supporting the resurgence efforts and calls for sovereignty by Indigenous Peoples.

Given that new teachers are frequently tasked with teaching civics courses in high schools (Milner & Lewis, 2011), and that conceptions of citizenship represented in curricula vary widely (Bickmore, 2006; Butler et al., 2015; Journel, 2010; Sears, 1994; Shultz, 2007; Young, 2010), investigating how White teacher candidates navigate learning about social justice, civic engagement, and their own racial positionality in teacher education programs is an important part of a much larger effort to understand how to close an identified gap between theory and practice (Evans et al., 2009), enabling K-12 civic educators to keep pace with the more critical theorizing in the field of postcolonial and justice-oriented civic education.

Teachers own identities (Chin & Barber, 2010; McLean & Truong-White, 2016), racial consciousness (Aitken, 2020; Levine-Rasky, 2000b; Solomon et al., 2005), and civic knowledge all influence how civic education is taught (Cone, 2012; Journell, 2013; Milner & Lewis, 2011; McLean et al., 2008; Solomon et al., 2005; Urrieta & Reidel, 2008). Solomon et al. (2005) argue that teacher candidates' understandings of democracy and citizenship are "intricately linked to discourses of race, racialization and belongingness" (p. 148). Urrieta and Reidel (2008) similarly argue that without an analysis of social positioning, White preservice teachers normalize citizenship engagement that upholds White, middle-class ideals. Postcolonial and anti-racist educators emphasize that teacher education programs must enable students to understand their own social positioning in relation to inequitable power structures, in order to forge ethical

relationships as a basis for civic action across identity groups (Andreotti, 2010; Dion, 2007; St. Denis, 2007). In addition, understanding social positioning can foster belonging to a place while decoupling civic engagement from the colonial state apparatuses that many civic actions uphold (Abdul-Jabbar, 2015; Strong-Boag, 2002; Woons, 2014). An emphasis on race and deconstructing Whiteness (both as social constructions and material realities), in teacher education programs is not only integral to the process of cultivating informed, ethical civic education practices that attend to cultural and racial identities in settler colonial contexts (Leonardo, 2002; Leonardo & Vafi, 2016; Urrieta & Reidel, 2008), but also to mitigate the effects of the historical and continued supremacy of Whiteness in education (Leonardo, 2013; Stanley, 2011). Solomon et al. (2005) note that "the continued failure to implicate whiteness in discussions of societal change enables the teacher candidates to effectively remove themselves from the change process, thereby re-entrenching the normalcy and centrality of whiteness and white reality systems" in education, and broader society (p. 158).

Interrogating White supremacy and positionality in teacher education training is particularly significant, given the racialization of teachers in Canada. The "continued over-representation of white, female, middle class and heterosexual bodies within [teaching] faculties clearly belies the increased minority representation in the schools" (Solomon et al., 2005, p. 149). In 2006, just 7% of teachers across Canada identified as belonging to a visible minority group, which was significantly lower than the 16% visible minority population in the country at that time (Ryan et al., 2009). Ten years later, in the 2016 Census, the number of visible minority students (ages 5 to 24) rose to 27%, defined problematically as "persons, other than Aboriginal peoples, who are non-Caucasian in race or non-white in colour" (Statistics Canada, 2016f). In 2016, 7% of the school aged population identified as Indigenous, including First Nations, Métis,

and Inuit (Statistics Canada, 2016f). Together, these two groups account for over a third (34%) of the school aged population in Canada. Meanwhile, the percentage of teachers and educators who identified as visible minorities in 2016 was merely 11% (Statistics Canada, 2016g), with only 4% of teachers identifying as Indigenous (Statistics Canada, 2016e), leaving approximately 85% of the teaching force who identified as 'Caucasian' or 'White in colour'. In the 2017-18 school year, 76% of elementary and secondary educators in Canada also identified as women, with this number rising to 84% when looking exclusively at elementary schools (Statistics Canada, 2018). These statistics, exemplifying the Whiteness of the teaching force, are echoed in the United States (Sleeter, 2017) and England (Miller, 2016), and illuminate the structural chasm that exists between visible minority and Indigenous students and teachers.

The gap between Indigenous and visible minority teachers and students is not only significant in number. As Dei (2001) asserts, the need for diverse instruction and anti-racist education should not only be seen as a demographic issue, but must also attend to the structural power dynamics that these demographics represent. Dei (2001) argues that White people need anti-racist education, not only because it benefits them, or because Indigenous people and people of color demand it, but because "it lessens the likelihood that whites will endorse a political and social system that perpetuates white nationalism" (p. 150).

Politics of Self

The overlapping axis of my positionality are important to this work. I am a White, able-bodied, queer, non-binary person who holds Canadian citizenship, has settler ancestry, and speaks English as a first language. I grew up in a working-class, Christian household in a small town in Saskatchewan, on the borderlands of the Treaty Four and Treaty Six territories. Although I do not believe that living in a certain type of body produces a certain type of politics or

analysis, these different positional axes give me insights into how unjust societal structures are maintained – in particular, how Whiteness operates in my favor. My interest in doing this research stemmed from previously doing social and environmental justice civic education work with primarily White youth, through public school systems and through non-profit organizations. Throughout my Ph.D. process, I have continued this work at the pre-service teacher level; working on teams that planned and facilitated workshops and programs with teacher candidates around civic engagement. To produce this dissertation, however, means that I now actively benefit from this work and from the critiques that I am making, in particular those of Whiteness and being "the one who 'knows' whiteness" (Ellsworth, 1997, p. 265). If I do not implicate and critique Whiteness in my work, I benefit from being the "unmarked, unraced, unspoken norm" (Ellsworth, 1997, p. 265), and contribute to reproducing the ideological and discursive systems that I seek to disrupt. The reality of what Ellsworth (1997) calls the 'double bind of Whiteness' is that White people will benefit either way. As a racialized White person with settler ancestry, my positionality within the systems of White supremacy and settler colonialism calls for the task of working to educate and enlist other White and/or settler people in supporting the ongoing anti-racist, postcolonial, and decolonial work of scholars and educators who are calling for such labor from White educators (Aveling, 2004; James, 2007; Leonardo, 2002; Pete et al., 2013; St. Denis, 2007). As Oluo (2017) stated, "if Black people could end racism, we would have ended racism. We have died trying to end systemic racism. I need you [White people] to do the work in your community". Similarly, St. Denis (2007) has called for non-Indigenous educators in the context of settler colonial Canada to engage with a critical race analysis and critical anti-racism in their work, in order to "provide a foundation to forge alliances between diverse Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal communities in a common search for social justice in education" (p. 1070). James

(2007) has also urged that, "ultimately, if racism is to be addressed, and indeed eliminated, the consistent, concerted and sustained efforts and actions of White people are necessary" (p. 129).

Critical Race Theory and Critical Whiteness Studies

Although a more detailed account of my approach will be described in the theoretical and conceptual frameworks chapter, I wanted to preface the study with some initial descriptions of my theoretical positioning. My own racialization as a White person affected every aspect of this study. My choice of topic, the questions I asked and, in particular, how these questions are framed, all stem from my onto-epistemological positioning, and a responsibility to respond to calls for White educators and researchers to use a critical race analysis in their work. The principles of Critical Race Theory (CRT) guided my research project choices (Gillborn, 2006; Leonardo, 2013). The counter-narratives and mentorship of Black and Indigenous educators, and educators of colour, informed how I framed the research questions. My choice to study Whiteness in teacher education, and to analyze my data with a conceptual framework that looks at both critical civic education and Whiteness, is intended to confront the endemic nature of race and racism in the structuring of education (Sleeter, 2001; 2004; 2017). This choice is to study 'up' in White supremacist educational structures, by focusing on the root of the problem – how the ideology of Whiteness is reproduced and maintained, and what my own role is in perpetuating this ideology (Levine-Rasky, 2000a). In doing so, my intent is to disrupt the trend of White academics over-studying minoritized groups, or studying 'down' in education structures, constructing the groups being oppressed by White supremacy as the problem.

The 'problems' in schools that minoritized students face are often attributed "to the challenges in implementing culturally sensitive pedagogy (the space between 'us' and 'them') rather than to the workings of the dominant culture itself" (Levine-Rasky, 2000a, p. 272). This

study focusses on the 'us' side of the equation: Whiteness and justice-oriented civic education. By repositioning the gaze towards the dominant White culture in teacher education via Critical Whiteness Studies (CWS), I am continuing the problematization of "whiteness as active participant in systems of domination rather than of racialized difference as effect of domination" (Levine-Rasky, 2000b, pp. 263-264). This approach asserts that the 'racial achievement gap' exists, not because of any failure on the part of minoritized students, but due to the pedagogical failings and continued participation in structural racism in education by White educators (Diamond & Lewis, 2015; Ladson-Billings, 1998).

Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to engage teacher candidates in Bachelor of Education programs at public universities in Canada to reflect on their positionalities, and to understand how these positionalities might affect the conceptions of civic education that they facilitate in their future classrooms. It weaves together goals from civic education, anti-racist education, and social justice education, in hopes that more relational connections can be made between and among these fields in practice. At their core, both anti-racist education and critical forms of civic education ask whether our actions as White educators and civic actors seek to *dismantle* systems of White supremacy, settler colonialism, cisheteropatriarchy, and neoliberalism, or inherently *uphold* these systems. McIntyre (1997) poses the following questions to White teachers who wish to engage in anti-racist education and action:

> How do we, as white teachers, become more self-reflective? How do we learn to acknowledge our own sense of ourselves as racial beings actively participating in the education of young people? How are we to take action *against* discriminatory educational practices and take action *for* liberatory educational practices? (McIntyre, 1997, p. 14, emphasis in original)

Through these questions, McIntyre clearly links anti-racism with self-reflexivity and taking action. Theorizing in the fields of anti-racist, anti-oppressive, and decolonial civic education affirm the necessity of these connections (Abdi et al., 2015; Andreotti, & de Souza, 2012; Davies et al., 2018; Harshman et al., 2015; Shultz et al., 2011). In practice, however, these areas of work are less connected, with empirical research typically being conducted in anti-racist education *or* civic education (there are, of course, exceptions – see Solomon et al., 2005).

I chose teacher education programs in Ontario and Saskatchewan as research sites, based on my own contextual understandings of these two provinces' histories with civic education and justice issues, and due to the specific anti-racist and social justice work taking place in education foundations courses at the research site universities. While civic education is often taught in social studies courses, in both provinces' curricula, civic education is positioned as holistic rather than subject area-specific. In Ontario, Kindergarten through Grade 12 curricula in most subject areas contain a citizenship education framework (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2013a; 2013b), goals related to "active participation as world citizens" (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2006, p. 4), or sections on cross curricular and integrated learning that encourages student engagement (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2005; 2019b). Similarly, in all Saskatchewan curricular documents, there are sections that describe how each particular subject area contributes to building engaged citizens as a broad area of learning (Saskatchewan Ministry of Education, 2008; 2009; 2010a), and how each subject area will contribute to the cross curricular competency of developing social responsibility in students (Saskatchewan Ministry of Education, 2008; 2009; 2010b).

For these reasons, instead of looking at only social science methods courses at the two research sites, I wanted to understand what teacher candidates who were not, necessarily,

studying to be social studies teachers were learning about civic engagement, social justice, and anti-racism. If civic education and anti-racism are taught in overlapping ways, education foundations courses in teacher education are where the conceptual and practical implications of civic education and social justice-based topics are typically explored (Kerr et al., 2011). Education foundations courses are also typically mandatory, whereas only social studies teachers take social studies methods courses (even then, there is no assurance that social studies methods courses will address civic education, anti-racism, and social justice in substantive ways).

During their progression through their education foundations courses, I was interested in hearing how teacher candidates defined civic agency, social justice, and anti-racism, and how they imagined their own roles as future educators based on their positionality, in particular if their identities were based in ideologies of Whiteness. Concurrently, I studied how teacher candidates' knowledge, skills, and values concerning structural injustice and civic education evolved over the duration the semester. My study investigated three questions:

1. How do teacher candidates conceptualize civic engagement in relation to their own positionalities as the result of educational foundations courses?
2. How does justice-oriented or anti-racist coursework contribute to teacher candidates' understandings of structural injustice and their perceived future pedagogical choices?
3. How does the course content influence teacher candidates' own identities?

My methodological approach follows the assertion that, since civic education, global citizenship education, and anti-racist education are all shifting, context-specific pedagogies, asking similar questions in two different research contexts would yield different insights. For this reason, I employed a comparative case study approach (Yin, 2009; 2014), which seeks to study a phenomenon in two in-depth contexts. Using this approach, findings can be analyzed in context,

and compared across contexts. The data that emerged from these two case studies allowed me to better understand the gaps between justice-oriented civic education theory and teacher candidates learning about these in practice, and to make linkages between civic education and anti-racist education based on the through-lines of the data at both sites.

Politics of Language

Many of the language choices I have made are informed by calls to unsettle and problematize specific dominant discursive patterns. Several of the concepts I work with are described in the literature review, conceptual framework, and context chapters, but I wanted to preface this work by providing background for why I am using particular language. Language changes over time, and the ways that I use language in the dissertation are specific to the current socio-political context and my own schemas. Specifically, I will briefly describe here how I understand positionality, settler colonialism, settler, Whiteness, White people, cisheteropatriarchy, and social justice. During the progression of the dissertation, I will typically refer to the land on the northern part of Turtle Island as ‘Canada’, or ‘the land currently known as Canada’, in an effort to problematize the centrality of the settler colonial nation state in both civic education discourses and discourses more broadly.

In this dissertation, I use ‘positionality’ to refer to the relative position that an individual’s identities (sex, racialization, class, sexual orientation, ability, religion, gender, legal status) afford them based on societal structuring. Whether these axes of identity are self-identifications or ascriptions, they are made relevant through the discourses that create and maintain unequal structures in order to benefit groups of people. These discourses not only govern daily interactions, but also dictate whose ideological and ontological systems are reinforced and assumed to be ‘natural’. Positionalities determine our ability (or inability) to

access resources and the extent to which self-determination is possible within unjust systems. These relative positions in society matter because of the consequences, violence, marginalization, and oppression that certain systems precipitate. Positionalities also matter, significantly, when individuals are considering how to use resources in the service of anti-oppressive education and anti-racist civic action.

As an example, in the system of settler colonialism, certain positionalities benefit from the maintenance of settler colonial structures, while the logics of settler colonialism seek to violently erase others. Wolfe (1999) explains that, for Indigenous Peoples in a settler colonial structure "where survival is a matter of not being assimilated, positionality is not just central to the issue – it *is* the issue (p. 3, emphasis in original). Arvin et al. (2013) describe that:

> Settler colonialism and patriarchy are structures, not events … settler colonialism is a persistent social and political formation in which newcomers/colonizers/settlers come to a place, claim it as their own, and do whatever it takes to disappear the Indigenous peoples that are there. Within settler colonialism, it is exploitation of land that yields supreme value. (p. 12)

Razack (2002) asserts that what is currently known as Canada is an example of 'White' settler colonialism, which has its own logics, and that the process of continuous dispossession of Indigenous Peoples is done through the maintenance of racial hierarchical structures (social, economic, legal, education, governance, etc.) put in place by conquering White Europeans. The structural beneficiaries of settler colonialism in 'Canada', then, are also beneficiaries of 'Western' White supremacist structures. These compounding factors also manifest differently in different parts of the country, which I briefly navigate in the context chapters.

In the context of this research, 'Indigenous Peoples' refers to over 600 First Nations, Métis, and Inuit, that exist in sovereign and self-governing ways within the political borders of settler colonial Canada. Where these groups are referred to as 'Aboriginal' or 'Native' it is to

retain the original usage of author(s) cited. Wherever possible, I problematize the homogenization of these nations, but as St. Denis (2007) argues, also recognize that Indigenous Peoples in Canada share histories of colonization and racialization. I therefore defer to the Indigenous Peoples umbrella term when discussing the impacts of, and resistance to, the White settler colonial nation-state.

Understanding settler colonialism as the invasion of space and the ongoing reinforcement of hierarchical structures in that space, the term ‘settler’ identifies who has historically benefitted from this process, and who is involved in maintaining current settler colonial realities. Canada remains a nation that is ‘in the act of colonizing’, and therefore, there must be people who are responsible for keeping these structures in place (Lowman & Barker, 2015, p. 15). Settler is a situated and process-based identity, contingent on location-specific relationships to occupied lands, and the ongoing reassertion of claims to that land (Lowman & Barker, 2015). As mentioned, the term settler is often conflated with Whiteness in Canada. While all White people benefit from settler colonialism, and most settlers benefit from Whiteness, not all non-Indigenous people are settlers (such as groups with histories of slavery and disenfranchisement, see Amadahy & Lawrence, 2009). As Thomas (2019) explains:

> Settlers benefit from the privilege of having their worldview imposed upon the lands and bodies of everyone living in these lands. Their metaphysics, their epistemological and ontological approaches, inform every aspect of their governance and society. This is true even though there may be differences between groups of settlers; the settler colonial project sets aside ethnic or national differences between settlers (flattening Russians and Germans and English together) via whiteness … Settlers benefit from the privilege of not needing to be named, of not needing to justify their thoughts or presence, and this plays out in countless interactions.

Settlers benefit from settler colonialism through “structures designed to ensure that the intent to stay is supported by both material structures and by discourses that reflect settler colonial ontological understandings of land and place” (Lowman & Barker, 2015, p. 28).

Another facet of White settler colonialism in 'Canada' is the imposition of cisheteropatriarchal religious and societal structures. Arvin et al. (2013) describe heteropatriarchy as the "the social systems in which heterosexuality and patriarchy are perceived as normal and natural, and in which other configurations are perceived as abnormal, aberrant, and abhorrent" (p. 13). They assert that "expressions of patriarchy and paternalism … rely upon very narrow definitions of the male/female binary, in which the male gender is perceived as strong, capable, wise, and composed and the female gender is perceived as weak, incompetent, naïve, and confused" (p. 13). The addition of the 'cis' prefix to heteropatriarchy reflects the problematization and refusal of the idea of gender as connected to biological sex or gender expression through cisnormativity (Miller, 2016), in order to affirm the plurality of non-cisgender and non-binary identities.

Many of the structures described above fall under the umbrella of 'social' structures (although settler colonialism is also an economic and environmental structure), and I therefor often use 'social justice' to refer to the ongoing process of challenging the injustices that these systems reproduce. Sensoy and DiAngelo (2017) offer a definition of critical social justice based on the recognition of "inequality as deeply embedded in the fabric of society … as structural" (p. xx). They define shared principles of social justice as the recognition that all people are individuals and members of groups, and that these groups are valued unequally in society, giving greater access to resources to groups more highly valued (p. xx). People who work for social justice, they argue, "must be engaged in self-reflection about their own socialization into these groups (their 'positionality') and must strategically act from that awareness in ways that challenge social injustice" (p. xx). Social justice, in many ways, is the process of resisting the imposition of discursive and material oppression, in the ways that one's positionality affords.

Dissertation Structure

This dissertation is separated into ten chapters. In order to frame my study, the literature review in Chapter 2 outlines how I conceptualize the interplay between citizenship, White settler colonialism, and racism in Canada, in addition to civic education, global citizenship education, and anti-racist education, and some of the critiques of these fields. I then outline the current Canadian curricular context for civic education, look briefly at current civic education practices in K-12 classrooms, and then turn my focus to initiatives in teacher education in Canada and internationally. Here, I outline civic and global citizenship education initiatives and salient anti-oppression and anti-racist education initiatives in teacher education, grouped by the initiatives' outcomes.

In Chapter 3, I present the theoretical and conceptual frameworks that I draw on to situate and analyse my data, including Critical Race Theory (CRT), and Critical Whiteness Studies (CWS), and construct an adapted postcolonial global citizenship education framework that seeks to attend to White settler colonial educational contexts (see Table 1). Chapter 4 then outlines my methodological approach, where I detail my process using a multiple-site comparative case study research methodology, review my data collection tools and procedures, and describe the process and utilization of critical discourse and thematic data analysis methods.

Chapters 5 offers a contextual overview of the Ontario research site, including provincial, educational, and civic education discourses, and a description of the research site's course format, syllabus, and participant demographics. Chapter 6 then presents the findings from the Ontario site data, including descriptions of the ten themes that emerged as a result of analysis. These thematic areas include teachers candidates' individualistic understandings of civic engagement, aspirational civic involvement, their conflation of meritocracy and social justice,

their confidence (or not) with anti-racist pedagogy, understandings of settler colonialism, their anxiety concerning teaching for social justice, perceived subject area restrictions, desire for concrete teaching strategies, a ‘desire-not-to-know’ and maintenance of innocence, and resistance to learning about Whiteness, White supremacy, and racism (summarized in Table 3).

In Chapter 7, I outline the context for the Saskatchewan site, including provincial, educational, and civic education discourses, and then describe the course structure, syllabus, and participant demographics. Chapter 8 communicates eleven thematic findings based on my analysis of the Saskatchewan site data. These themes include teacher candidates’ systemic concerns and individual civic actions, their understanding of teaching as political, and of the social construction of identities, the level of system-based understandings amongst teacher candidates, the analytical frameworks they found useful, their desire for teaching strategies and understandings of the purpose of the course, their desire for diversity discourses or the ‘right’ things to say, and similar to Ontario, the ways that they resisted learning about Whiteness, White supremacy, and racism (summarized in Table 5).

The discussion in Chapter 9 addresses the findings from each research site, first in reference to my conceptual framework, and then in answer to my research questions (see Table 6). This chapter links discourses in the data to discourses in the literature, including teacher candidates’ individualistic understandings of civic engagement, race, racism, Whiteness, and settler colonialism, their perceived future pedagogy in relation to their positionalities, and their claims to innocence, meritocratic beliefs, and reassertions of White dominance. Chapter 10 offers a summary of the research project, speaks to the limitations of this study, and outlines contributions to the fields of teacher education, civic education, and anti-racist education. It concludes with lessons learned and recommendations for further research.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

> If citizenship is not a universalizable concept, then how might we nonetheless use it in strategic ways, while remaining conscious of its significant limitations, potential harms, and the partiality of any particular approach?
>
> - Pashby, daCosta, Stein, & Andreotti, 2020, p. 17

In order to engage with the relational concepts in my study, and to understand how they interact and overlap, the first section of this chapter is a conceptual review (Randolph, 2009). This conceptual review will establish historical context for the study, including a discussion of the development of citizenship and race in settler colonial 'Canada,' and how citizenship and settler colonialism are tied to capital and rooted in Whiteness. I then describe the development and goals of civic education and global citizenship education (GCE) in Canada, and how their various conceptions uphold or interrogate complicity in systems of oppression. From here, I delve into the tensions inherent in postcolonial and decolonial civic and global citizenship education, and present the ways that the goals of postcolonial civic education can overlap with anti-oppressive and anti-racist education.

The second section of Chapter 2 offers a representative review (Randolph, 2009) of the current Kindergarten to Grade 12 civic education context in Canada, including in curricula and in practice. In order to contextualize and situate my study in the teacher education literature, I then describe empirical studies of civic education, global citizenship education, postcolonial civic education, anti-oppressive, and anti-racist education foundations courses in teacher education programs. I describe primarily studies that have taken place in teacher education programs in Canada, supplemented by international teacher education studies where appropriate. Due to the breadth of empirical research in these overlapping areas, this second review is a 'representative' rather than an 'exhaustive' review (Cooper, 1988; Randolph, 2009). This representative review

endeavors to draw attention to the gap between education foundations courses that proport to tackle issues of social justice, but fall short in doing so, and critical education foundations courses that seek to enable teacher candidates to understand how their own positionality implicates them in addressing injustices.

Relational Concepts Review

Citizenship, Settler Colonialism, and Race

Citizenship is not a universal concept (Pashby et al., 2020, p. 17), and notions of civic or community roles and responsibilities are culturally specific. In this review, I will map the evolution of Eurocentric models of citizenship, in order to try to understand the context that I, and likely my participants, were socialized in. Hébert and Wilkinson (2002) describe this formulation of citizenship as a way for groups of people to live together that are based on either *consent* or *descent*. Models of citizenship based on consent allow voluntary allegiance to a state in exchange for certain rights and responsibilities (p. 5). Citizenship based on descent has characterized the rise of the 'nation-state' in the past century, where historical descent is considered equal to nationality, and "sovereignty is lodged in the people who share a common background within a political community" (p. 6). Taylor (1989) argues that this history of citizenship rights is directly tied to the evolution of European nationalism (p. 20), asserting that the consolidation of Europe into nation-states gave citizens both belonging within certain national configurations, and claims to emerging rights within these state borders. In this nationalist model, state governments became both the protectors of rights for certain groups of historical descent and the source of oppression for those groups who are denied access to citizenship (Hébert & Wilkinson, 2002, p. 6). Convincing groups that they belonged to a 'nation', an assumed community of like-minded individuals, instead of merely being situated

within newly defined state boundaries, gave these nation-states immense political power (Anderson, 1983/2006), vesting them with the authority to protect newly bestowed citizenship rights, and to create institutions (political, social, and economic) to maintain and enforce these rights (Hébert & Wilkinson, 2002, p. 6). The emerging assumption accompanying this era was that everyone can, should, and will 'have' a nationality (Anderson, 1983/2006, p. 8), and that human, social, and political rights would be tied to this legal identity.

Citizenship in settler colonial nation-states is particularly wrought, as the evolution of this form of citizenship has coincided with the creation and reification of race. As outlined in the introduction, settler colonialism is the invasive and ongoing imposition of onto-epistemological ways of being and knowing on all land and people who are considered within the settler colonial nation-state's borders (Arvin et al., 2013). Wolfe (2006) argues that, in this quest for control of land, resources, and people, the structures of settler colonialism employ the "organizing grammar of race" (p. 387). As a mode of domination, the structures and logics of settler colonialism must use race in order to justify the ongoing containment and elimination of Indigenous Peoples (Veracini, 2019), and subjugation and exploitation of Black and brown bodies (Maynard, 2017).

In Canada, citizenship was built for White, European settlers. For these groups, the creation of Canada was a 'consent' model of citizenship, as Confederation through the *British North America Act* (1867) allowed for certain British and French colonial groups to opt in to the newly created Canadian nation-state. However, for everyone external to these groups, the premise of citizenship in Canada is grounded in White supremacist, patriarchal applications of the 'descent' model, through liberal democratic conceptions of citizenship which create exclusions/inclusions based on 'ancestry' (Hébert & Wilkinson, 2002, pp. 6-7). In this way, racial categorizations were created in part by the White settler colonial government through

homogenizing groups of people, in particular Indigenous Peoples (Daschuk, 2013), Black people (Maynard, 2017), Chinese people (Stanley, 2016), and people of colour, and marking them as ‘other’ through legal, political, and social institutions. Wolfe (2006) describes that “different racial regimes encode and reproduce the unequal relationships into which Europeans coerced the populations concerned” during the initial creation of structures that form a settler colonial nation-state (p. 387). Through the creation of racial ‘others’ in legislation (Lawrence, 2003), educational institutions (Howard & Smith, 2011; Starblanket, 2018), and through the denial of political, economic, and social citizenship rights, settler colonial Canada was able to control racial ‘others’ in the name of sovereign goals (Stanley, 2016). Moreton-Robinson (2015) describes this creation and justification of race as a biological concept in settler colonial nation-states (writing about Australia – a similar context) as one that drew on the racist discourse that Indigenous people were “simpleminded, violent, and uncivilized … living in a state of nature that was in opposition to the discourse of white civility” (Moreton-Robinson, 2015, p. 158). Maynard (2017) writes that, in pre-Confederation Canada, “Black lives faced their own particular experiences of anti-Blackness throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the conflation of Blackness with inferiority and danger solidified its hold in the white settler imaginary” during this time (p. 23). This discourse of White civility was also interwoven with religion. In the settler colonial project, Christian groups are typically constructed as ‘civilized’, and non-Christian groups as ‘uncivilized’ (Wolfe, 2006, p. 390). In addition to new ‘biological’ categories of people, religion was used as further justification of superiority during the creation and maintenance of racist structures (TRC, 2015b).

Lawrence (2003) explains that for Indigenous Peoples, the *Indian Act* of 1876, in particular, created a homogenized, racialized identity that “was imposed on Indigenous

populations when settler governments in North America usurped the right to define Indigenous citizenship, reducing the members of hundreds of extremely different nations, ethnicities, and language groups to a common raced identity as 'Indian'" (pp. 4-5). The same Act also entrenched the Indian Residential School (IRS) system, regulating Indigenous children's education. With the goal of assimilating the 'savages' and to 'kill the Indian in the child' (TRC, 2015b), the IRS was devastating to Indigenous Peoples' cultures, languages, and lives, and ultimately resulted in genocide (Starblanket, 2018). The creation of racial categories through these legal and social structures further paved the way for group difference to be explained as innate, or based on biological difference.

Citizenship rights, including political, civil, and social rights, were also used to reify race. Political rights at the time included the right to vote, run for office, and participate in political processes; civil rights included the right to free speech, freedom of religion, and the right to own property; and social rights included the right to defend and assert equal rights to others in courts of law. All three of these categories of rights were categorically denied to Indigenous Peoples and racially minoritized groups (in addition to women and workers) during the creation of the Canadian nation-state (Strong-Boag, 2002). In particular, denying political rights and the right to own property was an effective form of control for the colonial government. Citizenship, then, was used as "a conceptual tool of the governing state that [called] for an acquiescence to an ideology" (Battiste & Semaganis, 2002, p. 94), and only acquiescence would afford racialized 'others' enfranchisement, or access to these newly created civil, political, and social rights in Canada (Marshall, 1950).

This reification of racialized citizenship categories was integral to justifying the dispossession and elimination of Indigenous Peoples from their territories. When discussing the

connections between genocide and settler colonialism, Wolfe (2006) asserts that "the primary motive for elimination is not race (or religion, ethnicity, grade of civilization, etc.) but access to territory. Territoriality is settler colonialism's specific, irreducible element" (p. 388). The early expansion of what is now known as Canada was premised on the acquisition of land and resources for the newly created sovereign nation-state. In 1869, for example, the purchase of Rupert's Land from the Hudson's Bay Company (originally claimed by the company in 1670 without regard for the sovereign Indigenous nations in this vast geographical area), marked the expansion of the territory claimed by the signatories of the *British North America Act* in 1867. Further land acquisition followed during a period of 'treaty federalism'; between 1871 and 1921, the British Crown signed treaties with Indigenous nations in order to gain further access to land-based resources and land-use for settlement. Battiste and Semaganis (2002) describe this process as one where First Nations signed treaties under the belief that both parties respected the right to self-determination, and that the Crown was recognizing the sovereignty of First Nations. History has shown, however, that these treaty promises were conceptualized differently by the signatories (Cardinal & Hildebrandt, 2000), and in many cases, First Nations signed treaties under coercive circumstances (Daschuk, 2013).

Modern day, nation-state-based citizenship in Canada cannot be understood without understanding how these racial hierarchies justified the exploitation of human labor and the environment by the driving settler colonial capitalist economic system. After decades of protest by groups who were historically denied civic, political, and social rights, some of these groups were 'given' the right to own land, to vote, and to run for office. However, by this time, many of the economic and political institutions and structures had already been created to serve the descendants of White, settler Canadians. For this reason, Taylor (1989) argues that "the idea of a

space between the state and the market, somewhere in 'civil society' where citizens can make democratic initiatives … operates mainly on the ideological terrain" (pp. 21-22). What is understood as 'democratic engagement', then, can amount to uncritically participating in these fundamentally racist social, economic, and political structures.

Whiteness

Whiteness, as a presumed biological race and ideological construction, thus answers to these historical, social, political, and economic systems, reified in Canada through the process of settler colonialism and domination of the 'other' (Razack, 2002). Frankenberg (2001) describes Whiteness as the relationship of dominance between White people and the 'other', enacted on and through individual, interpersonal, cultural, and institutional levels. Whiteness is at once a structural advantage, a set of cultural practices, and the unmarked, unnamed norm upon which all others are compared and subjected to (Baldwin et al. 2011). Leonardo (2004) similarly describes Whiteness as an ideology, forged through historical domination, and kept in place through an enduring series of actions, policies, and laws. In addition, because Whiteness is "supported by material practices and institutions" (Leonardo, 2002, p. 31), Whiteness can be seen as a worldview, consisting of choices being made where asserting Whiteness is of benefit. Grant (2018) discusses three 'registers' of Whiteness, including biological, performative, and supremacist, which include the overlapping ways that Whiteness employs domination (supremacy), history (biological ancestry), and culture (performative acts) in order to secure or maintain relative positions of power over the 'other'. Grant explains that all of these registers are utilized in different ways in varying contexts, often working together, in order to continually position Whiteness as superior.

Racism(s)

There are many context-specific definitions of racism. According to Solórzano and Yosso (2009), racism occurs when a group deems itself superior to all others, has power in which to act out their superiority (via creating and maintaining systems), and actively benefits from enacting racism while negatively affecting others. Tatum (1997) has described racism as the process of ‘prejudice plus power’. In the Canadian context, *racisms* include what Stanley (2014) describes as racializations, exclusions, and consequences, which are plural and context specific. By racializing and homogenizing Indigenous Peoples, Black people, and people of colour in Canada, the (White) Canadian government made it possible for laws to be created that tied economic, social, and political structures directly to the *idea* of separate races (Razack, 2002). Resulting exclusions included capital and material realities, and the creation of a stratified society that benefits White people, and in which White people are invested (Baldwin et al., 2011). The incommensurability between the violence of settler colonialism and the ‘fairness’ espoused by the ‘egalitarian’ democratic system in Canada also contributes to a particular form of cognitive dissonance called ‘democratic racism’ (Henry & Tator, 1994). Democratic racism “is the justification of the inherent conflict between Canadian society's egalitarian values of justice and fairness and the racist ideologies reflected in the collective mass belief system” (Henry & Tator, 1994, p. 4). This particular form of cognitive dissonance allows for societal stratification to be offered as ‘evidence’ through racist discourses that ‘othered’ groups of people have inherent biological characteristics that have determined their potential. In addition, King (1991) describes ‘dysconscious racism’ as the process where White people accept these dominant White norms and privileges, or do not think critically about racial inequity, aside from accepting “certain culturally sanctioned assumptions, myths, and beliefs that justify the social and economic

advantages White people have as a result of subordinating diverse others" (p. 135). When I use 'racism' in this dissertation, it is to refer to unequal societal structures, in addition to the discourses and justifications that individuals and groups employ in order to uphold these structures through their actions.

Civic Education

Pashby et al. (2020) argue that the 'modern/colonial imaginary' metanarrative frames much of citizenship education. This metanarrative, which assumes Western/European colonial and capitalist logics best serve all global spaces, presents a universal and inevitable "economic system organized by (racialized) capitalist markets, a political system organized by nation-states, a knowledge system organized by a single (European) rationality, and a mode of existence premised on autonomy and individualism" (p. 3). Indeed, Schugurensky and Meyers (2003) argue that early North American citizenship education can be characterized as a 'conservative' orientation to citizenship, where "capitalism and democracy are perfect complements and it would be impossible to conceive of one without the other" (p. 2). This premise, that capitalism and democracy are inseparable and inherently good, remained unquestioned and at the heart of civic education in Canada for many years.

Early Canadian civic education discourses relied on promoting united, nationalistic, democratic values (Osborne, 2006), and was influenced by civic education in the United States, which similarly served to create a single, dominant White culture, where "ethnic and immigrant groups had to forsake their original cultures" (Banks, 2004, p. 297) in order to assimilate into mainstream culture. These particular conceptions of citizenship education served early settler colonial purposes, reasserting and normalizing White political, economic, and educational systems. In addition to the devastating effects of settler colonialism, such forms of civic

education resulted in 'cognitive imperialism' for Indigenous Peoples (Battiste, 2000), and 'cultural repression' for immigrant groups (Banks, 2004, p. 298), where notions of mainstream citizenship, which assumed that "knowledge is neutral, objective, and uninfluenced by human interests and values" was deemed by the nation-state to be best for all groups (Banks, 2015, p. 154). These ideas about how to best educate for democratic citizenship were the result of people who held positions of power, and different interest groups vying for the type of democracy that best suited their ideological agendas (Beyer, 1998, p. 247).

Educators concerned with more progressive orientations to citizenship education in the twentieth century recognized the "inherent tension between capitalism and democracy, as the former generates inequalities and exclusion, and the latter attempts to reduce them" (Schugurensky & Meyers, 2003, p. 2). This tension makes civic education a contradictory endeavor, and Osborne (2010) asserts that the very essence of citizenship "is to be found in the continuing debate over what it means to be a citizen" (p. 13). Subsequent debates concerning civic education have focused on primarily two areas: what knowledge, skills, and values are believed to be best for civic participation in 'Canada' (Sears & Hughes, 1996; Johnson & Morris, 2010), and what pedagogical approaches engender these desired knowledges, skills, and values in both K-12 (Torney-Purta, 2002) and post-secondary education systems (for example, Kelley & Brandes, 2010). These debates have precipitated "little real consensus around what we mean by a 'good' citizen" (Sears, 2004, p. 93), and have produced different conceptions of what a 'good' citizen looks like in state-sanctioned subject matter and curricular objectives (Bickmore, 2006, 2008; Journell, 2010; Sears, 1994; Sears & Hughes, 2006), as well as in the examination of K-12 pedagogy used by teachers in the name of civic education (Geboers et al. 2013; Pasek et al. 2008; Torney-Purta, 2002).

In order to map prevalent citizenship conceptions, Westheimer and Kahne (2004) developed a spectrum that detailed ‘personally responsible’, ‘participatory’, and ‘justice-oriented’ approaches to citizenship education, each with their own assumptions and underlying values. ‘Personally responsible’ civic education encourages students to have national pride, act responsibly, and is often associated with character education (learning to be obedient, law-abiding, polite, etc.). Examples of actions that this type of education would encourage might include voting, paying taxes, signing petitions, and donating to food or clothing drives. ‘Participatory’ civic education, Westheimer and Kahne (2004) explain, encourages students to engage in decision-making processes in their communities, and could include working to get a political candidate elected, advocating for certain types of policy changes, or organizing ‘get out the vote’ drives. Justice-oriented civic education, then, emphasizes interrogations of the root problems of societal injustices, and would encourage civic engagement that sought to change systemic processes and policies that entrench these injustices. Journell (2010) also developed a detailed spectrum of citizenship education conceptions found in curricular documents, with conceptualizations that moved along a similar ‘personally responsible’ to ‘systems-level’ spectrum, including: civic republicanism, character education, deliberative, social justice, participatory, transnational, and cosmopolitan civic education. These conceptions of civic education continue to garner criticism, however, as certain knowledge, skills, and values thought to be needed for ‘good’ citizenship continue to engage students unequally. In particular, personally responsible and character education conceptualizations of citizenship do not adequately address what citizenship education should look like for students who experience the effects of colonialism and oppressive social, economic, and political systems (Banks, 2015; Kahne & Sporte, 2008; Mirra et al., 2013; Woons, 2014).

For countries that have populations which have grown from and been determined by settler colonial policies, relying on legal definitions of citizenship is also problematic. As outlined, socio-political citizenship rights were not extended to all groups (in the past, this has included immigrants, women, and Indigenous people, and currently extends to migrant workers and refugees). Strong-Boag (2002) describes the sense of alienation created by differentiated forms of legal citizenship rights as being at the heart of citizenship debates, which civic education has done little to address. In addition, assuming the legal rights definition of citizenship strips the term of anything but a nation-state-given identity, which is challenging for citizens and newcomers alike (Banks, 2015). As Abdul-Jabbar (2015) explains that, for newcomers, "only by renouncing citizenship, as a socio-political construct that stipulates nationalism, can … newcomers become active citizens" (p. 131). Furthermore, only by understanding civic engagement as de-centered from the Canadian nation-state, can Indigenous, non-Indigenous, and newcomer citizens participate in ethical and culturally-affirming ways.

Global Citizenship Education

The international Global Citizenship Education (GCE) literature and field has grown, in part, out of a need to respond to the concerns outlined above, and in particular to address the inability of traditional forms of civic education to confront global economic changes and growing systemic injustices in a globalized world (there are of course overlaps, and no conceptions in either civic education or global citizenship education are mutually exclusive). In Canada, GCE programs started to gain traction as part of international development education efforts in the late 1990s (Shultz, 2007), and the GCE literature has since stressed the urgency for global citizenship education programs to be developed as independent areas of study (Davies, 2006; Mundy et al., 2007; Mundy & Manion, 2008; Pike, 2008; Young, 2010; Zahabioun et al.,

2013). Like citizenship education, there are many conceptions of global citizenship education, each with different foci and ideological underpinnings, ranging from neoliberal, to liberal, to critical, to imagining GCE that operates beyond Western epistemological frameworks.

Andreotti (2010) contends that global citizenship education emerged in response to national efforts to maintain economic advantages, which called on educators to adopt "pedagogies and epistemologies that are more malleable in the constant shifts and uncertainty of economies … where the focus is on the production of new products, new markets, new identities and new patterns of consumption" (p. 240). These forms of global citizenship education produce what Shultz (2007) termed the 'neoliberal global citizen', and Stein (2015) characterized as the 'entrepreneurial' global citizenship position. Focused on adapting and utilizing global economic logics and rationale for economic focused international development or 'interventionism', these types of global citizenship education "disregard any need for structural change" (Shultz, 2007, p. 252). Stein (2015) explains that entrepreneurial global citizenship education programs are "a largely depoliticized, market-centric means to ensure students will be attractive to employers" in a global labour market, and that individual motivations in this type of GCE coincide with a belief that the Global South needs to 'catch up' to Western capitalist ideals (pp. 244-245). Pashby et al. (2020) note that these neoliberal forms of global citizenship education have been the most readily identifiable and critiqued, whereas others, discussed next, have less rigid boundaries.

The 'liberal' conception of global citizenship education found in the literature (Pashby et al., 2020; Stein, 2015), ideally includes critical self-examination, the capability to recognize connections to others, and the ability to "imagine oneself in another's shoes" (Stein, 2015, p. 245). Stein (2015) terms this form of global citizenship education the 'liberal humanist' approach, noting that it can overlap with the neoliberal/entrepreneurial approach, as it also

emphasizes individual changes rather than change on a structural scale. This form of global citizenship education features intercultural communication, and is often at the heart of community service learning or international exchanges (Stein, 2015). Liberal global citizenship education can also align with culturally responsive pedagogical approaches. In their framework, which attends to multiculturalism, faith, race, gender, eco-justice, and language and literacy, Eidoo et al. (2011) stress an emphasis on interactive, practice-oriented learning, and that students need space to critically engage with non-dominant perspectives. In addition, they call for teachers to use culturally responsive methods, and to look beyond charity as a means of action. Banks (2015) has advocated for a similar culturally responsive civic education approach, that seeks to address the "social, cultural, economic, and political systems within a nation-state [that] prevent marginalized groups from attaining full structural inclusion" (p. 152). Through seeking to validate the cultural identities of students, this form of civic education would ideally enable them to engage in ways that "challenge racial, social class, and gender inequality" (p. 154). Although often well intentioned, some forms of culturally responsive pedagogy and learning from the 'other' presume that "Western students have a right to access Others' difference for their own development" (Stein, 2015, p. 245), and it can also "reify the notion that students in positions of relative material advantage have solutions to the problems of those denied it, rather than prompting these students … to consider how their privileges may be assured through the impoverishment of those they seek to help" (p. 246).

Critical approaches to global citizenship education typically include a centering of the systems that create inequality, and a commitment to social transformation (Johnson & Morris, 2010; Pashby et al., 2020; Shultz, 2007; Young, 2010). Young (2010) notes that these approaches are transformative, not only in their analysis of inequality from a systems

perspective, but in the way that they can also challenge objective approaches to curriculum knowledge and dominant classroom practices. Johnson and Morris' (2010) framework, for example, integrates learning about political ideology, understanding the interconnectedness of dominant discourses, and knowledge of one's own positionality in order to cultivate an informed praxis. Stein (2015) terms this type of critical global citizenship education as the 'anti-oppressive position,' as it "tends to identify how colonial, racialized, and gendered flows of power, wealth, and knowledge operate to the advantage of the Global North" (p. 246). Shultz' (2007) 'radical' global citizenship education approach is also comparable to these critical conceptions, as it calls for an understanding of complex global power relations and engagement in resistance against the institutions (in particular economic institutions) that perpetuate inequality. In general, these forms of critical or anti-oppressive global citizenship education tend "to advocate for more equitable distribution of resources, cognitive justice, and more horizontal forms of governance, and to [promote] radical transformation of existing structures, up to and including their dismantling" (Stein, 2015, p. 246).

Postcolonial Global Citizenship Education

Although some conceptualizations of global citizenship education attend to setter colonial and racist structures, critiques of global citizenship education stem from the potential (for even critical forms) to distance themselves from historical and current realities of settler colonialism, cisheteropatriarchy, and White supremacy, when actors involved fail to "recognize their complicity in the systems under critique or to question their own assumptions and motivations" (Stein, 2015, p. 247). This failure can often surface through initiatives that do not make racism, settler colonialism, and White supremacy specific, central components of study and reflection (Arvin et al., 2013; Battiste & Semaganis, 2002; Leonardo, 2002). As Leonardo (2002) notes,

discourses of global citizenship education that divorce themselves of their colonial, White-dominated pasts are harmful, since, “like the economy, whiteness as a privileged signifier has become global” (p. 30), and it cannot be ignored when discussing global civic education.

In the settler colonial context of Canada, in particular, global citizenship education is rife with problematic realities (Battiste & Semaganis, 2002; Woons, 2014). As Battiste and Semaganis (2002) explain, “current issues of citizenship in Canada carry baggage that again drives First Nations relationships, treaties, and self-determination to a bias towards Eurocentric perceptions of citizenship and governance” (p. 93), where students’ cultural knowledge of citizenship, diversity, and collective relationships are absent, or actively contradicted by curricular definitions of citizenship (Woons, 2014). Smith and Rogers (2015) note that efforts to address the colonial nature of citizenship is essential, as it “is a means of understanding relationships between people as agentive actors with different histories and conceptions of collective belonging” (p. 66). The authors, echoing other postcolonial (Andreotti, 2010) and decolonial scholars in this area (Abdi et al., 2015), ask whether or not decolonizing citizenship is possible, given that the history and enduring structure of public schools in Canada is based in settler colonialism (Stanley, 2011; Smith & Rogers, 2015). In addition, Battiste and Semaganis (2002) posit that, in order to define citizenship in a way that advocates for Indigenous consciousness and sovereignty, civic education must address “treaty relationships and the responsibilities of Canada and Aboriginal people to those relationships” (p. 109). Similarly, Arvin et al. (2013) have stressed that “Indigenous communities' concerns are often not about achieving formal equality or civil rights within a nation-state, but instead achieving substantial independence *from* a Western nation-state” (p.10, emphasis added).

In their meta-review of typologies of global citizenship education, Pashby et al. (2020) map the neoliberal, liberal, and critical discursive orientations and approaches to global citizenship education, but also ask whether or not scholars and educators who are theorizing from within a Eurocentric colonial epistemology can imagine outside of this frame. The authors posit that a fourth form of global citizenship education could potentially draw on Shultz' (2007) 'transformationalist' global citizen, Andreotti's (2010) 'postcolonial' global citizenship education framework, and Stein's (2015) 'incommensurable' global citizen position, in an effort to break through the modern/colonial imaginary, which could "critique the Eurocentric cosmopolitical ordering of the world and its presumed hierarchy of humanity" (Stein, 2015, p. 247). In Shultz' (2007) description of the 'transformationalist' approach, for example:

> Global citizens learn that the world is determined by structures that prevent authentic change or relationships from developing. As understandings of how common experiences of poverty and marginalization extend beyond state boundaries have developed, a new approach to global citizenship has developed. Based on understandings of a shared planet and a common humanity, global citizens learn that compassion and care become powerful connections that cross the typical boundaries of state, nationality, race, class, and sex. Power relations become negotiated in localized contexts as spaces of interaction are established for dialogue and deliberation. These become global spaces through the connection of transnational networks and coalitions of solidarity. (p. 257)

Shultz' definition emphasizes connections 'beyond boundaries' and asserts that global citizens must navigate structures that operate in ways that are antithetical to authentic change. Stein (2015) similarly considers ways forward in this conceptualization of global citizenship education as promoting "encounters within and across difference" in the reconsidering of onto-epistemological borders (Stein, 2015, p. 247).

Andreotti (2010) describes a postcolonial approach to global citizenship education as one with similar goals to decolonization, and which "would equip learners to engage in dialogue, to see difference as a source of learning and not as a threat and to engage critically with local or

global issues" (p. 241). Moreover, this conceptualization of postcolonial global citizenship education could equip students "to negotiate change, to transform relationships, to dream different dreams, to confront fears and to make ethical choices about their own lives and how they affect the lives of others by analyzing and using power and privilege in ethical and accountable ways" and in an effort "to establish ethical relationships across linguistic, regional, ideological and representational boundaries (i.e. to be open to the Other) and to negotiate principles and values 'in context'" (p. 241). Pashby et al. (2020) posit that in order to sit "at the edge of the modern/colonial ontology," educators must ask themselves how the "modern/colonial ontology [has] restricted our horizons and what we consider to be possible, desirable, intelligible and imaginable?" and, "what is it that keeps us invested in these ontologies?" (p. 16).

Anti-oppressive and Anti-racist Education

The goals of postcolonial global citizenship education described above begin to overlap with the goals of anti-oppressive and anti-racist education. Where conceptions of postcolonial global citizenship education differ from anti-oppressive and anti-racism education is through the focus that the latter place on issues of race and social oppression (Dei, 2001), and primarily through their differential histories as fields of study and praxis. Anti-racism work has been happening for as long as there has been racism, in response to various socio-historical contexts of injustice (Gillborn, 2006), and specific anti-racism work in teacher education in Canada had many names before the term 'anti-racism' was specifically adopted.

In the 1970s and 80s, 'multicultural' education (Bakan, 2016) was an area of theory and practice looking at issues of race and social inequality in education (Young, 1995). St. Denis (2007) describes the rise of multicultural education in Canada as coinciding with Canada's initial 1971 multicultural policy, and later the 1988 *Multicultural Act*. St. Denis (2007) writes that

multiculturalism was “intended to acknowledge the need for increased understanding between ethnic groups, and the need to address racial discrimination” but that, in “the context of historical and ongoing colonization in Canada, both policies in fact prevent possibilities for anti-racism and anti-colonialism (pp. 307-308). As a form of education, multiculturalism promotes ‘food, song, and dance’, exposure to ‘cultural others’, and emphasizes celebrating diversity. This form of education does not combat social inequality, flattens all ‘othered’ groups in a way that obscures Indigenous sovereignty movements, and produces Canada as a successful multicultural state (pp. 308-310).

Culturally relevant pedagogy, which emerged more prolifically in the United States, has had more success (Ladson-Billings, 1994; 2000; Milner, 2013). Culturally relevant approaches require that teachers deeply understand the cultures and histories of their students, and that teachers should strive to teach their students (not just the curriculum) in identity- and culturally-affirming ways (Ibrahim, 2008; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Warren, 2018). However, while culturally relevant pedagogy is a necessary strategy that anti-racist allies certainly utilize in order to address injustices in schools (Eidoo et al., 2011, for example), when done in isolation from specific anti-racist education, ‘cultural’ approaches used by White teachers can reassert the very dominance that they seek to address (Gebhard, 2017a; St. Denis, 2009). In this way, culturally relevant approaches have been critiqued as being a new form of multicultural education, by failing to attend to the structural oppression that necessitates this type of pedagogy in the first place (Pete, 2017; Pirbhai-Illich et al., 2016).

Several seminal texts in the anti-racist literature in teacher education (in Canada in particular: Dei, 1995; 1996; James, 1995), propelled the transition from multicultural education and culturally relevant pedagogical approaches to more specific anti-oppressive and anti-racist

approaches. Dei (2001) describes the intersectionality of the anti-racism field by explaining how "the cancer of racism and other forms of oppression (sexism, homophobia, classism) challenge every bit of social decency and existence (political, economic, material, cultural, spiritual and emotional)," but that anti-oppressive forms of anti-racism enjoin us to understand and approach "differences that extend beyond race, gender, class and sexuality to issues of language, culture, religion and spirituality" (p. 144), in order to address the intersectional experiences of those students who hold multiple, overlapping marginalized positionalities.

Anti-racist education maintains a focus on the relations of power amongst individuals and groups (Madden, 2015), and in particular, how these power relations create inclusions, exclusions, and consequences, based on racializations (Stanley, 2014). Stanley (2014) reminds anti-racist educators that racisms are plural, consisting of multiple, contextually-based exclusions, which shift and reinvent themselves over time. Anti-racist education recognizes the institutional structures that reinforce racial discrimination, marginalization, and exclusions, and seeks to challenge the ideologies that maintain these structures, including those that maintain other forms of discrimination, based on class, gender and sexuality, and ability. Dei (2001) urges that the task of the anti-racist educator is to challenge the reassertion of coercive power and dominance in the classroom (p. 146), and for this reason, Young (1995) positions anti-racist education as fundamentally different from other forms of education, as it requires an understanding that teaching is a political activity, rather than a vocational one (p. 61).

Specifically investigating Whiteness and White supremacy has also become a priority in anti-racist education, especially in contexts where teacher candidates and students are overwhelmingly White. Aveling (2006) argues that "the critical examination of Whiteness is part of a larger project of anti-racism because for too long we have focused on the

differences/shortcomings perceived in the 'Other' and equated race with 'studying down' in the power structure" (p. 263). A focus on Whiteness turns the gaze towards those teachers and educators who play a role in sustaining racism and settler colonialism (Carr & Lund, 2007; Case & Hemmings, 2005; Evans-Winters & Hoff, 2011; Fine et al., 2004; Frankenberg, 1993b), and focusses on strategies for overcoming White resistance to anti-racist education. Through presenting "counternarratives [that work] towards a fulsome notion of colonial racism that might attend to: gender, class, sexuality, geographical location, local cultural/colonial practices and agendas, as well as consideration of Diasporic Indigeneity" (Madden, 2015, p. 11), anti-racism that focusses on Whiteness can open up possibilities for White teacher candidates to become racially conscious (Jupp et al., 2016).

Representative Empirical Review

K-12 Civic Education Curricula

In historical and contemporary Canada, Kindergarten to Grade 12 (K-12) curricula are developed by provincial and territorial Ministries of Education, and can vary dramatically from region to region. Many provinces and territories include civic education in their social studies or English courses, while others offer civics as a stand-alone subject in high school (such as in British Columbia, Ontario, & Quebec). The evolution of history, social studies, and civics curricula in Canada is typified by what Osborne (2006) defines as four areas. The first is the nation-building, narrative approach (1890s to 1970s). During this time, early citizenship textbooks contained directions about how best to be a supportive citizen in the emerging country of Canada (McCaig, 1925/1932), including information on how the (new) government worked, and what one's participation would look like in this system – primarily voting and moral character education. Evans et al. (2019) describe this period as "social and political initiation and

nation-building, with a 'pro-British assimilationist bent'" (p. 139). Razack (2002) asserts that in White settler colonial nation-states, this initial mythology of *terra nullius* (empty, uninhabited land), civilized enterprising settlers, and 'pre-modern' Indigenous Peoples is a necessary and ever-present nationalistic story that needs to be told in order to justify racializations of people and spaces (pp. 2-3).

Following this narrative, when more European settlers arrive and begin to create a 'nation', Razack (2002) argues "a second installment of the national story begins to be told" (p. 3). This story is one of development of land by settlers, progress, and self-reliance, that give birth to a "commitment to liberty and democracy" (p. 3). Indeed, as McLean (2010) found, during the 1940s and 1950s, "with few exceptions, women of any race …[and] Canadian men and women of African, Chinese, Japanese, Indian, and many European nationalities are not represented, despite their long-term presence in Canada" (p. 48). Notwithstanding attempts by justice-oriented educators, curricula "presented Canadian identity and values through a storyline of national progress and linear social, economic, and political developments" (p. 48). At the same time that this "history-from-above" (Osborne, 2006, p. 108) nation-building was being taken up in public schools, the Indian Residential School (IRS) system had been established for the children of First Nations, Métis, and Inuit residing in the borders of newly established Canada. As previously mentioned, for these Indigenous people, the nationalist, colonial character education was devastating (TRC, 2015b), and the assimilatory efforts imposed on these immensely diverse linguistic and cultural groups resulted in deaths, abuse, and trauma that remain to the present day (Starblanket, 2018).

In response to what was described as "racist, sexist, class-based" gaps and omissions in civic education, the second 'era' of citizenship education began in the 1970s on the heels of

social movements of the 1960s and subject-as-discipline curricular renewal coming out of the United States (Osborne, 2006, p. 108). Evans et al. (2019) also claim a re-examination of citizenship education during this period was prompted by shifting immigration patterns, Canada's growing foreign military involvement, and First Nations' land claims. This era in Canadian civic education sought to supplement nation-building narratives with "history-from-below," by investigating contemporary problems within their historical context, and profiling the social histories of women, workers, First Nations, and cultural minorities (Osborne, 2006, p. 108). This shift purportedly also encouraged teachers to focus on the 'process' (inquiry) rather than the 'product' (memorization) of history, but it is unclear how many teachers actually adopted these pedagogical approaches (Osborne, 2006, p. 112).

A report prepared by the Council of Ministers of Education, Canada (CMEC) and the Canadian Commission for UNESCO (2001) notes that during the 1970s and 1980s, citizenship education across the country shifted towards an emphasis on multiculturalism, and inclusion of issues of class, race, gender, and an emphasis on global education, human rights, and the environment. Beginning with the passing of the multicultural policy (1971) and the Charter of Rights and Freedoms (1982), Evans et al. (2019) note that attention to civic education started to become more common in provincial curricula renewal processes, and the subsequent release of 'Canadian Studies' curricula emphasized Canada's unique cultural identity.

Both Evans et al. (2019) and Osborne (2006) note that a third, significant shift in civic education in Canada began shortly after this period, in the 1990s, where history was starting to be considered a form of "intellectual training rather than as an education for citizenship" (Osborne, 2006, p. 113), and where increasing global understandings and civic global interests and dimensions were being explored. This shift to the development of 'historical consciousness'

(Seixas & Morton, 2012) and 'global dimensions' (Evans et al., 2019) marked an era of using history and social studies curricula to help students make sense of the world, develop conceptual frameworks, and master the inquiry process, which was heavily influenced by disciplinary thinking coming out of Europe at the time (Osborne, 2006, p. 114).

By the early 1990s, citizenship education in many provinces in Canada also increasingly focused on preparing students to acquire the necessary skills to succeed in a global economy, in response to the rise of global citizenship education coming out of the international development sector (Shultz, 2007), government development agencies, and international charities at the time (Evans et al., 2019). Similar to Donald's (2012) conceptualization of 'colonial frontier logics', Razack (2002) notes that this global evolution of the national mythology draws on racist, spatial-specific border narratives, where increasing immigration from 'other' countries are drawn to the "legendary niceness of European Canadians, their well-known commitment to democracy, and the bounty of their land" (Razack, 2002, p. 4). This narrative entrenches White Canadians' primary claim to the land, continues to enforce 'separate' categories of Canadians, and justifies the "racialized structure of citizenship that characterizes contemporary Canada" (p. 5).

Specific studies have found that contemporary civic education curricula in the twenty-first century in Canada ranges widely. Bickmore's (2006) analysis of constructive democratic conflict in curricular documents in three Canadian provinces confirmed that although some curricula addressed political, international, and social problems, they "rarely required teachers or students to address either specific instances or the underlying foundations of such problems" (p. 374). Pike (2008) argues that global perspectives were often being kept out of curriculum in practice, and Cook (2008) noted a de-emphasis on peace education during this time. Waters (2007) found that the Ontario civics curriculum, in particular, emphasized procedural state

political knowledge that reinforced Canada's colonial systems. Kennelly (2009), after studying the new civics curricula developed by Ontario, British Columbia, and Quebec, described how:

> Drawing on histories of liberalism and current ideologies of neoliberalism, the active citizen of contemporary civics curricula is one who engages with the state through self-regulated acts of responsible citizenship that are limited to individual encounters with the electoral process, charitable community work, and/or participation through formal aspects of the political system, such as official parties. (p. 144)

In a later study, Kennelly and Llewellyn (2011) also found that civic education curricula in three Canadian provinces reinforced notions of responsibility towards the state, and encouraged compliance with nation-state ideals of citizenship. Other curricula have been found to contain contradictory messages about what global education and social justice should include (Bergen & McLean, 2014; Young, 2010), and marginalize representations of Indigenous histories (Butler et al., 2015). Unfortunately, these studies primarily position recent civic education curricula in Canada as espousing the neoliberal (Shultz, 2007) or personally responsible (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004) conceptions of citizenship *engagement*, despite the more critical documents containing curricular outcomes on social justice *issues* (Bergen & McLean, 2014).

K-12 Civics Classroom Pedagogy

As it stands, Canada's civics classrooms see teachers using teacher-directed activities most often (Evans, 2006; Llewellyn et al., 2010; Tupper & Cappello, 2010; 2012), which are "considerably less critical" (Bickmore, 2014, p. 260) than the somewhat more progressive provincial curriculum guidelines. In their study, Llewellyn et al. (2010) found that civic education courses stressed procedural civic knowledge over objectives that promoted more active forms of citizenship. That said, teachers often recognize that civics *should* use more student-centered and deliberative-based teaching strategies (Evans, 2006; Losito & Mintrop, 2001). Teachers report, however, that they do not have the training or resources needed to teach

in more student-centered ways (Hughes et al., 2010), are intimidated by using student-centered or inquiry pedagogical approaches (Gibson, 2012; McLean et al., 2008; Reimer & McLean, 2009), or are disheartened by public opinion and perceived curricular restrictions (Schweisfurth, 2006). Even when teachers do interrogate settler colonial structures in their teaching, Mitchell (2018) found that White students in high school social studies courses in Western Canada re-inscribed their identities through the use of dominant nationalist discourses, despite learning about historical and contemporary examples of atrocities and colonialism. Students reinforced discourses that Canada is a multicultural, peaceful, tolerant, kind, polite nation, while simultaneously constructing White Canadians as 'real' Canadians, and 'non-White' Canadians as not truly Canadian, through the use of 'us' and 'them' narratives.

Insofar as the history of civic education in Canada has been influenced by both the United States and Europe, here too pedagogical approaches in civics classes use mainly teacher-directed classroom activities (Evans, 2006; Hughes et al., 2010; Keating et al., 2009; Losito & Mintrop, 2001; Osler, 2011; Westheimer & Kahne, 2004). In the United States, Westheimer and Kahne (2004) argue that teachers educating for personally responsible citizenship was the most common amongst programs studied – pedagogies that encourage honesty, integrity, and patriotism over deeper analysis of social problems, and Farver (2019) found that early-career teachers, despite their best intentions to teach about racism, tend to reinforce uncritical ways of thinking. Losito and Mintrop's (2001) study of civics teachers' approaches across Europe found that recitation, textbooks, and worksheets were widely used, and that knowledge transmission was the main goal of many countries' civic education. Keating et al. (2009) confirmed this in the case of England, and also found a heavy reliance on textbooks and note-taking. In a study of civics teachers in England, Osler (2011) reported that some of the teachers used local

volunteering and tried to emphasize student action through project work and community-based learning wherever possible. Teachers here also value participatory learning, but face similar barriers to Canadian teachers – a lack of resources, a lack of training to teach in student-centered ways, and inadequate professional development to learn these skills (Davies et al., 2009; Hughes et al., 2010). More recently, Ross and Davies (2018) described the lack of traction that global citizenship education has received in curricula in the European Union more broadly.

Teacher Education

As Faculties of Education across the country adapt to train their teachers candidates to teach provincial curricula, teacher certification programs vary substantially in their pedagogical foci, core subject matter, practica placements, and program length (Christou, 2017). In addition, the Accord on Indigenous Education, signed by the Canadian Deans of Education in 2010, and the release of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's Calls to Action have both underscored the importance of incorporating Indigenous content and pedagogies into teaching (Blimkie et al., 2014), educating students about the Indian Residential School (IRS) system, and cultivating understandings of the settler colonial structures of Canada (TRC, 2015b). Given these many foci, efforts to prepare teacher candidates to teach critical civic education vary greatly across the country.

In the two teacher education programs that I studied, there was no explicit civic education methods course. In fact, it has only been recently that global citizenship education initiatives have shifted from extracurricular options to being embedded within programs (see McLean & Cook, 2011, for example). The difficult part of this representative review was knowing which studies to include; anti-oppressive and anti-racist courses do not necessarily identify themselves as being civic education courses, and global citizenship education initiatives do not necessarily

call their work anti-oppressive or anti-racist education (even if this is a component of the course). In addition, most of the studies reviewed focus on the changed knowledge of teacher candidates. Although this knowledge is directly tied to course pedagogy, I do not interrogate the intents of course professors, or the subtleties that may lie between course professors' theories in action (pedagogy they plan to use), and theories in use (pedagogy they actually use) (Kane et al., 2002) in these courses.

What follows is the continuation of a representative review that seeks to identify the central issues in the field, rather than provide an exhaustive overview (Randolph, 2009). The first section is a review of civic and/or global citizenship education initiatives, and the second is a review of anti-oppressive and/or anti-racist education initiatives in education foundations courses. Both reviews are primarily in Canadian teacher education programs (from approximately 2000-2018), but I also included literature from countries whose curricula and pedagogy influences Canadian civic and anti-racist education, and which are facing similar challenges of disrupting demographic and hegemonic Whiteness in their teaching forces, namely the United States (Sleeter, 2017) and England (Miller, 2016). In order to identify the central issues, I use insights drawn from Andreotti's (2006) postcolonial global citizenship education framework, and the heuristic review of neoliberal, liberal, and critical typologies of global citizenship education by Pashby et al. (2020), to make sense of how 'soft' or 'critical' the processes and outcomes of the education foundations courses reviewed are.

Civic / Global Citizenship Education Foundations Courses

Estellés and Fischman (2020), in their international review of global citizenship education initiatives from 2003 to 2018, argue that what unites GCE initiatives in teacher education is a "recognition of the existence of a new geo-political scenario and a sense of

urgency to respond to the challenges derived from globalization" (p. 6). However, the way that initiatives tackle this challenge in teacher education programs, and the rationale for doing so, fluctuates. Estellés and Fischman (2020) identified that the most prominent discourse amongst the studies reviewed was that global citizenship education in teacher education is being used "as a redemptive educational solution to global problems … [which] requires teachers to embrace a redemptive narrative following a model of rationality based on altruistic and hyperrationalized and markedly romanticized ideals" (p. 6). Parallels can be draw between this discourse of altruism and redemption and the 'improvement' of the 'other' that is seen in the neoliberal and liberal global citizenship education heuristic models described earlier (Pashby et al., 2020). Bergen et al. (2020) have also argued that global citizenship initiatives in teacher education programs in Canada, England, and the United States, which seek to enable teacher candidates to civically engage in ways that account for their own positionality, fell largely on the 'soft' end of Andreotti's (2006) 'soft' to 'critical' global citizenship education typology (although there are some exceptions), where civic action is framed within, and reproduces uneven economic, social, and political systems.

Some of the most prominent 'neoliberal' forms of global citizenship education in teacher education include community service-learning placements that do little in the way of prompting reflection on individual privilege and structures of power (Larsen & Searle, 2017; Maynes et al., 2013), or that serve as 'exposure' for teacher candidates to culturally diverse communities (Cone, 2012; Boyle-Baise, 1998; Boyle-Baise & Kilbane, 2000; Boyle-Baise & Sleeter; 2000; Sunal et al., 2009). For example, observations of teacher candidates during service-learning practica, including at community organizations (Maynes et al., 2013) and during international experiences (Larsen & Searle, 2017), both revealed that while teacher candidates' awareness of

social inequality may have increased, authors were skeptical of the depth of analysis and future engagement possibilities based on these experiences. In one case, authors reported that "93% [of teacher candidates] felt they could make a difference in their community" (Maynes et al., 2013, p. 90), but that more space and time for reflection may have aided in the transformational nature of these experiences. It was also unclear if teacher candidates' who thought that they could 'make a difference' were motivated by an attitude of 'helping' or through an analysis of their own positions in perpetuating inequitable structures (Andreotti, 2006). 'Exposure' service-learning initiatives were also typically part of multicultural education courses, requiring students to contribute to a community organization and reflect on their experiences. Findings from several studies indicated that through acting and observing, some teacher candidates moved away from deficit views of students (Cone, 2012; Sleeter, 2001). These initiatives, however, reinforced narratives that some people are part of the 'problem', and others (the teacher candidates) are part of the 'solution' (Andreotti, 2006). The teacher candidates' perceptions of democratic education pedagogy did not shift significantly during the course of the projects, and Sunal et al. (2009) concluded that in their study, teacher candidates "demonstrated a quite shallow understanding of democratic citizenship education" (p. 61). In addition, Boyle-Baise and Kilbane (2000) recommended that their service-learning projects in the future should investigate the root causes of inequality, provide more opportunities for student teachers to understand their own positionality in relation to power structures, and place a greater emphasis on social change.

'Liberal' examples can be found in 'one-off' global citizenship education professional development opportunities for teacher candidates, and through courses that stand in isolation from the rest of their teacher education programs (Appleyard & McLean, 2011; Guo, 2014; Urrieta & Reidel, 2008). Guo (2014), for example, worked with 45 teacher candidates in a

teacher education course about educating for global citizenship at a Canadian university. While teacher candidates gained a better understanding of what global citizenship education might entail and possibilities for implementation, they were worried about offending other educational stakeholders when looking at issues that involved prejudice, and perceived that closed-mindedness amongst parents and students would impact their ability to teach global citizenship. Guo (2014) concluded that a holistic approach to global citizenship education was needed in order to yield more confidence and experience with this type of pedagogy. Similarly, during professional development for teacher candidates interested in global citizenship education during their Bachelor of Education program at another Canadian university, Appleyard and McLean (2011) found that, in order to foster deeper learning and engagement, teacher candidates needed opportunities to practice and reflect on how they might implement global citizenship education in classroom settings, and that a more consistent use of global citizenship education pedagogies was needed across their teacher training program. In addition to a lack of deep learning in these cases, a similar study by Urrieta and Reidel (2008) with White preservice teachers found that students failed to understand how citizenship could be linked to culture and racial identity, and held ideas about citizenship that reinforced forms of engagement that benefitted primarily White, middle-class communities.

In some programs, global citizenship education is left largely up to NGOs (Smith, 2016). Keating et al. (2009) report that in 2008 less than half of current practicing teachers in England had any citizenship education. Despite government mandated citizenship in England, and national commitments to coordinate citizenship education teacher training efforts (Hughes et al., 2010, p. 302), studies describing teacher candidate preparation to teach citizenship typically found that teacher candidates did not feel that their degrees prepared them to teach civic

education (Chikoko et al., 2011; Harber & Serf, 2006; Peterson et al., 2015). Harber and Serf (2006), for example, found that, save for the teacher candidates who were training specifically to be civics teachers, none of the remaining teacher candidates felt adequately equipped to teach democratic citizenship, or to teach controversial issues (Chikoko et al., 2011). Peterson et al. (2015), in their study of 295 teacher candidates, noted that while over 65% of the respondents felt it was *important* or *very important* to teach young people about civic engagement, only 13% said that they felt prepared to teach civics. These gaps in implementation have meant that global citizenship education for teachers is being taken up on a professional development basis by non-profit, social, and private organizations. Smith (2016) describes this as one of the effects of mandating citizenship education, noting that, "goals were not specifically outlined by government guidance, [as a result] foundations and support groups for [citizenship education] began to pop up across the educational landscape" (p. 3) (see Davies, Gregory, & Riley, 2005, for example). The degree to which these initiatives are preparing teachers to develop critical citizenship education pedagogical practices, however, is unclear.

Further examples of 'liberal' initiatives typically engaged teacher candidates in learning about citizenship through service-learning that was combined with an interrogation of these experiences through various lenses (but not necessarily 'to what end') (Sulentic Dowell, 2008; Tinkler & Tinkler, 2013). Through service-learning opportunities, such as tutoring and maintaining community gardens with students, authors found that the teacher candidates' (who were mostly White students in both studies) perspectives on diversity were expanded and their self-reflexivity increased. In addition, 70% of the respondents in one study indicated being more aware of educational inequalities as a result of the program (Tinkler & Tinkler, 2013), and in the

other, teacher candidates developed greater responsiveness to socio-cultural issues that their future students might face (Sulentic Dowell, 2008).

The most prominent ‘critical’ examples were service learning and social action curriculum projects (SACP) that gave teacher candidates the responsibility of defining the ‘problem’ through a critical or discursive pedagogical lens, and tasked them with interrogating their own beliefs about particular discourses (Butler et al., 2017; Ponder et al., 2011; Shultz & Baricovich, 2010; Stenhouse & Jarrett, 2012). Stenhouse and Jarrett’s (2012) Problem Solutions Project and Shultz and Baricovich’s (2010) SACPs saw teacher candidates identify problems as a group, brainstorm solutions, implement some form of action, and typically write reflections on the process. Projects ranged from a lack of resources and books in elementary schools to hunger rates faced by teacher candidates’ in their own communities. Stenhouse and Jarrett’s (2012) findings revealed that teacher candidates felt a sense of empowerment as a result of being engaged in issues that affected their own realities (these types of SACPs also need not be limited to education foundations courses; see Ng-A-Fook, 2013, for a science curricula-based example). Similar to SACPs, Ponder et al. (2011) revealed that asking teachers to implement a service-learning projects in their classrooms enabled them to effectively foster a democratic classroom environment where student-led initiatives could be facilitated, to make connections and build partnerships with communities outside of the classroom, and to reflect on their own growth throughout the process. Finally, Butler et al. (2017) describe how White teacher candidates were tasked with learning from urban high school students, through a student voice project, by inquiring about students’ learning experiences, and asking what advice they had for teacher candidates. The authors found that, over the course of the year, teacher candidates cultivated deeper relationships with students than those that would normally be constrained by a typical

practica placement in their teacher education program. Teacher candidates learned about the positive place-based associations that students had with their school, and this in turn allowed the teacher candidates to develop deeper understandings of themselves. Unlike the first three, this latter project (Butler et al., 2017) was not tied directly to an education foundations course, however, the approach is in line with the types of approaches that these courses can take. In addition, in all of the aforementioned projects, ethical engagement and action was prioritized over 'exposure' or 'awareness' (Andreotti, 2006), and teacher candidates were learning about injustices that affected their *own* lives, in addition to the lives of their students.

Anti-oppressive / Anti-racist Education Foundations Courses

Despite engagement with critical materials about race and racism, outcomes of anti-racist education foundations courses reviewed mostly fall within the neoliberal and liberal heuristic frames (Pashby et al., 2000), or on the 'soft' end of Andreotti's (2006) spectrum. Schick and St. Denis (2003) describe three, pervasive ideological assumptions that can be found when teaching primarily White-identified students about race and anti-racism in education foundations courses: race doesn't matter, everyone has equal opportunity (meritocracy), and, by individual acts and good intentions, once can secure innocence as well as superiority (pp. 6-9). These three ideological 'common-sense' ideas include denying that race exists, accepting it exists but maintaining that it does not affect people's lives, and accepting that it might affect people's lives, but denying that White people are responsible for dismantling racist structures. These pervasive assumptions in anti-racist teacher education foundations courses reinforce ideas that White people can 'help' the 'other', which maintains relative superiority.

Anti-racist initiatives that could be considered as having more 'neoliberal' outcomes include education foundations courses that offer critical content, but where overwhelming

discourses of Whiteness prevent this message from being received (Dei, 2001; Evans-Winters & Hoff, 2011; Schick, 2000). Schick (2000), for example, engaged with 18 White pre-service teachers at a Canadian university following their completion of a cross-cultural/anti-racist course. Their lived experiences of benefitting from Whiteness affected these teacher candidates' ability to engage with anti-racist pedagogy. Schick (2000) argues that, "one of the effects of whiteness is participants' access to various ideological practices with which to escape uncomfortable identifications and which invariably rely on practices of othering in order to retain ideal selves" (p. 86). Faced with anti-racist pedagogy, Schick (2000) found that, "it is students' overwhelming desires for their productions of 'good' and 'innocent' identities that is at odds with their desires not to know, with their will to ignorance" (p. 86), and that teacher candidates interviewed employed various strategies to maintain this 'goodness', 'innocence' and 'respectability'. These strategies included distancing themselves from overtly racist White people, professing a commitment to / knowledge of Indigenous Peoples, and desiring to know what language to use in order to appear tolerant of the 'other'. Dei (2001) similarly found that student-teachers' responses to readings in their anti-racist course showed White students discussing the need for 'diversity' forms of instruction in response to a diverse population, and students whose responses characterized the idea that people who are pushing back against oppression are 'preachy' or 'racist against Whites'. In another case, Evans-Winters and Hoff (2011) document the resistance that two Black professors face from their White students through the teaching evaluations of their education foundations course. They assert that White students used silence as a weapon (by withdrawing from meaningful conversations about race), performed 'simulated' tolerance, and used course evaluations to take out their frustrations on being confronted with ideas about White supremacy. Like Dei (2001), students in the study also

claimed that the professors were ‘prejudiced against White people’ (Evans-Winters & Hoff, 2011).

Examples of ‘liberal’ initiatives in teacher education programs included foundations courses that contained significant engagement with critical or anti-oppressive content, and where teacher candidates professed changing some of their views, but where the root causes of inequality were not necessarily examined. Studies looking at the infusion of Indigenous content and pedagogies into teacher education, for example, have had mixed results (Deer, 2013; Blimkie et al., 2014; Kanu, 2011; Tupper, 2011). Teacher candidates have reported being uncomfortable incorporating historical and contemporary Indigenous content into their teaching (Deer, 2013), and claim ignorance or not knowing ‘how’ to teach about treaties (Tupper, 2011). In one study, Blimkie et al. (2014) found that 75% of teacher candidates reported incorporating Indigenous content in their teaching placements, but the authors worried about the tokenistic effects of such integrations. Kanu (2011), using a similar approach, also found that Indigenous perspectives were only added occasionally into largely Eurocentric curricula by teacher candidates. Although these teacher candidates were faced with examining their own privilege, their integration of Indigenous perspectives into their practica may have been motivated more by ‘awareness raising’ than by thinking critically about how to upset a Eurocentric curriculum. Andreotti (2006) warns that a potential problem with these types of citizenship education interventions is that they reinforce cultural superiority and colonial assumptions by paying limited attention to cultural minorities.

Anti-racist education foundations courses facilitated with White teacher candidates, in particular, revealed several resistance strategies used by White students. In their study of 200 teacher candidates attending two large urban Universities in Ontario, Solomon et al. (2005)

found that students showed “ideological incongruence; liberalist notions of individualism and meritocracy; and [would] negate white capital” (Solomon et al., 2005, p. 153). Ideological incongruence included students professing to hold anti-oppressive beliefs, but being unwilling to carry these out in practice. Negating White capital included denials of White privilege and structural racism, entrenched ideas about individual merit, and located the problem of racism as a lack of knowledge about other cultures, “thereby removing the need for an analysis of issues of power, dominance, historical colonization and oppression fostered primarily by whites against other groups” (Solomon et al., 2005, p. 158). A similar study conducted by Solomon and Daniel (2007) further found that teacher candidates were unaware of racism in Canada (‘not here in Canada’), and would try to center gender or class in discussions of race in order to avoid and de-center race. In another study of 47 White women enrolled in an anti-racism course, Case and Hemmings (2005) found that these preservice teachers also used several distancing strategies, including silence, social disassociation, and distancing from responsibility. ‘Silence’ included not outwardly disagreeing when someone said something racist, and remaining silent during class discussions out of a fear of being constructed as racist by their Black peers. ‘Social disassociation’ included distancing themselves from the label of racist, through avoiding situations where they might be construed as racist, and through claiming colour blindness (they don’t see race). ‘Distancing strategies’ included distancing themselves from responsibility by focussing on progress that has been made concerning racism in the past (p. 611). Considering all of these strategies, is it not surprising that Levine-Rasky (2000b) also found that teacher candidates overwhelmingly held inconsistent beliefs and internal tension about the causes of educational inequality and social difference. In a study of 35 teacher candidates (86% of participants identified having some ‘European’ ancestry) at a Canadian university, Levine-Rasky

(2000b) concluded that teacher candidates were conflicted about their Whiteness and significant critiques of the performance of Whiteness (‘White anxiety’), and similarly constructed social distance from racism. However, Levine-Rasky (2000b) argues that, what can be learned from these cases is that “delineating a teacher candidate’s values as a position in tension can advance our understanding of the social relations of domination and may indicate points where change may be initiated” (p. 280).

Some programs also found that teacher candidates ‘performed’ anti-racism. Matias et al. (2014) interviewed 16 teacher candidates (15 of whom where White) in a large urban-focussed teacher education program. Their analysis concluded that teacher candidates were emotionally (dis)invested in racial justice, they recognized that they were White, but did not push themselves beyond that acknowledgement, and teacher candidates got stuck in ‘White guilt’ (Matias et al., 2014, p. 5). The authors recommended that their program must seek to uncover effective ways for White teacher candidates to self-interrogate their investments in Whiteness in order to move from performative to active anti-racism. Mason (2016) similarly described that (95% White women) students arrive to her courses “well-practiced in what [she] dub[s] diversity discourse: while they often openly reject colorblindness, words like ‘urban’ and ‘inner-city’ stand in a coded language to signify racial categories without actually talking about race” (Mason, 2016, p. 1046). Analysis found that students did not want to ask difficult questions in front of classmates, struggling with the idea of imperfection in a profession where teacher candidates are expected to be perfect when they begin teaching.

These ‘liberal’ initiatives all saw teacher candidates reflecting on their experiences, on Whiteness, and introduced them to reflexive ways of thinking about difference (Andreotti, 2006). However, this increased awareness was not located in an analysis of the structures that were

causing educational inequalities, therefore restricting student teachers' reflections to move beyond the 'awareness' stage towards a 'responsible and ethical action' phase in their future pedagogical choices (Andreotti, 2006).

Examples of 'critical' initiatives included teacher candidates looking at structural power dynamics in classrooms, curricula, and their own education programs (Anderson et al., 2015; Kelley & Brandes, 2010; Schick & St. Denis, 2005; St. Denis, 2007), and being comfortable inquiring into tensions concerning racism and anti-racism (Pollock et al., 2010). In one instance, students were asked in a course to 're-write' national and personal narratives regarding their social location based on various identities (race, gender, class, etc.), and to reflect on the ongoing implications of these identities within systems of power. Teacher candidates navigated issues of injustice by allowing themselves to feel the 'uncomfortableness' of being a White teacher planning anti-racist activities, and noted being more well-placed to challenge racializations after this process (Schick & St. Denis, 2005). Another course asked teacher candidates to observe the diversity of student identities and power dynamics (including racial and gender dynamics) in their practica classrooms, and to design lessons that would address the dynamics they had observed. During this process, teacher candidates reported being more committed to anti-oppressive approaches in their future teaching (Kelley & Brandes, 2010). Anderson et al. (2015) used a similar action research approach, and worked with teacher candidates to interrogate the sites of learning about social and environmental justice issues in their own program. The process of this project led candidates to consider issues of power and privilege, and to brainstorm solutions together that could be implemented in the following years. Pollock (2008) notes that investigations like these with students, into one's own classroom or school, can have a sizeable impact on how students understand their own capacity for identifying and challenging unjust

structures. Similarly, Pollock et al. (2010) found that teacher candidates who understood the tension between theory and practice in anti-racist education, and were open to investigating both sides of these tensions going forward, were the most committed to serving students of colour in their future classrooms. All of these ‘critical’ initiatives describe teacher candidate deliberation about the justification for their positions of privilege, and how their positionality is implicated in the perpetuation of structural injustice. They also positioned social problems as the result of inequality, and not due to poverty or a lack of ‘development’, emphasizing that part of what individuals can ‘do’ is to analyse and understand their own position and attitudes in relation to the power structures they encounter in their daily lives (Andreotti, 2006, p. 47).

In addition to these critical initiatives, there are good practices and effective teaching strategies noted in the literature that are not necessarily the result of empirical studies, but which are nonetheless ‘critical’ (DiAngelo & Sensoy, 2014; Lund & Carr, 2018; Pollock, 2008; Smith et al., 2010). Lund and Carr (2018) call these strategies those that ‘disrupt denial’ in White teacher candidates who are learning about race, racism, and anti-racism in education foundations courses, and Pollock (2008) terms them ‘every-day’ anti-racist strategies. These types of strategies allow for productive learning instead of turns toward defensiveness, and are usually meant to be ‘practiced’. Like Schick and St. Denis (2015), Lund and Carr (2018) have found that critical self-reflection exercises about teacher candidates’ identities, where they must identify experiences that have shaped who they are, and explain the context of these experiences to their peers, can provide inroads into talking about race and racism. This strategy is similar to what Pollock (2008) describes as analysing ‘opportunity denial’ with teacher candidates, through asking critical questions about the racialized way that people have experienced the world, and what accounts for these differences. Lund and Carr (2018) also note that ‘equity surveys’ can be

an avenue for students to talk through answers to hard questions in small groups, in particular about topics that they may not have learned about in high school, and assess not only the content of the survey, but why they were denied this knowledge in school. Both Lund and Carr (2018) and Pollock (2008) also note that media literacy activities are particularly powerful, and that by utilizing these strategies in a way that encourages teacher candidates to practice using different discursive lenses (with a newscast or article) can reveal important analysis (Lund & Carr, 2008, p. 199).

DiAngelo and Sensoy (2014) also offer several other good practices, including using ‘silence breakers’, analogies, and vignettes in order to create constructive learning environments for White students. Silence breakers include equipping students with phrases prior to discussions about race, so that they can articulate claims and questions in ways that open rather than shut down discussions (DiAngelo, 2018a; DiAngelo & Sensoy, 2014). These can include “I have always heard that … What is an anti-racist perspective on that?” or “I am having a ‘yeah but.’ Can you help me work through it?” (p. 194). DiAngelo and Sensoy (2014) also recommend using analogies to help students understand anti-racism as a conceptual lens rather than a debate, and vignettes that allow students to analyze situations where they are not directly implicated, but can nonetheless unsettle and reassess their expectations. The vignette approach is also similar to a perspective-taking approach described by Warren (2018), and is a key component of the ‘through other eyes’ approach developed by Andreotti and de Souza (2008), which allow teacher candidates to imagine and encounter systems from other points of view, encourage both empathy development and critical analysis, and ultimately endeavor to cultivate ethical frameworks for engagement.

This chapter attempted to map my engagement with research, concepts, and education foundations courses that help to situate my project in context. The history and connections between White settler colonialism, citizenship, and racism in Canada are what make any discussion of citizenship education simultaneously a discussion about race and Whiteness, and this interplay informed the goals of this research project, namely, to try and uncover how these fields are overlapping in teacher education. Through describing current civic education curricula, K-12 classroom practices, and the teacher education context in Canada, my hope is to understand how these contexts affected the outcomes of my study. In addition, by looking at empirical studies in civic education, global citizenship education, social justice education, and anti-racist education in teacher education, I was better able to understand what practices might contribute to breaking through harmful discourses of individualism, racism, and Whiteness, and which may combat resistance from White teacher candidates. From here, I move on to discuss the theoretical and conceptual frameworks that I draw upon to position and analyze my data, before moving on to my methodology chapter.

Chapter Three: Theoretical & Conceptual Frameworks

We have all been steeped in White supremacy (Battiste, 2018).

Philosophical Assumptions

My parallel interests in community organizing, social justice, and public education prepared me to pursue and facilitate research projects that investigate inequality perpetuated in schools, in addition to working to change the societal structures that reinforce this inequality. I am perpetually uneasy, however, when I think about doing research and positioning myself as a 'knower'. Designing research projects conjures images of another 'liberated' academic creating projects to study the 'unliberated other' (Ellsworth, 1989), especially when considering my own socialization in the context of "modern/colonial ontology" (Pashby et al., 2020, p. 16). Conducting research requires the necessary re/development of my own self-reflexivity in an effort to 'unsettle my innocence' as a White settler researcher working in a settler colonial context (Tuck & Yang, 2012). But how is it that I can imagine, think, or act outside of this ontology? In response, I heed Lather's (2006) caution about claiming a permanent 'epistemological home,' and in this project I endeavor to develop an epistemological and conceptual spectrum that may "multiply the levels of knowing and doing upon which resistance can act" (Spivak as quoted in Lather, 1991), and through which I can further learn and grow.

Theoretical Orientation

For the purposes of this study, I draw on the work of intersectional critical, anti-racist, and critical race educational theorists in order to theoretically situate my study in the racialized economic, social, and political structures of the 'Canadian' context (Andreotti, 2010; Arvin et al., 2013; Battiste, 2013; Dei, 1996; 2001; Kumashiro, 2000; Leonardo, 2002; 2013). As Gillborn (2006) has asserted:

> If we *only* focus on the scale of inequity, and school-level approaches to addressing it, we lose sight of the most powerful forces operating at the societal level to sustain and extend these inequalities. Essentially, we risk tinkering with the system to make its outputs slightly less awful, but leaving untouched the fundamental shape, scale, and purpose of the system itself. (p. 18)

The systems that I therefore interrogate in this study include neoliberal capitalism (including looking at issues of monetizing relationships and choices, individualism, meritocracy, socioeconomic status, mental and physical ability) (Peters, 2012), cisheteropatriarchy (looking at issues of gender, sex, and sexual-orientation) (Arvin et al., 2013; Miller, 2016), settler colonialism (including issues of language, belonging, religion, racialization, culture, land, and citizenship status) (Arvin et al., 2013; Battiste, 2013; Veracini, 2010; Wolfe, 1999; 2016), and White supremacy (including issues of racialization, Whiteness, and superiority intersecting with gender, class, and ability) (Leonardo, 2002; 2013). The overlapping nature of these systems produces exploitation, marginalization, powerlessness, cultural imperialism, and violence against people and the environment (Young, 2011), all of which contribute to the oppression that permeates education systems, and the ways that schools reinforce racialized forms of civic engagement.

In *Race Frameworks*, Leonardo (2013) outlines several frameworks through which researchers and practitioners can critique these oppressive systems and mobilize change, and he details the benefits and tensions of using various approaches for different purposes, including through Marxism, Cultural Studies, a multidimensional 'post-race' theory, Critical Race Theory, and Critical Whiteness Studies. While my study draws on some aspects of all of these fields, my choice to use Critical Race Theory and Critical Whiteness Studies stems from the purposes and foci that Leonardo outlines for each approach. I will briefly outline some of the ways that the study draws on work from critical Marxist and Cultural Studies approaches, before outlining why

critical race and critical Whiteness approaches were the best suited for this research project. I will also briefly discuss the utilization of these frameworks in the context of decolonial work.

Although they are not the same, critical theory and critical pedagogy draw many of their roots from a Marxist critique, and this approach is what introduced me to the fundamental social stratification caused by capitalist accumulation and the exploitation of labour, in addition to research that seeks to dismantle neoliberal capitalism's influence on educational structures. Critical theorists support research that is developed as part of community responses to imperial and capital oppression, and which equips people with the knowledge and skills needed to critically interrogate social, political, and economic systems, and engage in actions that will change the injustices caused by these systems or challenge the systems themselves (Apple, 2004; Carr & Kemmis, 2009; Freire, 1970; 1994; Giroux, 2004a; 2004b; 2013; hooks, 1994; 2003; Irizarry, 2009; Kincheloe, 2008). Leonardo (2013) notes the importance of this critique, but also that the centrality of labour and property in critical and Marxist critiques often subsumes a race critique as a "species of class analysis" (p. 45). In addition, other intersectional critical theorists argue that capitalism, cisheteropatriarchy, and settler colonialism are inseparable (hooks, 2015; Smith, 2012), and urge that critical research dealing with racialized systems must name these systems and address one's position within them.

I have also learned a great deal form Cultural Studies approaches to thinking about race and racism. Leonardo (2013) describes how representation and discourses allow racism to be made knowable, and that through Cultural Studies we can understand how Whiteness monopolizes "the apparatuses of representation" in every aspect of society, including education, media, and policies (p. 114). Here, Hall's (1997a; 1997b) work on representation, race as a 'floating signifier', and a mobilization of Foucault's notions of subjectivity (Bakan & Dua, 2014)

introduced me to an analysis of race as a representative, discursive construction (not a biological reality), that both makes the racialized ‘other’ the subject *of* race and subjected *to* racism. I draw on these discursive representations of race and Whiteness, but also wanted the study to examine practice in order to foster changes: in my own thinking and pedagogy, in the thinking and pedagogy of the participating teacher candidates, and perhaps through future interventions based on this work. In this way, critical race theorists’ focus on changing policies and practices seemed a better fit. So too with the multidimensional theory of race, Leonardo (2013) navigates how a post-race theory could provide a productive space for thinking through the contradictions and realities of the current “pigmentocracy that is Whiteness” (p. 164), and how a post-race theory could provide spaces of hopefulness for imagined, shared futures. From this work, I learned about the possible futures that anti-racist civic engagement work could be pointing at, but it would be another project altogether to envision with teacher candidates what a post-race education system could look like.

Although there is overlap between critical race and decolonial research, in settler colonial nation-states, decolonization “is a distinct project from other civil and human rights-based social justice projects” (Tuck & Yang, 2012, p. 2). Doing research that seeks to *decolonize* education does not fit within other social justice frameworks (Alfred & Corntassel, 2005; Battiste, 1998; 2013; Donald, 2012; St. Denis, 2007; 2011; Smith, 2012; Tuck, 2009; Tuck & Yang, 2012; 2014), but instead focuses specifically on the issue of settler colonialism, and how this system of domination interacts with neoliberal capitalism and cisheteropatriarchy. This focus can represent different foci than critical and anti-racist-informed research. As Tuck and Yang (2012) explain, “the disruption of Indigenous relationships to land represents a profound epistemic, ontological, cosmological violence” (p. 5), and that decolonial work must have at its forefront the repatriation

of land to Indigenous Peoples. As someone engaging in critical, anti-racist work; interrogating the Western, Eurocentric, and White supremacist structuring of language, education, and society, my intent is to *support* the work of decolonization – but this research project is not decolonial in and of itself.

Critical Race Theory and Critical Whiteness Studies offer a productive space for this project's critique, by stressing the necessity of cultivating understandings of race as a significant, organizing feature of capitalist, settler colonial, and White supremacist societies, including in the structure of education (Dei, 2001; Ladson-Billings, 1998; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Leonardo, 2002; 2004; 2013), and offering potential avenues for change that could be made in teacher education programs to mitigate some of the findings. In the next section, I will discuss my engagements with Critical Race Theory and Critical Whiteness Studies, and then describe how these theories shaped the conceptual framework that I used to analyze my data.

Critical Race Theory

Gillborn (2006) argues that a Critical Race Theory (CRT) analytical lens actively implicates educational systems as racist and works to identify sites for change. He writes that "simply asserting our anti-racist intentions means nothing if we leave unchanged the dominant systems of testing, the curriculum, teacher education, and punitive inspection regimes that penalize schools serving working-class and minoritized communities" (Gillborn, 2006, p. 15). Leonardo (2013) similarly asserts that CRT is "not a matter of abstraction but a way to make intelligible the lived dimensions of race," particularly in education (p. 24).

For many critical race scholars and educators, theory and utilizations of CRT in educational settings therefore also consider other axis of experience (class, gender, sexual orientation, or ability, for example). The CRT body of work does not "jettison class analysis but

integrates it" (Leonardo, 2013, p. 25). Ladson-Billings (1998) also contends that CRT inherently critiques liberalism, as liberalism only allows for incremental change, whereas CRT calls for broad-based changes to racist systems, and endeavors to expose the conflation of capitalism and democracy, in order to draw attention to the direct link between historical property ownership and citizenship in nation-states (pp. 12-15). CRT also draws on an intersectional analysis (Crenshaw, 1991) to critique and endeavor to eradicate interlocking systems of oppression. Like CRT, intersectionality was firmly theorized in legal studies (Crenshaw, 1991), with roots in the Combahee River Collective (Eisenstein, 1977), who emphasized the decades-old efforts of organizing against interlocking racist, classist, and sexist policies in social, political, and economic systems. While intersectionality is occasionally accused of a reductionist tendency to equate all identity labels (race, class, gender, ability, sexual orientation, language) as carrying similar oppressive histories without exploring any axis in depth, Harris and Leonardo (2018) argue that, with intersectional CRT, "the dynamism between interlocking social systems does not preclude *beginning* from racial analysis. A critical analysis of education may begin strategically with race without ending on a single-axis explanation" (p. 16).

By recognizing race as an ideological construct that has every-day consequences for people and groups, and by working to change policies and practices that uphold racism and other interlocking forms of oppression on individual, cultural, and systemic levels, CRT is 'active' (Delgado & Stefanic, 2001; Ladson-Billings, 1998; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Omi & Winant, 1994; Solórzano, 1998). Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995) argue that CRT must attend directly to the structural, racist policy issues that racism has created in society and in education. Solórzano (1998) further argues that "critical race theory in education challenges the dominant discourse on race and racism as they relate to education by examining how educational theory,

policy, and practice are used to subordinate certain racial and ethnic groups” (p. 122). Solórzano (1998) also describes several key components (tenets) of CRT, which are echoed by other critical race theorists, including: 1) The centrality of race as an organizing feature of society (Delgado & Stefanic, 2001; Gillborn, 2006; Omi & Winant, 1994; Solórzano, 1998), 2) The challenge CRT poses to dominant ideology in education, 3) A commitment to social justice through changing policy and practice, 4) Taking direction from the lived experiences of people of colour, and 5) The interdisciplinary nature of CRT (Solórzano, 1998, pp. 122-123). Researcher and practitioner utilization of CRT typically addresses several of these goals at once.

In the present study, the goals of CRT are addressed in several ways. The first is through framing the study in the settler colonial nation-state context of Canada, which implicates the history of state formation and educational systems as racialized, and race as a central organizing feature of ‘Canadian’ society. The second goal is brought into focus through the investigation and implication of White settler colonialism in teacher education. Ledesma and Calderón (2015) reiterate that linking CRT to challenging dominant ideologies in education and changing actual practices in K-12 and postsecondary education is essential, in order to stay true to the legal roots of CRT. They state that “it is only when Critical Race education scholars recouple their work with Critical Race legal literature that CRT’s commitment to eliminate all forms of oppression can be more fully actualized” (p. 206). The authors stress that engaged CRT must go beyond theorizing and identifying institutional racism to offer ways to engage with enduring racism.

In this way, this study not only seeks to identify the forms of resistance that White teacher candidates pose to anti-racist civic education pedagogy in education foundations courses, but further seeks to identify ways of countering prevalent ideological discourses in education, in hopes to inform future policies and practices in teacher education. Ladson-Billings (1998) argues

that Critical Race Theory should seek to expose the “White supremacist master script” (p. 18), and that teachers should interrogate race-neutral or colorblind perspectives in curricula (Bonilla-Silva, 2006; Ullucci & Battey, 2011), understand deficit-thinking, and reject the idea that there are race-neutral approaches. By mapping the ways that teacher candidates resist anti-racist or justice-based pedagogy, and illuminating the ways that ‘worked’ in getting through the White supremacist ‘master script’, a focus on these anti-racist strategies can attend to the third goal of CRT, which is a commitment to social justice and trying to change educational practices. In the ‘Canadian’ White settler colonial context, in particular, CRT offers a productive way to interrogate neoliberalism, individualism, meritocracy, deficit thinking, and other pervasive discourses in education that are directly tied to White supremacist ideas of race (Dei, 1996; James, 1995). CRT offers a way to point to the many intricacies of democratic racism (Henry & Tator, 1994), the ways that this form of racism plays out in education, and to recommend ways forward. In many ways, anti-racist education is one application of Critical Race Theory; many educators and scholars working in anti-racism cite the tenants and theories of CRT as influencing their work, or as central to it (Gillborn, 2004; King & Chandler, 2016; Marshall et al., 2015; Ohito, 2016; Sonn, 2008).

Critical Whiteness Studies

Similar to the principle that critical race researchers should take direction from the lived experiences of people of colour (Solórzano, 1998), Leonardo (2002) argues that White researchers engaging with issues of race and White supremacy “must be guided by non-white discourses” (p. 46). Drawing on the field of Critical Whiteness Studies (CWS), which Gillborn (2006) classifies as a conceptual and methodological ‘tool’ of CRT, further reinforces a commitment to dismantling White supremacy. For the purposes of this study, I draw specifically

on the theory and experiences of Black, Indigenous, and scholars of colour in the Critical Whiteness Studies (CWS) field in order to theorize racialized White teacher candidates' experiences learning about/through anti-oppressive and anti-racist pedagogy. This choice stems from the foundational understanding that the study is being conducted within and about White settler colonial realities, and that the Critical Whiteness Studies field builds on earlier, seminal theorizing about Whiteness through the works of Du Bois (1903/2017) and Baldwin (1962).

Where Critical Race Theory takes up the task of training educators to dismantle racist structures and exclusions, Critical Whiteness Studies asks what this process should look like for educators and students who are White, and who are committed to dismantling White supremacy. Du Bois (1903/2017) implored the White readers of *The Souls of Black Folk* to confront the realities of Black lives by examining their own role in perpetuating White supremacy, and to become 'students' of race. Just as Baldwin (1962) wrote that White people find it difficult "to divest themselves of the notion that they are in possession of some intrinsic value that black people need" (n.p.), Ledesma and Calderón (2015) highlight that "we must teach Whites to understand themselves through the history of [what they construct as] the other, in much the same way many communities of color understand themselves in relationship to Whites" (p. 209). In this way, CWS tackles the "socially constructed and constantly reinforced power of white identifications and interests" (Gillborn, 2006, p. 25). Where CRT investigates structural and institutionalized racism in education (in addition to how race intersects with gender, sexual orientation, and ableness), CWS tasks educators with understanding *their participation* in a culture of exclusion, and to be accountable for this participation, by asking "that whites initiate a dismantling of unjust and racist social relations or divest themselves from the power they embody in social institutions" (Levine-Rasky, 2000a, pp. 272-273).

In this study, the utilization of CWS contextualized the analysis of White teacher candidates' experiences of anti-oppressive and anti-racist civic education. As Solomon et al. (2005) explain, it is imperative to "examine [how] notions of whiteness facilitate the maintenance of its incorporeal nature thereby reinscribing its dominating power" (p. 148). Specifically, CWS seeks to understand White teacher candidate resistance to learning about institutionalized racism and White supremacy, in an attempt to uncover ways of penetrating this resistance in education. McIntyre (1997) argues that "white student teachers need to be intentional about being self-reformers … *purposefully thinking through their own racial identities as salient aspects of their thinking through the racial identities of the students they teach"* (p. 5, emphasis in original). Through taking stock of the various ways that teacher education programs undertake this task, Levine-Rasky (2000a) argues that "programmes oriented towards preparing educators to effectively teach to diversity are themselves identified as a crucial element in the failure of equity education" (p. 272), and that it is only through "the identification of whiteness as a social marker of power and privilege [that began] to make inroads into this impasse" (Levine-Rasky, 2000a, p. 272) in teacher education programs.

In the past 25 years, Critical Whiteness Studies (as a field, largely beginning in the United States) has seen two predominant waves in the way that it interrogates White resistance in teacher education. The first wave emphasised the role that White privilege plays in White teacher candidates' pedagogical choices. These earlier approaches "unjustly centralized the experiences of White people and/or overemphasize individualistic perspectives" (Mason, 2016, p. 1046). First-wave White teacher identity studies emphasized that "the pathway suggested for White preservice and professional teachers focused on transforming White race-evasive identities into White ally identities" (Jupp et al., 2016, p. 1161). This type of pedagogy

reinforced "monolithic understandings that equated Whiteness with white-skinned individuals [and] failed to drive at understandings of Whiteness that included historicized complexities of race, class, gender, and nation building" (McCarthy, 2003 as cited in Jupp et al., 2016, p. 1162). What became known as 'White privilege pedagogy' was criticized for lacking adequate context, by "failing to elaborate upon the basis of White privilege in the historical, social, and political arrangements between groups" (Levine-Rasky, 2000a, p. 274). Lensmire et al. (2013) argue that, "to an amazing degree, the antiracist aspirations and responsibilities of white teacher educators have been concentrated in McIntosh's discussion of white privilege," (p. 411) via her infamous 'Unpacking the invisible knapsack' article. CWS scholars argue that it is time to move past White privilege pedagogy, which asks White people to confess their privilege, and (at its worst) allows this confession to stand in for anti-racist action. Instead, teacher education programs need to move towards accountability for participation in unjust structures.

For Leonardo (2004), the examination of White privilege must be "complemented by an equally rigorous examination of white supremacy [because] the conditions of white supremacy make white privilege possible" (p. 137). Second-wave White teacher identity studies, then, urge moving away from talking about White privilege to talking about White supremacist structures (Lensmire et al., 2013; Leonardo, 2004; 2013). This move allows for "complexity in the process and content of white peoples' coming to racial consciousness" (Mason, 2016, p. 1046), by asking different questions: instead of asking White people to divest themselves of White privilege, the question becomes more about what White people can do to make society more racially just. This question "can lead down very different paths, and lead to quite different antiracist projects that have a different kind of meaning to students who engage in them" (Blum as quoted in Lensmire et al., 2013 p. 415). In this way, second-wave White teacher identity studies seek to look at the

"cultural production of race, whiteness, and white teacher identities that articulates complex historical and social forces along with related understandings of teaching and learning in context" (Jupp et al., 2016, p. 1163). In doing so, second-wave pedagogical practices try to encourage 'race-visible' White teacher identities, where teacher candidates recognize race, class, culture, and other identities in themselves and in their students, and understand these differences as having transformational potential in their classrooms (Jupp et al., 2016, p. 1168).

In addition to encouraging race visibility, Critical Whiteness Studies also offers a space to name resistance strategies that White people employ to secure dominance in different contexts (Carr & Lund, 2007; Lea et al., 2018). As Leonardo (2004) contends, "whiteness studies expose white lies, maneuvers, and pathologies that contribute to the avoidance of a critical understanding of race and racism … [and that] perpetuate white racial supremacy through color-blindness, ahistorical justifications, and sleights-of-mind" (p. 141). As outlined in the literature review, there are several disruptive and avoidance strategies used by White teacher candidates when learning about race and racism in foundations courses. These include colorblindness, or claiming not to 'see' race (Bonilla-Silva, 2006; Ullucci & Battey, 2011), or admitting that race exists, but maintaining that it doesn't matter (Schick, & St. Denis, 2003), including through claims that society is a meritocracy (Schick, & St. Denis, 2003; Solomon et al., 2005). Teacher candidates also negate their own White capital (Solomon et al., 2005), get defensive, (Solomon & Daniel, 2007), see critiques of Whiteness as racism against Whites (Dei, 2001; Evans-Winter & Hoff, 2011), and exhibit White anxiety and White guilt when faced with being implicated in White supremacy (Levine-Rasky, 2000b; Matias et al., 2014). In particular, teacher candidates will deny that Canada is a racist country, in favor of more 'polite' or peacekeeping discourses (Solomon & Daniel, 2007), try to distance themselves from overtly racist people or a history of

racism (Case & Hemmings, 2005; Lavine-Rasky, 2000b; Schick, 2000), and use other identity axis (like gender or class) to decentralize race in discussions (Solomon & Daniel, 2007). Teacher candidates are also worried about offending people when talking about oppression (Guo, 2014), including their Black classmates (Evans-Winters & Hoff, 2011). They profess to be sympathetic to Indigenous 'issues' (Schick, 2000), perform tolerance for the 'other' (Evans-Winter & Hoff, 2011), and may even perform anti-racism, but are unwilling to practice it (Matias et al., 2014; Solomon et al., 2005). In addition, teacher candidates are sometimes savvy in 'diversity discourse', where they arrive to education foundations courses equipped with social justice language, but may not have an accompanying analysis (Mason, 2016). Students also resist learning about race and racism through using and weaponizing silence (Case & Hemmings, 2005; DiAngelo, 2018a; Evans-Winters & Hoff, 2011), and propose diversity or multicultural approaches to teaching and learning (Dei, 2001) in order to reinforce their own sense of goodness or innocence (Schick, 2000; Schick & St. Denis, 2003).

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework that follows is an attempt to make these theories and forms of resistance an actionable form of data analysis in this study. The conceptual frameworks' foundations are drawn from a critical postcolonial global citizenship education framework (Andreotti, 2006) that has been supplemented with work drawn from both Critical Race Theory and Critical Whiteness Studies.

In order to decipher my participants' understandings of the intersections between civic education, anti-racist education, and social justice education, I draw on a spectrum created by Andreotti (2006), which seeks to address the well-founded critiques levelled against civic education and global civic education alike – including that both can be taught in uncritical

Eurocentric, colonial, neoliberalist, and state-driven ways (Abdul-Jabbar, 2015; Battiste & Semaganis, 2002; Pashby & Andreotti, 2015; Strong-Boag, 2002). Andreotti (2010) argues that a postcolonial way of thinking about civic education (global citizenship education in particular), adds new tools and perspectives to educators' toolboxes, while still keeping the useful parts of existing tools and concepts (p. 244). Andreotti (2010) stresses that postcolonialism, which emerged in the fields of anti-colonial struggles and literatures, tackles "the epistemic violence of colonialism and … European cultural supremacy in the subjugation of different peoples and knowledges in colonial and neocolonial contexts" (p. 238). In this way, a postcolonial approach seeks to destabilize the supremacy of 'Western', European, and White thought in education, knowledge creation processes, and the ways we teach and live in the world.

To describe how global citizenship education can turn towards postcolonial thinking and doing, Andreotti's (2006) framework positions some citizenship education initiatives as 'soft' and others as 'critical'. On one end of the spectrum, 'soft' civic education initiatives promote individualistic solutions to problems of inequality, and fail to attempt to critique the structural roots of these problems. These civic education initiatives reinforce Eurocentric ways of viewing the world, silence multiple ways of knowing, and entrench binary ideas about power. On the other end of the spectrum, 'critical' civic education initiatives seek to equip students with the language to talk about dismantling hegemonic, ethnocentric, ahistorical, apolitical, and paternalistic structures (both more broadly and as part of their own ways of thinking) (Pashby & Andreotti, 2015, p. 12). These more critical initiatives do not seek to prescribe ways of acting or engaging, but focus on "continuous deconstruction and hyper-self-reflexivity as a way to de-center the self in its encounter with those who live in very different contexts from oneself" (Pashby & Andreotti, 2015, p. 13).

This framework describes sixteen areas where the differences between soft and critical civic education are most apparent. These areas include how the civic education initiative frames the nature of the 'problem' and the justification for Northern positions of privilege. It also looks at how civic education programs define what needs to be changed, why things need to be changed, the role of 'ordinary' individuals, and what individuals can do. Finally, it asks questions about how change happens in different kinds of civic education, the principles that this change is based on, the goals and strategies of particular kinds of civic education, and the potential benefits and problems of civic education programs (please see Appendix A for the full spectrum) (Andreotti, 2006; Pashby & Andreotti, 2015, pp. 15-17).

In addition to utilizing Andreotti's framework, my study also required that I navigate additional lenses, based on my own identity and on my participants' self-identifications. At both research sites, teacher candidates overwhelmingly self-identified as White. In an effort to make this framework more actionable and contextually responsive for my study, I turned to Critical Race Theory (CRT) in education and Critical Whiteness Studies (CWS) in teacher education in order to gain more specific conceptual tools for analysis. The insights of these two bodies of literature meant that I could adapt some of Andreotti's categories to include what civic education initiatives look like that are engaging primarily White teacher candidates. For example, Andreotti (2006) posits that the goal of critical forms of civic education could be to "empower individuals to reflect critically on the legacies and processes of their cultures, to imagine different futures and to take responsibility for decisions and actions" (p. 48). In the context of my research, I was interested in how the self-identification by teacher candidates as White will affect this goal. Therefore, I revised the framework to ask: how can civic education engage *White and/or settler* teacher candidates in the Canadian context to reflect critically on the legacies and processes of

the cultures of White supremacy and settler colonialism, and what does taking responsibility for decisions and actions look like for White and/or settler teacher candidates?

In particular, my analytic focus included spectrums (see Table 1) that described the discursive patterns that 'uncritical' and 'critical' teacher candidates reproduced and maintained. These patterns included how teacher candidates defined societal problems, what teacher candidates viewed was the justification for educational inequality, and how they justified their own positionality/superiority. I also looked at teacher candidates' understandings of race, racism, and settler colonialism, and their beliefs about Whiteness and White supremacy. Finally, I looked specifically at what individual teacher candidates thought needed to change, how they believed change happens, and what they viewed as their role in this process. I drew on discourses in these areas in order to describe this spectrum of what 'uncritical' and 'critical' teacher candidates might reproduce in these areas (Levine-Rasky, 2000b). By analyzing teacher candidates' answers, my aim was not to 'prove' that teacher candidates 'are' racist; I was more interested in identifying the discourses that are being employed by teacher candidates to justify their own positionality, in order to try and learn about the interventions that might combat these specific discourses. Since individuals can hold contradictory views, this spectrum of discourses was particularly useful. As evidenced in the two findings chapters, individualistic understandings of civic engagement, racism, and Whiteness can coexist with discourses that implicate oneself in upholding structural injustice – a foundational tension in this study.

I next move on to discuss the comparative case study methodology that guided my project, the methods that I used to collect and analyze my data, and the strategies I employed to validate my findings. The methodology chapter serves as a bridge between the theorizing in the last two chapters and each research sites' context and findings that follow.

***Table 1.* Conceptual Framework**

Spectrum of teacher candidates' discursive reproductions		
Guiding Question	**'Uncritical' Discourses**	**'Critical' Discourses**
How do teacher candidates define the nature of the 'problem' that civic engagement should address?	Poverty, helplessness – due to lack of development, education, resources, skills, culture, technology (Andreotti, 2006).	Inequality, injustice – due to complex structures, systems, attitudes, power relations that create and maintain exploitation and enforced disempowerment (Andreotti, 2006).
What are teacher candidates' justifications for educational inequality?	Lack of cultural literacy, inability to assimilate, lack of parental support, lack of 'equal opportunity' (Andreotti, 2006; Levine-Rasky, 2000b).	School, curricula, and classrooms as sites that reproduce inequality (Andreotti, 2006).
How do teacher candidates justify their own positionality?	Education, hard work, better organization and use of resources, meritocracy (Schick, 2000), negation of White capital (Solomon et al., 2005).	Benefit and control over unjust and violent systems and structures (Andreotti, 2006).
How do teacher candidates understand race, racism, and settler colonialism?	Unwilling to name race, racism as individual attribute (Leonardo, 2002), avoid identifying with racial 'group', maintain goodness or innocence, (Schick, 2000), distancing from overtly racist White people, desire to appear tolerant (Mason, 2016).	Name racist structures, racism as systemic (Leonardo, 2002), reflect critically on the legacies and processes of their cultures (Andreotti, 2006), take responsibility for decisions, actions, and role in perpetuating racism (Schick & St. Denis, 2003).
What are teacher candidates' beliefs about Whiteness and White supremacy?	Whiteness as an individual attribute ('White people'), supremacy includes individual acts of hate and overt racism (Leonardo, 2002; Levine-Rasky, 2000a).	Whiteness as a colonial and ideological construction tied to capital, the structuring of society upholds White supremacy (Leonardo, 2002; Levine-Rasky, 2000a).
What do teacher candidates think needs to change, and how will their students succeed?	Need more multiculturalism, more 'diversity' training (Dei, 2001), encourage hard work (Andreotti, 2006).	Need to change structures, own belief systems, institutions, assumptions, cultures, individuals, and relationships (Andreotti, 2006).
What do teacher candidates view as their personal responsibility? What do teacher candidates think that they can 'do'?	Avoidance - Advocate for diversity, multiculturalism, support campaigns, donate time, expertise, resources, 'be the change' (Andreotti, 2006).	Accountability - Anti-racist pedagogy, analyze own position in context, utilize positionality to change structures, assumptions, and power relations (Andreotti, 2006).

Chapter Four: Methodology

"…what can we do now in order to be able to do tomorrow what we are unable to do today?"

- Freire, 2014, p. 115

Project Design

This multiple-site comparative case study (Yin, 2014) sought to engage teacher candidates in a mutually beneficial metacognitive research process. Teacher candidates engaged in the project through posing questions, thinking about their own learning, and responding to prompts and questions during the span of a four-month semester. Meanwhile, I engaged in trying to understand how these teacher candidates conceptualized the intersections of civic, social justice, and anti-racist education. It was important to me that the project could be engaging and beneficial for the participants, and that the research design and approach that I employed sought to reflect this intention.

Structural injustice in education requires analysis and action that considers how social justice and anti-racist practices intersect with civic education pedagogy, and I revisit my own pedagogy frequently with these questions in mind. As such, I wanted to engage teacher candidates who were also curious about these intersections and about asking similar questions of their own pedagogy. Research sites across 'Canada' were narrowed down based on recommendations from committee and community members, and through an examination of practices used by course professors in the literature. Primarily, I wanted to talk to teacher candidates enrolled in courses that would be engaging them in an analysis of their own positionalities, delving into issues close to the 'critical' end of Andreotti's (2006) postcolonial global citizenship education spectrum. I looked for those courses that included course content focusing on "complex structures, systems, assumptions, power relations and attitudes that create

and maintain exploitation" (Andreotti, 2006, p. 46), in particular, settler colonialism, neoliberal capitalism, and cisheteropatriarchy. Teacher candidates engaged in an examination of these structures in conjunction with developing their own civic education pedagogy could shed light on my research questions.

In comparative case studies (also called multiple-site case studies or multiple-case designs), the same research questions are posed in two or more settings with similar research designs (Yin, 2014). Bishop (2010) explains that, "by richly illuminating the experiences, implications, or effects of a phenomenon in more than one setting, wider understandings about a phenomenon can emerge" (p. 587), which produces both within-site patterns and cross-site analysis. Chmiliar (2010) describes how each site is typically 'bounded' in terms of time or place, and can provide a more in-depth understanding than a single case can, by selecting different cases in order to understand an issue and theorize about its broader context (p. 582). Yin (1982) explains that the emergence of multiple-site case study designs arose from a contemporary need to examine "multiple experiences with the same type of phenomenon" (p. 86), in particular with respect to complex topics. In the comparative case study approach, each case is analysed separately, with a final comparative analysis of emergent themes of both cases taken together.

I selected the two research sites in this study, consisting of Bachelor of Education programs at two publicly funded universities - one in Saskatchewan and one in Ontario - for two reasons. The first rationale for selecting each site was based on the potential for the courses to shed light on what was 'working' in the areas of civic, social justice, and anti-racist education, by selecting what Yin (2009) describes as distinctive or 'special' cases for research. Both of the selected education foundations courses in these programs were taught by tenured faculty who

each have decades of experience in education foundations work, and well-established course models. An examination of their syllabi (discussed in each site's context section) and publications revealed a focus on anti-racism, social justice, and civic education pedagogy. The second rationale for site selection included my own contextual knowledge of the two research sites. Having lived in both Saskatchewan and Ontario for many years, my knowledge of the social, political, and economic histories of the research sites uniquely placed me on the insider-outsider spectrum when conducting this research (Mercer, 2007). I was not an insider to the research in the sense that I was also a teacher candidate participant in the project, but my understandings of the sites' contexts, in particular as a White settler, gave me a nuanced understanding of some of the teacher candidates' observations. In this way, I was a 'contextual insider' to the research site *discourses*. At both sites, I looked at teacher candidates that were enrolled in mandatory education foundations courses in their Bachelor of Education programs. Although both of the universities selected also offer specific Indigenous teacher education programs, I chose to conduct research in the 'general' programs only, in order to gain insight into how primarily non-Indigenous White students were grappling with the intersections of civic and anti-racist education.

The comparative case study design also calls for 'thick' descriptions to contextualize the research sites (Chadderton & Torrance, 2011), in the same way that single-site case studies require. Here, however, contextual information can be focused "to discover contrasts, similarities, or patterns across the cases" (Campbell, 2010, p. 175), drawing out the facets of each cases' context that may be important for comparative analysis. It is especially necessary to do so with case studies "where phenomenon and context are intertwined" (Yin, 1982, p. 85), as are the research circumstances in this project.

As with other case study approaches, this project used a variety of online, in-person, document-based, and research journal data collection methods in order to provide multiple openings to answer my research questions. Online and in-person methods provided data concerning participants' perspectives, and document-based and research journal methods allowed me to "look beyond the immediate" (Chadderton & Torrance, 2011, p. 56) of participants' experiences in order to build the cases. By using a diversity of methods, along with extensive contextual information regarding the research sites, I tried to make the case study understandings as 'comprehensive' as possible (Merriam, 2001), as this is one of the ways that case study findings can be validated. Unlike other case studies, however, which are based on more long-term researcher observations and which seek to theoretically explain a phenomenon, my approach falls more in line with applied research, where the researcher is invested in the case due to "a substantive interest in the particular professional dilemma and problems of participants" (Chadderton & Torrance, 2011, p. 55). This substantive interest, in addition to contributing to the research field, also included how my own pedagogy was affected by what I was learning from participants' experiences.

The comparative nature of the case study approach also allowed me to draw connections between two different contexts and the broader structures in which they were embedded (Neuman, 2011). I was able to create an in-depth understanding of the responses of teacher candidates at each site. Since the research sites were contextually very different, the differences in teacher candidates' responses made what was or was not 'working' in the courses more readily apparent. Yin (2009) describes this as a strength of multiple-site case studies, where using a similar set of methods in two different sites produces overlapping themes, these findings are stronger than those of a single-site case study. As a result, I was able to connect the

experiences of teacher candidates in these two micro-level contexts to other macro-level national and international obstacles in implementing anti-racist and justice-based civic education in teacher education programs.

Participants and Procedure

The Ontario and Saskatchewan sites offered a unique opportunity to investigate how contextual differences might paint a more robust picture regarding overlaps in civic and anti-racist education in teacher education programs. Upon gaining ethics approval for the project, I contacted the professors at each of the sites about partnering with me to invite their students to participate in the project. With their support, I then sought ethics approval at the host institutions. Upon gaining ethics approval, I worked with the professors at each site in order to develop the most appropriate research invitation format for their students.

Ontario Site

Process. In Ontario, I discussed the process for recruiting teacher candidates to participate in the project with the course professor. The education foundations course comprised of two classes every week, usually a lecture or guest speaker during the first class and a group discussion during the second class. In consultation with the course professor, I recruited participants by presenting the research project to the teacher candidates in the second week of the fall semester. I was first introduced by the course professor, and then gave a short presentation about the research project and its goals. I explained the benefits of participating in the research for the teacher candidates, including the opportunity for critical self-reflection regarding their pedagogical development, discussing what they had learned with their colleagues, and a small gift certificate from a venue of their choice for their time. Next, teacher candidates were guided through an information letter and ethics declaration (Appendix B). After approximately ten

minutes to review the letter and ask questions, I invited interested teacher candidates to sign the letter if they would like to participate, or to leave it blank if they were not interested. All letters were then anonymously deposited in an envelope that was given back to me at the end of the class. Supplementary information about the project and a copy of the consent letter was included with the first online survey, and sent electronically only to those who had consented to take part in the study. In addition, the first question of the pre-course survey asked participants to reaffirm their consent to participate in the project. I continued to attend the first month of classes, in order to gain more context about what the participating teacher candidates were learning and experiencing in the course, and recorded observations in my research journal.

Response Rates. The class that was invited to participate in the research comprised of 48 teacher candidates, and 21 candidates filled out and returned the consent form after the initial presentation on the research project. Of these 21 interested participants, 15 teacher candidates filled out the out the pre-course survey. Teacher candidates were asked to create pseudo names for themselves, which they used throughout the project, in order to be able to correlate responses across data collection instruments. Based on their use of pseudo names, the same 15 teacher candidates also responded to the mid-point observation prompts through the online survey tool. Near the end of the course, 13 of these teacher candidates filled out the post-course survey, and 12 of these attended a focus group or answered the focus group questions via email. I offered two focus group times; four teacher candidates attended the first time slot, and seven attended the second time slot. One teacher candidate submitted answers to the focus group questions through email. Descriptions and more detailed information about the data collection methods are offered later in this chapter.

Saskatchewan Site

Process. At the Saskatchewan site, a similar approach was used as that in Ontario. I discussed the recruitment of participants with the course professor and an approach was decided upon that would best engage interested teacher candidates. Here, I engaged with two sections of the same education foundations course, as these courses were smaller than that in Ontario. At the end of the first class of each course, the professor introduced me, and I gave a short presentation about the goals of the research project, and benefits for teacher candidates who wished to participate. Similar to Ontario, I provided teacher candidates with an information letter and consent declaration to review. I explained this document in detail, and teacher candidates had the opportunity to ask any clarification questions they had. Those who wished to participate signed the consent forms, and those who did not wish to participant left their forms blank. All of the forms were collected anonymously in an envelope and given to me. Additional project details, a copy of the consent letter, and the first survey were sent only to those that indicated their consent to participate in the project. Similar to the Ontario site, the first question of the pre-course survey asked participants to reaffirm their consent to participate in the project.

Response Rates. Two sections of the course (each approximately 35 students at the beginning of the term) were invited to participate in the research. In total from the two sections, 30 teacher candidates returned the consent forms completed, indicating their interest in the project. Of these initially interested teacher candidates, 22 filled out the pre-course survey that was sent to them via email. Similar to the Ontario site, they were asked in this pre-survey to create pseudo names for themselves to be used throughout the project. Based on their use of pseudo names, 19 of the same 22 people that responded to the pre-survey also responded to the mid-point observation prompts that were emailed using the same online survey tool. Of these, 17

also filled out the post-course survey. In total, 13 of the original 22 teacher candidates attended focus groups or sent answers to the focus group questions via email. Two focus group times were offered: five participants attended the first time slot, and five participants attended the second time slot. Three teacher candidates sent their responses to the focus group questions via email.

Data Collection

I collected data at both sites using methods suggested by Yin (2009) for comparative case studies, including surveys, participant observations, focus groups, documentary evidence, and direct observations. The methods used with teacher candidates included online pre- and post-course surveys, online co-researcher (teacher candidate) observations, and in-person focus groups. Supplementary methods included the collection of the course outlines for each research site, and recording thoughts and direct observations in a research journal throughout the project. In order to ensure high response rates from teacher candidates that chose to take part in the research, a number of strategies were used to increase responses for each method. The first strategy was employing a user-friendly online survey tool (SurveyMonkey) to facilitate the collection of pre- and post-course survey responses and mid-point participant observations. In the information sessions at each site, I asked if the teacher candidates were familiar with SurveyMonkey, and the majority of people said that they had used it before. In addition to this user-friendly mode of data collection, ample time was provided to complete each survey or observation. Typically, I allowed for one week to complete each data collection instrument after I sent it to the candidates. After this first week, I sent a reminder email, and another three days were given to complete the survey or observation, after which I closed the online instruments to any further responses. To provide a sense of progression through the research project, I also included a schedule outlining the surveys, observations, and focus group timelines in all emails

sent to the participants, noting which of the instruments they were currently being asked to complete, and which were still to come.

Online Pre- and Post-course Surveys

The online pre- and post-course surveys were designed to solicit responses that provided a ‘before and after’ baseline of data, or what Yin (1982) describes as a ‘two-wave design’ for multiple-site comparative case studies, where two or more waves of questions can be asked to supplement data gaps in the first wave (p. 96). The online pre-course survey asked about teacher candidates’ thoughts and beliefs in a number of areas, and spoke directly to my research questions. These surveys were also designed to gather responses that could inform the drafting of mid-point observation prompts, post-course survey questions, and focus group questions, based on emerging issues that the teacher candidates were encountering in their learning and pedagogical development. The focus of these surveys was on the teacher candidates’ definitions of civic engagement, social justice, and anti-racism, and their reflections about their pedagogical development in these intersecting areas.

Due to the anticipated small research population sizes (the number of participants who competed *all* of the research project components was 12 at the Ontario site, and 13 at the Saskatchewan site, although some methods had higher response rates), conducting survey research enabled me to easily “identify important beliefs and attitudes of individuals” (Creswell, 2012, p. 376), in an in-depth and efficient way, before and after their participation in the selected courses. Despite being only 16 weeks apart at both sites, the pre- and post-course surveys tracked small changes in the same group of people over time (Creswell, 2012, p. 378). This quasi-longitudinal survey design allowed me to ask the same group of teacher candidates similar

questions at the start and end of the course in order to gauge any changes in attitudes, knowledge, and perceived skill levels.

The surveys consisted of demographic data questions, Likert scale-style questions, and open-ended questions with no word limits (see Appendix C for the full list of pre- and post-course survey questions). Examples included questions about participants' current knowledge of civic issues, social justice issues, and anti-racism, and their comfortability with these pedagogies. The pre-course survey was emailed to participants after they had agreed to participate in the study. The post-course survey was emailed to participants before their last week of classes, approximately one week prior to the focus groups.

Online Co-researcher Observations

At both sites, participants completed open-ended co-researcher observations. These participant observations were an effort to position the teacher candidates as 'knowers' in their own right, and less as research 'subjects'. These observations encouraged them to reflect on their own learning and practice (Mills, 2011 as cited in Creswell, 2012, p. 578), and encouraged responses that were not framed by my own goals as a researcher.

During the initial information session about the project at both sites, I encouraged teacher candidates who were thinking about participating to keep track of what they were curious about, or struggling with, throughout the course. Since the courses at both research sites included multiple reflection assignments, I suggested that these observations may also be useful in completing some of their course requirements. The observation prompt at the Ontario site read, "Based on what you have learned in the lectures, discussions, readings, and assignments in the course so far, what is something that you are glad you learned, are learning more about, or are struggling with?" At the Saskatchewan site, based on their pre-course survey responses, this

prompt was adapted to also include, "This can be anything from terminology, an idea, a concept, a realization, to a more nuanced understanding of a topic, system, the structure of schooling, etc. Please elaborate!" following the initial prompt. At both sites, these mid-point participant observation prompts were sent via email to participants after the first six weeks of their courses (via SurveyMoneky). No word limits were set or suggested, and teacher candidates' responses ranged between 50 to 300 words.

Focus Groups

Based on my interest in the saturation of discourses at the research sites, I decided to conduct focus group instead of doing individual interviews (Onwuegbuzie et al., 2009). Looking at the prevalence of discourses (such as Whiteness or settler colonial discourses) across focus groups instead of looking at individual teacher candidate responses within the cases, allowed me to better understand patterns, and to engage with more participants than I would have been able to with individual interviews. This choice also stems from a desire to analyze data as a 'whole case' for cross-case comparison, instead of analyzing differences in individual data across methods, following the example of Schick's (2000) study, which focuses on discourses at play in the case as a whole, and not micro-differences amongst teacher candidates.

Approximately one week after the teacher candidates filled out the post-course surveys, I held focus groups in order to clarify teacher candidates' survey and observation answers, hear examples from participants about what they had learned, and allow for open conversations amongst participants about the issues related to the research topic. Creswell (2012) describes these types of focus groups as "focus group interviews" (p. 384), where researchers ask the group questions and record the answers to the subsequent group conversation. The drawbacks to choosing focus groups instead of individual interviews include the potential for collecting

“individual data” from people in a group setting, or for a few loud voices to dominate the discussion (Hollander, 2004). However, having conducted and having been a part of focus groups in the past, I was confident that I could facilitate a robust discussion.

In the post-course survey, participants were offered multiple potential times to attend the focus groups, and were encouraged to select the time that worked best for their schedule. Two focus groups were held at the Ontario site, and two were held at the Saskatchewan site. If participants could not attend any of the offered focus group times, I asked if they would be willing to complete the focus group questions online via the same survey tool used for the pre- and post-course surveys and mid-point observations. At all of the focus groups, I provided a variety of food, and participants were encouraged to eat and talk as we waited for everyone to arrive. After everyone settled in, I distributed hard copies of the questions that we used to launch our discussions (Appendix E). I explained that I would be recording the focus groups, and described that only I would be reading the transcripts, encouraging participants to be as frank or honest as they wished. After asking each question, I encouraged participants to think about their answers for a moment before we started hearing from one another. After everyone had answered, open conversation was encouraged. No time limit was set for the focus groups, and most lasted for approximately one hour.

My own racialization and that of the participants undoubtedly affected our conversations. For example, in both of the in-person focus groups at each site, one participant (out of approximately four to seven participants per focus group) self-identified as non-White, and it is possible that due to my own racialization and that of the majority of participants as White, they may not have been able to say what they really thought. My hope was that, however, since I stressed the voluntary nature of these focus groups, non-White teacher candidates who attended

did so out of their own curiosities and felt safe to do so. Another racialized dynamic that I considered is the possibility that White participants, due to the relatively horizontal and low-stakes context (without their Black or Indigenous professors present, amongst a majority of White peers, and facilitated by a White person), may have expressed opinions they otherwise may not have felt comfortable to. By 'reading' me in particular racialized ways, it is possible that the White teacher candidates believed me to be 'on their side'. However, it is also possible that due to the presence of a non-White colleague in some cases, these teacher candidates may have refrained from saying particular things out of a desire to not cause offence or to be constructed as racist (Evans-Winters & Hoff, 2011). The conversations that emerged, despite these dynamics, provided rich, sometimes uncomfortable discussion, and afforded opportunities for further learning for both myself and the research participants.

Document Analysis

At each research site, I requested a copy of the syllabus after all final changes had been made. These two documents were collected to contextualize what the participants were learning in the span of their coursework, and so that I could complete the readings that teacher candidates would be doing throughout the term. The contextual information provided in the syllabi allowed for a more nuanced understanding of the examples that teacher candidates referenced when talking about their knowledge or pedagogical development in particular areas. In addition, the format and structure of each of these courses could be understood in relation to one another, in order to identify commonalities or points of divergence.

Research Journal for Direct Observations

I kept a research journal throughout the project, as both a source for data and a tool for ongoing analysis (Holly & Altrichter, 2011). My journal included three types of entries: memos,

descriptive sequences, and interpretive sequences (including theoretical and methodological notes), as per Holly and Altrichter's (2011) recommendations for researcher journal/diary structure. Memos included writing down short thoughts, ideas, and questions as they happened in real time. Descriptive sequences included detailed direct observations of the research sites' classroom environments and reconstructions of the perceived mood in each focus group, based on participants' attitudes and demeanors. Interpretive sequences included re-reading memos, descriptive sequences, and preliminary data, and making notes, observations, and connections within this data.

Data Analysis

On a paradigmatic level, my approach to analysis is as a critical constructivist, and my choice to employ both thematic analysis (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003) and critical discourse analysis as a methodology flows from this stance (Fairclough, 1992; 2010; Lincoln et al., 2011; Rogers et al., 2005; Van Dijk, 1993; 2001). My approach holds, ontologically, that the world is contextually constructed, and epistemologically, that all knowledge is a construction (Kincheloe, 2008, pp. 7-8). As a researcher, I act as a co-creator of knowledge, and must pay explicit attention to how "dominant power operates to control knowledge" (Kincheloe, 2008, p. 10), both through my own assumptions, and in the data. As Andreotti (2010) describes, "the correlation between language and reality is not one where language 'describes' reality, but one where languages construct (different) realities" (p. 235). In this way, linguistic interpretations dictate "what counts as knowledge" (Andreotti, 2010, p. 235), making my analysis a process of identifying discourses, and also creating new knowledge through this process of demarking those data that I consider to be important in answering my research questions.

Data analysis took place in an iterative way throughout the project, both through ongoing research journal interpretive sequences, and through reviewing the results of every survey and mid-point observation within days of their completion. I recorded my initial thoughts and observations about this data in my research journal. Upon the completion of all data collection methods at each site, I re-read the data and recorded additional notes and thoughts in my research journal before a concerted data coding process began.

At this starting point in the formal data analysis process, I had to attend to several ethical considerations. The first of these considerations was whether or not to include separate analysis of Black, Indigenous, and students of colour's responses. Initially, I set out to engage White teacher candidates only, in-line with not wanting to 'study' people who are not racialized as White with these particular research questions, and due to the way that I constructed my conceptual framework. Since there were very few non-White participants, and their answers also did not represent outliers in the discourses being reproduced, I decided to analyze how discourses, in particular the ideology of Whiteness, was pervasive in responses of *all* participants. A second ethical consideration was whether or not I should include non-White participant answers as quoted 'examples' of particular discourses. Since the research questions mostly focus on how White teacher candidates are engaging with social justice, anti-racism, and civic engagement, and again, since there weren't that many outlier answers, I decided to only use quotes from White teacher candidates as examples of particular themes.

In this project, efforts at formalized data analysis used a combination of two interrelated forms of qualitative analysis: thematic analysis and critical discourse analysis. Initial thematic coding followed Auerbach and Silverstein's (2003) coding process, which moves from raw text, to relevant text, to repeating ideas, to themes, and finally to theoretical constructs (p. 35). Using

this process allowed me to narrow down large amounts of raw data into manageable sections. The raw data included spreadsheets of pre-course survey responses, post-course survey responses, and mid-point observations for each site, organized in columns by question. Raw data also included the combined transcripts of the focus groups from each site, organized by question, and my research journal and course syllabi documents. Relevant text included any content from this raw data that contributed to potentially answering my research questions. In this way, the majority of teacher candidates' responses in the pre- and post-course surveys and mid-point observations were relevant. Focus group transcripts and research journal entries contained some data that was not relevant to the research questions, and this data was 'put aside' in the initial coding process. For example, participants conversations drifting to more general critiques of their program, or journal entries containing project timelines and logistical information was excluded from initial coding. Continuing with the thematic analysis of this relevant text, repeating ideas were identified within participants' answers to specific questions, and more significantly, across data collection instruments. For example, several teacher candidates expressed various kinds of apprehension about teaching about racism in one survey, and many others noted anxiety about 'saying the wrong thing' in another survey. Once these repeating ideas were identified across research instruments, short-hand descriptions of these idea groups were created (for example, 'apprehension', 'anxiety', and 'uncomfortable' became repeating idea-group names).

The process of identifying themes and theoretical constructs in Auerbach and Silverstein's (2003) coding process coincides with the theorizing process of critical discourse analysis, which "focuses attention on the process whereby the social world is constructed and maintained" (Phillips & Hardy, 2002, p. 2), and seeks to understand the socio-historic situation

of the data (Gillen & Peterson, 2005, p. 147). Critical discourse analysis techniques (Fairclough, 1992; 2010) involve connecting language used in the data to discourses in the literature and broader structures that the data is situated within. In a review of the various ways that critical discourse analysis has been utilized in the field of education, Rogers et al. (2005) describe how this makes it possible to "pay attention to the macro context - the societal and the institutional as well as the local level of a text and the grammatical resources that make up the text" (p. 377). Specifically, Solomon et al. (2005) used discourse analysis in a comparable way in their study, where "[teacher] candidates' responses … were analyzed for the ideas, messages, values, beliefs and worldviews (ideological system) they reflect" (p. 152). It was during this thematic identification phase of data analysis where the bulk of my theorizing about the data in relation to my conceptual frameworks took place.

For my study, this process involved iterative reading and re-reading of my conceptual frameworks during the phases of coding to provide what Fairclough (2010) calls "points of entry" into understanding how the data relates to the specific societal structures that discourses in the data are both describing and maintaining. Paying attention to how language was pointing to particular discourses aided in drawing connections between the repeating ideas to form the basis for the emerging themes in the texts. For example, the repeating idea categories of 'apprehension', 'anxiety', and 'uncomfortable' all contained language that teacher candidates used to construct themselves as 'external' or 'separate' from the issues of racism that they were being tasked with interrogating. As a result, they were grouped together in a theme that was named using one participant's verbatim statement, "isn't my place". Once themes had been generated in this way, I undertook a process to connect the language used in each thematic category to first specific, and then more general, discourses. For example, the "isn't my place"

theme is directly related to what Schick (2000) describes as "claims to innocence" by White teacher candidates during their pedagogical development process, where feelings of apprehension and uncomfortableness allow them to justify why they should not be expected to teach about or question structural racism. In turn, claims to innocence discourses (Schick, 2000) are connected to a broader trend in education that enables teacher training programs to uphold White supremacist structures by allowing these views of teacher candidates to go unchallenged.

Validation Strategies

As Chmiliar (2010) emphasizes, examining phenomenon across multiple cases can provide "a tougher test of a theory" (p. 582), since findings in one case can be contrasted or reinforced through a second case. By drawing on data from two research sites, I was able to better understand and answer my research questions than I would have from a single case alone. Yin (2009) terms this a 'literal replication', when findings produced at two contextually different cases reveal similar themes. Another one of the strengths of case study research is the triangulation of evidence across multiple data collection instruments (Yin, 2009). In this project I used multiple online, in-person, and document-based data collection methods, all of which were entered into spreadsheets for analysis. In all cases, the themes that emerged through analysis could be traced to data that was collected through more than one data collection method. These corroborations suggest that the themes generated describe the case study sites in a more comprehensive way, and are not based on answers to single questions from any one data collection instrument.

Several strategies were used to make my data analysis process defensible. The first strategy is through explicit researcher positioning. By acknowledging that I am a co-producer of knowledge in the data analysis process, and not an objective observer, I am able to draw upon

my own conceptual and contextual knowledge bases for understanding the discourses being upheld in the data. Being a White researcher, for example, allowed me unique access to the responses of White teacher candidates, whom may likely not have been as forthcoming with someone they did not perceive to be ‘one of us’. In addition, explicit researcher positioning aids the process of transferable validity, and my ability to generate working hypotheses concerning the two cases (Guba & Lincoln, 2009). Since I conducted the research at both sites (rather than a different researcher conducting the research at each site, as some comparative case studies do), I am better placed to understand the congruence between my two cases’ contexts, and therefore what can be learned from the data. Secondly, by using two forms of data analysis, including thematic analysis and critical discourse analysis, I was able to approach the data from different conceptual lenses. Confirming that the themes generated from the repeating ideas in the text correspond to the identification of particular discourses lends strength to the conclusions. Not only do the themes represent connected groups of repeating ideas, but also clusters of text that espoused specific features of the discourses described in my conceptual frameworks.

This chapter provided a detailed account of the methodology used in this study, including the multiple-site comparative case study research design, the recruitment of participants and data collection methods, thematic and critical discourse data analysis strategies, and strategies for validating my findings. The following chapters detail the context and findings for the Ontario site and the Saskatchewan site first as individual cases, before moving on to a comparative cross-case discussion chapter.

Chapter Five: Ontario Site Context

To develop a deeper and more nuanced understanding of the research site, in this section the research is contextualized by describing provincial and educational histories in order to understand the discourses operating at the Ontario research site. To limit the scope, my descriptions in each context chapter begin with provincial information, given that education is a provincially controlled public service, and with the knowledge that many of my participants attended schools in Ontario. Tracing the evolution of the public school system and teacher education in the province enabled me to analyze participants' responses in context, and supplemented my own prior knowledge of the research site. To describe the discourses operating at both provincial and research site-specific levels, I utilized content analysis and critical discourse analysis techniques while drawing on statistics, historical sources, government documents, and course syllabi.

Provincial Discourses

Demographics in each province have affected both provincial and research-site specific discourses. Ontario is the most populous province in Canada, with over 13 million people (Statistics Canada, 2016c), and is the third largest province by land area, behind British Columbia and Quebec. In 2016, close to 3% of the total population within Ontario's borders identified as Indigenous Peoples. Over 62 distinct First Nations are represented in the province; the larger nations include the Ojibway, Cree, Mi'kmaq, Mohawk, Anishinaabe, and Oji-Cree Nations (Statistics Canada, 2016a). In addition, there is significant representation of the Métis Nation and Inuit within Ontario's borders, living in both urban centres and on traditional or federally designated reserve lands (Statistics Canada, 2016a). In 2016, close to 67% of the province's total population were designated as 'non-immigrants'. Ethnically, the top three most

commonly reported ethnic origins in Ontario were 'Canadian' (24%), English (21%) and Scottish (16%). An estimated 29% of the population are designated as 'immigrants', and an estimated 1.5% of the people living within Ontario's borders are non-permanent residents (Statistics Canada, 2016c). The combination of 'non-immigrants' and self-reported ethnic origins account for close to two-thirds of Ontario's population as being primarily White residents.

The provincial government in Ontario was created in 1867 under the same *British North America Act* that marked the genesis of Canada. The present-day provincial government emerged as a parliamentary democracy during this time. Similar to federal government structures, several populations, including women and many Indigenous Peoples, were excluded from voting in elections and running for office for the first 50 to 90 years of the province's existence, depending on the group, marginalizing these voices during initial decision making processes in the province. For the better part of the 20th century, Ontario was governed by the Progressive Conservative Party, either through majority or minority governments. These (almost exclusively White male) conservative governments were considered 'traditional, red Tory' governments (Pinto, 2012, p. 27), as their approaches to governing and policy typically aligned with the federal Liberal party during that time (Pinto, 2012, p. 23). During much of the 20th century, these provincial governments oversaw the expansion of public services and infrastructure, including overseeing the growth of the K-12 public education systems for both the French- and English-language curricula, and the designation of funds for the separate French- and English-language school systems.

Provincial Educational Discourses

The historical structure of school systems and teacher education in Ontario have precipitated racist educational systems, and in particular, educational structures and processes

that maintain anti-Black and anti-Indigenous racism. Prior to the creation of the province of Ontario, education in the Upper Canada region included residential schools and segregated Black schools (Howard & Smith, 2011). After the province of Ontario was founded, these schools served to further the settler colonial project in the area, and laid the groundwork for the racialized ways that modern-day education systems are structured in the province. Beginning with the creation of reserves and solidified with the *Indian Act* (1876), education for Indigenous Peoples in Ontario became the jurisdiction of the federal government. Catholic and Protestant church-run schools prior to Confederation were taken over by the federal government, creating the Indian Residential School (IRS) system. Although jurisdictional control for this system was assumed by the federal government after Confederation, many residential schools continued to be staffed by Catholic nuns and Protestant church representatives. The IRS system, which was separate from the Ontario public education system, operated 25 schools in Ontario at its peak; many of these remained open well into the 20th century, with the last school in Ontario closing in 1974. The legacy of mistreatment, violence, and abuse of the Indigenous students that attended these schools in the Ontario region is widespread (Metatawabin & Shimo, 2015).

As residential schools began to close, federally funded schools on reserves in Ontario took their place, but the level of education offered by the state at these schools remained abysmal, mirroring the lack of federal investment in infrastructure on reserves in general (Angus, 2017). Resistance from Indigenous nations in Ontario to these conditions came in many forms. In addition to grassroots activism, many First Nations in Ontario began negotiating contemporary treaties and self-governing agreements with both the province and federal government, including land claims and transferring control over education back to First Nations communities. As in other provinces, modern treaties have meant that self-governing First Nations communities once

again have control over the provision of education to their members (Tremblay, 2001). In Ontario in 2008, for example, after 20 years of negotiations, the Anishinabek Education System was launched as the result of one of these negotiation processes (Government of Canada, 2019), recognizing Anishinabek control over education. This agreement included 23 First Nations in Ontario, and now serves over 2,000 students on reserves included in the agreement (Government of Canada, 2019). In many reserve communities, however, underfunded federally-run schools remain the norm.

Since its inception, anti-racist reforms in Ontario's public education system have directly reflected changes in the political ideological landscape in the province. Recognizing the need to act on behalf of Black, Indigenous, and students of colour facing systemic barriers in the public education system, for example, the *Education Act* was amended in 1992, requiring all school boards to develop and implement anti-racism and ethnocultural equity policies (Ng-A-Fook et al., 2017b, p. 136). In 1993, the provincial government also released the *Anti-racism and Ethnocultural Equity in Schools* policy (Ontario Ministry of Education). The election of the Progressive Conservative Party in 1995, however, marked a period of increasingly neoliberal approaches to governance and policy in education, rooted in meritocracy, the denial of inequality, and the use of 'back to basics' discourses. These discourses constructed the anti-racist school board policies at the time as detracting from the 'fundamentals' of education (Dei & Karumanchery, 2001). Similar to the neoliberal policies taking hold in Europe and the United States at this time, the manifestation of neoliberal ideology in provincial politics advocated for decreased investments in education, and privatization of educational processes (Pinto, 2012).

The subsequent tenure of the provincial Liberal government (2003-2018) introduced measures to improve the quality of education over the span of the 15 years that followed,

including caps on class sizes and resistance to public-private partnerships in education. In 2015, graduation rates in the province reached the highest in history, jumping to 85.5% from just 68% in 2004 (Government of Ontario, 2016). In 2017, Ontario also passed the *Anti-Racism Act*, which enshrined the government's Anti-Racism Directorate into law. This directorate includes the Anti-Black Racism Strategy, with a vision to eliminate "disparity [of] outcomes for Black Ontarians in the child welfare, education and justice sectors by 2024" (Ontario's Anti-Racism Directorate, 2020), including efforts to maintain an increase in graduation rates for Black youth.

Current Ministry of Ontario (2019) statistics indicate that over two million students are enrolled in close to 5,000 Kindergarten to Grade 12 schools in the province, and the graduation rate has remained high, at 87% (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2019a). The most recent Progressive Conservative majority (elected in 2018), however, has reignited privatization efforts through decreased spending on education in both the K-12 and post-secondary education systems. In the Ministry's *Education for Tomorrow* plan, they plan to increase class sizes in Grades 4 to 12, and implement a mandatory eLearning initiative requiring high school students to take at least two courses online (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2019c). These moves indicate further divestment in public education, and are reminiscent of the 'back to basics' discourses typical of earlier conservative approaches to learning in the province, which reinforced the idea that anti-racism initiatives are 'extra' or as detracting from the 'fundamentals' of schooling.

Teacher education in Ontario similarly evolved in response to political ideological shifts in the province. Beginning with an early educational system that sought to educate the children of early White settlers, Ng-A-Fook et al. (2017b) trace teacher education back to early 'Prussian approaches' established by Egerton Ryerson, which used readers and texts that sought to 'civilize' future Ontarians, in order to create citizens that upheld the interests of the British

Commonwealth (p. 127). The authors note that "not only *how* teachers were taught but also *what* was taught was described in terms of a factory model; schooling not for emancipation of the mind, but for the new industrial workforce" (p. 129). Although teachers were later being urged to move away from a lecture format, "showing early roots of active learning research," the authors note that "the colonial-industrial content … only indoctrinates more effectively by being dressed up in the rhetoric of inclusive child-centric communities of learning" (p. 132). The transfer of responsibility for teacher training to university Faculties of Education in the 1960s saw a more standardized approach to teacher education, but by the 1980s, had not significantly shifted away from training students to be effective workers. Ng-A-Fook et al. (2017b) emphasize that:

> Early teacher education programs, as arms of the state, aimed to reshape the several different non-Indigenous and Indigenous communities into the mold of (White) European statesmen, and to keep an understanding of the atrocities committed by the state from past, present, and future settler students. (p. 138)

Civic Education Discourses

Early civic education in the province was housed in social studies and history courses, which were historically heavily invested in promoting nation building (Osborne, 2003), not only in the service of justifying the ongoing dispossession and genocide of Indigenous Peoples, but also to deny accounts of structural racism against other minority groups by promoting investment in the grand narrative that Canada is a benevolent state, free of structural racism (Stanley, 2006). Tomkins (1986) remarked that "schools needed little encouragement to promote imperialist sentiment" (p.145), and that early readers in Ontario glorified militarism and imperialism. Even into the 1950s, social studies curricula remained "ethnocentric and imperial European-oriented" (p. 396).

Although there was a push for more content that centered a 'Canadian identity' in the 1960s, little changed until multicultural curricula flourished in the early 1970s (Tompkins, 1986,

p. 339). Even so, Tompkins (1986) notes that "considerable bias by omission" continued to saturate social studies textbooks, portraying Indigenous Peoples as exotic, and treating visible minoritized groups as 'outsiders' or in conflict with the British and French majority groups (p. 340). In addition, Indigenous Peoples "typically disappeared from social studies textbooks shortly after the explorers and settlers arrived on the scene" (p. 343). In the 1970s, the Ontario Ministry of Education also began investing heavily in character education, which led to the production of a 'personal and societal values' resource guide for teachers in 1983 (Winton, 2010), stressing that there are universal, core values that teachers should be conveying to students. Winton (2010) notes that research concerning character education, however, has largely been unable to prove its effectiveness.

In 1999, the province introduced both a mandatory, one-semester high school civics course, and 40 hours of mandatory community service for high school students in Ontario. In the intervening years, studies have shown that neither the civics curriculum (Milner & Lewis, 2011) nor mandatory community service (Henderson et al., 2007) have had any tangible effects on high school students' civic participation (through voting) in the former, or attitudes concerning civic engagement or overall civic participation, in the latter. In 2008, the Ministry released the second edition of a report called *Finding Common Ground: Character Development in Ontario's Schools, K-12*, which Winton (2010) argues began to stress the development of knowledge about equity and critical democratic skills in schools.

Discussion of racism in any systemic terms remains absent in contemporary K-12 social science curricula and textbooks. Montgomery (2005) found that discussions of racism in Canadian history textbooks in Ontario reinforced the discourse that isolated incidents of racism were unfortunate exceptions in a historical narrative of Canada as a benevolent nation-state.

Smith et al. (2011) found that official history textbooks and the *Canadian and World Studies* (2005) curriculum document also exclude any meaningful discussion of the Residential School System. Analysis of social studies curriculum documents in the province over the years have revealed some shifts away from Eurocentric, nation building foundations (Sears & Hughes, 1996). However, many have found that these discourses remain. Clausen et al. (2008), for example, assert that the Ontario social studies documents viewed citizenship as a 'condition' rather than an active concept, and that the concept of democracy was heavily tied to 'rights' in many grades, encouraging students to work within existing state and democratic structures. Llewellyn et al. (2010) similarly found that Ontario curricula continued to stress procedural civic knowledge over more active forms of citizenship, and Bell (2013) notes that Ontario curriculum guidelines are fragmented in the way that they represent concepts of interconnectedness and wholeness, or "reasoning without spirit" (p. 99). More recently, Butler et al. (2015) observed that even the updated Ontario civics curriculum document created marginalizing representations of Indigenous histories, by equating Indigenous governance systems with municipal structures in Canada instead of as autonomous, sovereign entities.

Research Site

The research site is situated in a large municipality in Ontario with a diverse population, and the area broadly surrounding the research site is the current and historical territory of many Indigenous Peoples, including the Anishinabek, Huron-Wendat, Omàmiwininiwak, and Haudenosaunee Nations. In 2016, however, just 2.5% of the city's population identified as being Indigenous (including First Nations, Métis, and Inuit) (Statistics Canada, 2016e). The remainder of the city's population consists of overlapping populations, including approximately 64% who identified as having European ethnics origins, 28% who identified as having a 'Canadian'

ethnicity, 26% who identified as being a visible minority, and 24% of people who identified as immigrants (Statistics Canada, 2016e).

The Ontario research site institution has a strong emphasis on linguistic and cultural diversity, and similar to other teacher education programs in Ontario, the Faculty of Education recently transitioned from a one-year post-degree Bachelor of Education program to a two-year program. Until 2015, teacher education in Ontario was legislated as a one-year post-degree program across the province. In 2015, the province established measures to shift these programs to an 'enhanced' Bachelor of Education program, with four semesters over two-years of post-degree programs. However, this restructuring did not necessarily accompany the reconceptualization of teacher education that such a change was originally intended to do, in particular around goals related to Indigenous partnerships and answering the Calls to Action of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, leaving these reconceptualization efforts largely up to individual institutions (Ng-A-Fook et al., 2017a).

Within the research site program, the teacher candidates who were invited to participate in the study were enrolled in a mandatory education foundations course in the first year of their two-year program. It was offered in English, and in the fall semester; teacher candidates would not yet have taken a mandatory course on First Nations, Métis and Inuit education, or other elective courses on social justice and equity in schools. Teacher candidates in this course were enrolled in learning to teach at either intermediate grade ranges (Grades 4-10), or senior grade ranges (Grades 7-12). The course studied was made up of mostly students who had selected a program focus on education in diverse and urban contexts, including education that seeks to serve linguistically, culturally, and religiously diverse student and community populations (Ontario Site Program Document, 2017).

The instructor who facilitated the course is a Black, male, tenured professor at the institution with many years of experience teaching education foundations courses. His teaching philosophy includes what he describes as relational teaching, where he 'hosts' students and endeavors to facilitate sincere, true dialogue. He describes 'hosting' as inviting students into a space where difference can be worked through, and where everyone in his courses are humanized. 'True dialogue,' he describes as facilitating learning and discussions where hard questions can be asked of himself and of one another. Many of the students who participated in the research project commented on his teaching style, noting that "he actually wants to engage with you," and that "he modeled what we should strive to be in our classrooms" (Ontario Site, Focus Group 1, Speaker 3). Other teacher candidates echoed this sentiment, saying that "he's so approachable and he relates with us" (ON, FG1, S2), and that "he gets us engaged" (ON, FG1, S3). The course professor also noted that his teaching style endeavors to cultivate relationships with his students through humour, popular culture, and relatability, and that this approach takes patience and time. As one student noted, "he manages to present the information and creates discussions that are super engaging with enough lightheartedness that it's still appropriate. But funny, just enough to make us feel like a safe and comfortable space to talk about it, even though it's a really heavy talk" (ON, FG1, S3).

The course consisted of two classes per week. The first class typically consisted of a lecture given by the professor or by a guest speaker, and the second class was used for class discussion. The objectives for the course at the Ontario research site, as laid out in the course syllabus, included exploring education in relation to social class, gender, ethnicity and race, (dis)ability, and sexuality, and looking at schools as sites that can both reproduce and challenge inequality. There were also course objectives exploring culture, First Nations, immigrants,

refugees, and settlers, and objectives addressing inequality and social justice in education. Finally, there were also objectives that looked at the various roles and responsibilities of stakeholders involved in education, including teachers, politicians, and communities.

The progression of the course in the syllabus was set up thematically. The themes of the ten weeks of the course included building learning communities, historical education and treatment of First Nations in Canada, 'Canadian' culture, identity and White privilege, civic education, pop culture and the self, racism and anti-racism, the culture of schools, and restorative justice (Ontario Site Syllabus, 2018). Readings for these themes included two short fiction novels, academic articles, as well as listening to audio content. Of the course materials, two texts were mentioned specifically by teacher candidates as having had an impact on them. One of the novels, by an Indigenous author (not cited specifically to protect the anonymity of the research site), was mentioned by several of the focus group participants and in the post-course survey responses as having had an impact on teacher candidates' ideas about issues affecting First Nations. An academic article on the topic of anti-racism was also mentioned several times by participants. The course syllabus was also infused with quotes about education that invited students to remain open to shifts in their own perspectives.

Assignments in the course included responses to weekly readings (including films), inquiry papers, and a group project that included creating a website concerning issues in education. The group project presentations took place during the discussion sections. In attendance at one of these sessions, I noted that several groups presenting their projects provided a deep analysis of the educational issues at hand. These short, 15-minute presentations outlined potentially controversial issues in education, including topics surrounding race, LGBTQ2S+ issues, and inclusion of students with disabilities. In addition to their assignments, many students

in the focus groups indicated that learning from the course professor himself through class discussions had prompted reflection and shifts in their perspectives as educators.

The pre-course survey asked the teacher candidates to self-identify in a number of areas: age, gender identity, ethnic / racial identity, sexual orientation, future teaching areas, and future teaching levels. In the pre-course survey at both sites, 'racial identity' was used in place of 'racialization', knowing that students may not have encountered this word/concept before, and may conflate racialization with ethnic identity (in the post-course survey, 'racialization' was used). I reiterated that all of the questions were voluntary, and that demographic questions would help me understand who they were, and prompt them to start thinking about how their identity impacts their pedagogy. Teach candidates' responses to these questions helped me to better understand and contextualize their answers, and followed the trend of an overrepresentation of White, heterosexual, women in teacher education. Currently, the Ontario College of Teacher's (2018) reported that their teaching staff across the province is made up of 74% women, 25% men, and .02% non-binary and Two-Spirit people. In the pre-survey, ten participants identified as women, and five identified as men. Eleven participants self-identified as White (five of these responding by answering that they were 'Caucasian'). Two participants identified as Black, one participant identified as "brown, (south american/Indian)", and one participant identified as "mixed (black/white)". The average age of participants was 24, with outliers of 21 and 53. Twelve participants identified as heterosexual, two identified as lesbian, and one participant did not specify. Participants' future teaching areas spanned a wide range of subjects, including math, biology, physical education, chemistry, physics, English, visual art, music, French, geography, and history. Six participants were studying to teach at the junior/intermediate level (Grades 4-10) and nine participants were studying to teach at the intermediate/senior level (Grades 9-12).

This chapter sought to identify discourses that have influenced civic education, anti-racism, and teacher education in Ontario's educational systems. Provincial government structures were set up to serve the interests of White settlers, and excluded Indigenous Peoples and immigrants from this process. Segregated Black schools and the Residential School System have had lasting impacts on the structural exclusion of Black and Indigenous voices during the creation of the public education system. The last impacts of these exclusions have meant that the public education system does not serve these students, as seen through lower graduation rates, the overwhelming White racialization of public school teachers, and presence of targeted initiatives to try to curb these structural racist effects on Black and Indigenous people. Teacher education in the province was meant to produce citizens that would advance the interests of the British Commonwealth, and was also structured to best serve the need for workers - an important goal if efforts to continue to settle the land and advance nationalistic goals were to be achieved. Both past and present-day civic education curricula rely heavily on nation-building, emphasize engagement within current political and economic structures, and continues to minimize and deny the sovereignty of Indigenous nations. Progressive and anti-racist initiatives in the province have been curtailed by neoliberal attempts to devalue these efforts through 'back to basics' narratives. The Ontario research site Bachelor of Education program has responded to these discourses in many ways, through attempts to interrupt White settler ideas about history and encourage critical thought about meritocracy and identity. The themes that emerged from the data, however, are unsurprising given the history and structure of schooling, teacher education, and civic education in the region. These findings for the Ontario research site are discussed next.

Chapter Six: Ontario Findings

In talking about anti-racism and things you can do to promote it, you're also promoting how to be more civically engaged and how to provoke social justice. Like [another participant] said, it's really overwhelming, the power that you have, you're a political figure as a teacher.

- Ontario Focus Group Participant, 2018

This chapter presents an analysis of the Ontario site data. Repeating ideas from all data collection methods formed the basis of ten interrelated thematic areas that are grouped together in four 'broad areas' to underscore their connectedness (see Table 2). The broad areas are also tied to areas of inquiry in my research questions, namely: teacher candidates' civic identities, their understandings of anti-racist, civic, and social justice education, their understandings of structural injustice, their perceived future pedagogical choices, and how their positionality may have impacted their learning in the course. Many of the themes I identified overlap, especially in the ways that they draw on particular discourses. I have created boundaries in order to discuss significant aspects of each theme, but much crossover exists.

As a result of collecting demographic information in the surveys, and through my own observations of the course, this class replicated the institutional pattern identified by Solomon et al. (2005), and which were reinforced by the statistics I provided in the introduction about the makeup of the teaching force in Canada: the majority of teacher candidates were White, heterosexual, women. In my analysis, I will note the instances if this is not the case, but overall, the data represented here are the result of the responses by this group of teacher candidates.

Similar to notation in the context chapters, in the two findings chapters I use abbreviations to keep contextual reference points for participant quotations, while maintaining their anonymity. The Ontario research site is abbreviated as 'ON', the Saskatchewan site is abbreviated as 'SK', and the methods from which the quotes originate are abbreviated as Pre-

survey, Mid-point, Post-survey, FG1, FG2, and FG3 (Focus Groups 1, 2 and 3). Specific teacher candidate responses in the surveys and mid-point observations are abbreviated as 'TC' followed by their assigned number, and only this notation is used when the research site and method of data collection are clear. When referencing the focus groups, I use 'S' before the teacher candidate speaker number.

Table 2. **Ontario Site Themes**

Broad Area	Themes
Civic awareness and action	1. Individualistic understandings of civic engagement
	2. Aspirational civic involvement
Knowledge	3. Meritocracy and social justice
	4. Anti-racism and overconfidence
	5. Settler colonialism
Future pedagogy	6. "If we're allowed": Overwhelmed and unsure
	7. Perceived subject area restrictions and "that's just not me"
	8. "Give me some tools to solve problems"
Positionality	9. Desire-not-to-know and maintenance of innocence
	10. 'White talk' and resistance

Broad Area: Civic Awareness and Action

The first broad area of themes ties together teacher candidates' understandings of civic engagement and their own reported areas of civic action. As a group, the Ontario site research participants did not consider themselves to be significantly civically aware. When asked in the pre-course survey, "How would you describe your current awareness of democratic processes (knowledge of current events, opinions on current issues, knowledge about campaigns in your community and city)?", zero participants selected *very aware* or *extremely aware*. Out of fifteen, the majority of teacher candidates selected *somewhat aware* (n = 9) out of the five multiple

choice answers available. The remaining teacher candidates selected *not so aware* (n = 4), or *not at all aware* (n = 2). Teacher candidates' answers to this question changed only slightly after they completed the course. The post-course survey again asked, "How would you describe your current awareness of democratic processes (knowledge of current events, opinions on current issues, knowledge about campaigns in your community and city)?" The *not at all aware* (n = 1) and *not so aware* (n = 2) options remained relatively the same, and the *somewhat aware* option decreased (from n = 9 to 6). The main difference between the pre- and post-course surveys was that the *very aware* option increased slightly (from n = 0 to 2). However, only 13 people filled out the post-course survey (as opposed to 15 who filled out the pre-course survey), making it hard to assign meaning to these somewhat changed responses.

Theme 1: Individualistic Understandings of Civic Engagement

Based on the Ontario site data, teacher candidates' definitions of civic engagement demonstrated that individualistic civic engagement discourses are the most prevalent, characterized by 'be the change' and 'make a difference' narratives. Responding to an open-ended pre-course survey question that asked teacher candidates how they would define civic engagement, two thirds of participants indicated that civic engagement meant being involved in a community: "getting involved in the community" (TC2), "participating in the community to represent a group of people" (TC11), or "involvement in your city" (TC15). Six out of the 15 participants indicated that civic engagement meant involvement with democracy, government, and political processes or parties: "being involved with understanding who represents me at the different levels of government" (TC13), or "engaging in, and researching, your local political parties, voting and being a part of the political conversation" (TC8). Very few of participants' answers contained a rationale for civic engagement. Those that did allude to a 'why' rationale

indicated that the goal of civic engagement was to: “make a difference” (TC14), “bring positive change” (TC1), “make positive change” (TC9), or “help the public” (TC6). None of the teacher candidates’ definitions were specific about what these changes may be, other than that they would be ‘positive’. Two participants responded that civic engagement meant staying educated about issues and discussing them with others, and one participant responded that they were “not sure” (TC7). Taken together, participants’ definitional responses showed a lack of specificity (or possibly understanding) about what civic engagement involves, and drew heavily on popularized phrases about community involvement that suggest that individual, or ‘personally responsible’ action, reminiscent of character education, is what constitutes engagement (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004).

Interestingly, the issues that teacher candidates reported being concerned about would require systemic changes in order to address the root cause of their concerns. In response to the open-ended pre-course survey question, “What issues are you concerned about?” (participants could indicate more than one issue), eight participants listed poverty, seven listed mental health, five listed concerns about the environment (including climate change, pollution, environmental degradation, extinction of species, and food security), four listed inequality (including income inequality), and three listed education (including school closures, poor funding, and access to technology). Other issues that participants were concerned about included civil rights, racism, women’s rights, physical health, and community involvement. One participant responded that they were “indifferent” (TC14).

The top three issues that teacher candidates were concerned about (poverty, mental health, and the environment) stand in contrast to the self-reported types of civic engagement that teacher candidates indicated being involved in. An open-ended pre-survey question asked, “How

are you involved in your community (locally, nationally, or globally)? Responses might include anything from volunteering, sitting on committees or boards or councils, voting, going to rallies, public engagement work, etc." In response, half of participants indicated that they were involved in volunteering as a general activity. An additional teacher candidate wrote, "I don't think I am … does being involved with a church count?" (TC1), indicating a lack of understanding about which types of community engagement 'counted'. Five teacher candidates indicated that they vote, and three indicated that they were involved with non-profit boards or committees. In addition, three participants indicated that they were not involved, answering "not really, too meh" (TC4), or "nothing" (TC15). Other modes of involvement that individual participants listed were coaching sports, "participating in global travel and studies" (TC14), and tutoring. The disconnection between teacher candidates' modes of civic action and the issues that they were concerned about speaks to a growing tension: young people are increasingly encountering and grappling with structural injustice, while only having access to (or having been taught) individual- or consumer-based ways of acting (McLean, L. et al., 2017).

Theme 2: Aspirational Civic Involvement

Although teacher candidates' levels of civic awareness did not change significantly after taking the course, there were differences in their definitions of civic engagement. In particular, their post-course survey answers revealed slightly more nuanced definitions, and a desire to be more civically engaged in the future. In response to the post-course survey question asking teacher candidates to define civic engagement, a majority of respondents (n = 9) similarly named 'community involvement' and referenced the goals of civic engagement a being 'positive change' (n = 5). However, there was an increase in the number of respondents who cited civic engagement as being involved in government, policy, or political processes and parties (n = 6).

For example, one teacher candidate's definition in the pre-course survey was, "being involved in the community to make positive change," whereas their post-course definition was, "actively participating in advocating for policy change" (TC9). Another participant's definition shifted from "participating in the community to represent a group of people" in the pre-course survey, to "being involved in community and social justice affairs" (TC10) in the post-course survey. Finally, the respondent who was "not sure" (TC7) what the definition was in the pre-course survey, responded in the post-course survey that civic engagement meant "being engaged in the world/city/province around you." These slight changes, moving from 'positive change' to 'policy change', the inclusion of social justice, and a burgeoning definition of civic engagement, suggest that teacher candidates' understandings of civic engagement sharpened or deepened slightly as a result of the course.

Participating in the course did not inspire an increase in civic engagement on behalf of teacher candidates, although several teacher candidates stated that they would like to be more engaged in the future. The post-course survey asked teacher candidates the open-ended question, "As a result of your coursework, have you become more civically engaged in your community (local, national, or global), or do you plan to be? Please elaborate." Five teacher candidates responded that they have not been more engaged yet, but hoped to be or had plans to be more engaged in the future. As one teacher candidate noted, "No, but I feel more educated, which is the first step!" (TC4). Additionally, four more teacher candidates indicated that they were not more engaged, but had gained more awareness about different issues, and thought they were more likely to educate those around them. For example, one teacher candidate responded:

> I have never been the one to 'civically engage' on a local, national or global level, however after learning more about the topics on gender, disability, race, Indigenous culture, I am more inclined to educate others around me. I think one easy [thing] I can see myself doing, is using inclusive language. By speaking in a way that does not

> discriminate against any an individual person, I am creating a small change locally. My hope is that people around me would be influenced by my language and slowly begin to change their vocabulary. (ON, Post-survey, TC12)

Two teacher candidates indicated that the course *had not* made them more civically engaged, while two teacher candidates responded that it *had* made them more engaged. For example, one teacher candidate responded, “Yes I have. Through [course] projects, meeting new people, and going to workshops, I have been engaging more with my community. I plan to become even more engaged as time goes on” (TC9).

Broad Area: Knowledge

The second broad area of themes concerned areas of knowledge that teacher candidates engaged with over the span of their foundations course. The major themes in this area include teacher candidates’ belief that meritocracy was equivalent to social justice, how their understandings of racism affected their confidence when engaging with anti-racist pedagogy, and a lack of knowledge concerning the history of (or their participation in) settler colonialism in Canada. These themes are interrelated, particularly in the case of how notions of meritocracy overlap with understandings of racism as an individual attribute rather than systemic injustice.

Theme 3: Meritocracy and Social Justice

Teacher candidates’ definitions of social justice indicated that, overwhelmingly, they held meritocracy-based understanding of justice. The ideological assumption behind meritocracy holds that “everyone has equal opportunity because we are all basically the same; all that is required to get ahead is hard work, talent, and effort” (Schick & St. Denis, 2003), and that ‘fair’ democratic institutions in Canada will mitigate all other forms of oppression, including racism (Henry & Tator, 1994). The pre-course survey asked teacher candidates to define social justice. Answer coding was not mutually exclusive; some answers contained contradictory language or

more than one definition, and were coded as part of two or more repeating idea groups. In response to the pre-course survey question, eight out of the 15 participants included references to ‘equality’ or ‘fair treatment’ for everyone: “a system that works for all” (TC7), “making sure people have a fair trial” (TC5), and “everyone is treated fairly” (TC15). In addition, five answers included ‘equal opportunity’ language: “equal access to opportunities” (TC1), “equal opportunities and treatment for all people regardless of race, religion, age, gender, etc.” (TC10), indicating that teacher candidates view social justice as an issue of equality and access to opportunities, and not an issue of equity.

In contrast, a minority of teacher candidates understood that social justice dealt with the distribution of resources in a society. Two participants indicated that social justice meant *equity* in the way that resources are distributed, writing that social justice meant “creating equity for all people and correcting injustices while being mindful of reconciliation” (TC13), or “justice with regards to the distribution of resources in a community” (TC6). One teacher candidate also indicated that social justice included addressing past injustices, while another equated social justice to attending rallies or demonstrations or creating special interest groups (speaking more about tactics rather than goals).

Definitionally, slight changes occurred when analyzing how teacher candidates defined social justice after the course. Although language still largely focussed on ‘fairness’, more definitions included ideas around equity and structural injustice. In response to the post-course survey question, “How would you define social justice now?” nine participants (out of 13 total) used language that once again focussed on ‘equal’ and ‘fair’ treatment of everyone. In addition, in one of the focus groups, a teacher candidate stressed that “I believe that everybody should be treaty equally and have fair opportunities” (ON, FG2, S6). Interestingly, however, this was the

only response that contained the language of ‘opportunity’ (down from five in the pre-course survey), and four participants instead used the term ‘equity’. Although answers around correcting past injustice and distribution of privileges remained relatively the same, two teacher candidates in the post-course survey also used language that indicated social justice meant that systemic changes were needed. While the majority of responses still alluded to or directly referenced fairness (and thereby meritocracy), increased use of the word ‘equity’ may either signal the acquisition of social justice language, or shifts in understandings of the concept itself.

Theme 4: Anti-racism and Overconfidence

Teacher candidates who believed that racism is a personal, individual-based mentality (rather than systemic) consistently indicated that they felt confident with anti-racist pedagogy, and would use anti-racist practices in the future. In the pre-course survey, teacher candidates were asked to describe their confidence with anti-racist pedagogy. Two candidates answered that they were *extremely confident*, four teacher candidates answered that they were *very confident*, and four answered that they were *somewhat confident*. Only five teacher candidates out of 15 indicated that they were *not so confident* or *not at all confident* with anti-racist pedagogy. When comparing these confidence levels to the same teacher candidates’ answers about how they define anti-racism in the pre-course survey, it became clear that many teacher candidates (10 out of 15) had individual-based rather than system-based understandings of racism. That is, teacher candidates thought that racism refers to the “explicit, conscious belief in racial superiority,” and not “a set of practices and institutions that results in injustice” (Lichtenberg, 1992/2002, p. 91), or in other words, racism was “more about prejudice and discrimination than … about the institutionalization of racism” (McIntyre, 1997, p. 48). For example, the two participants who answered that they were *extremely confident* teaching anti-racism defined it as “being against

racism, inequality, stereotypes, and prejudices" (TC3), and "stopping prejudices" (TC5). Another participant who was *somewhat confident* teaching in anti-racist ways defined anti-racism as "no negative bias towards other ethnicities" (TC15). Although 'being against' racism is also needed, "even if 'racism-in-the-head' disappeared, then 'racism in-the-world' would not" (Lichtenberg, 1992/2002, p. 95); constructing racism as an individual stance obscures the practices that perpetuate racial injustice.

Other teacher candidates who were *very confident* or *somewhat confident* teaching in anti-racist ways defined anti-racism using language that suggested taking a diversity or multicultural approach. As a case in point, one teacher candidate defined anti-racism as "promoting diversity, unity and, most importantly, being culturally aware (not being ignorant)" (ON, Pre-course, TC8), while another teacher candidate defined anti-racism as "promoting the equality of all individuals despite their origins/backgrounds" (TC14). Since multicultural practices "prevent an anti-colonial analysis" (St. Denis, 2011, p. 308), it would be problematic to claim that multiculturalism or diversity can stand-in for anti-racist teaching practices (Dei, 2001).

Prior to the course, there were two teacher candidates whose responses included language that acknowledged that racism was a systemic problem. One teacher candidate defined racism as "systemic barriers that groups who have been historically repressed face" (ON, Pre-course, TC11). In the post-course survey, two participants' responses also indicated an understanding that racism is systemic, writing that anti-racism must "work to redistribute power equitably" (ON, Post-course, TC6). Other than these two exceptions, the post-course survey definitions of anti-racism were equally as individual-based as the pre-course survey definitions. Teacher candidates in the post-course survey defined anti-racism as "the idea of 'not seeing race'" (ON, Post-course, TC8), and "advocating for equitable treatment of all people regardless of race" (ON,

Post-course, TC9), exemplifying the ideological assumption that 'race doesn't matter,' which ignores differences in power "reflected in historical, social, political, and economic practices" (Schick & St. Denis, 2003, p. 7). These statements came from teacher candidates who were *very confident* and *somewhat confident* with anti-racist pedagogy. In general, the majority of teacher candidates indicated in the post-course survey that they were *extremely confident*, *very confident* (n = 6), or *somewhat confident* (n = 5) in their anti-racist pedagogy, and only two participants indicated that they were *not so confident* or *not at all confident* with teaching in anti-racist ways.

Theme 5: Settler Colonialism

Teacher candidates indicated that they were grateful to be learning about Indigenous history (including about the Indian Residential School system), and at this point in their program sequence, would not have taken their required course on issues affecting First Nations, Métis, and Inuit education. In many ways, their descriptions of their learning at this point in their program often essentialized or reinforced stereotypes about Indigenous Peoples. When asked in the mid-point observations, "Based on what you have learned in the lectures, discussions, readings, and assignments in the course so far, what is something you are glad you learned (or are learning more about)?", over half of participants (n = 8) indicated that they were learning about Canada's history of settler colonialism. In their descriptions, however, it is unclear how deep these understandings ran. As one teacher candidate wrote, "I didn't realize how little I knew about First Nations and native education before beginning this course. It has been eye opening and really interesting to learn about the darker history of our country" (TC2). Other candidates wrote that, "I am glad we are learning about indigenous people because I do not currently feel knowledgeable about that people group" (TC15), and "I am extremely grateful that this program has a large focus on reconciliation. It has made Indian Education real for me and has giving [*sic*]

me the understanding to create an opinion on our past wrong-doings" (TC8). By using phrases such as 'really interesting', '*that* people group', and 'create an opinion', it seems that these participants still understand the history of settler colonialism in Canada as largely separate from themselves; positioning this history as 'interesting' or something that they should have an 'opinion' about, rather than acknowledging their own complicity in the history and ongoing reality of settler colonialism, or that they may benefit from living and working on stolen Indigenous land. These positionings are directly linked to maintaining a sense of innocence (Dion, 2007; Schick 2000), discussed in more detail in the positionality broad area of themes.

In talking about their learning, five of the eight participants who said they were glad to learn about settler colonialism additionally indicated that they were either embarrassed at how little they knew about the topic, or that their own K-12 education had failed them when it came to learning about Indigenous Peoples, which is common amongst teacher candidates (Hare, 2020). These histories have been categorically excluded from public school experiences and curricula (Ng-A-Fook & Milne, 2014), including in Ontario, as was outlined in the context section. One teacher candidate wrote, "I am glad I learned more about Indigenous communities. It's almost embarrassing to say that I never learnt this in school" (ON, Mid-point, TC1), while another said, "I never heard about residential schools until I was 18" (ON, FG2, S4). One participant went as far as describing their internalized stereotypes about Indigenous Peoples, saying that "this course taught me about First Nations and the whole history, because I was never taught that. It's kind of scary, the first time I learned about it was here … beforehand I had no idea. I just went with what people told me; they're just drunks by nature, they like to do drugs, all that stuff" (ON, FG1, S2). Finally, one candidate related that:

> I feel like I've learned a lot more about the influence of schooling in the lives of native peoples. When I was taught about aboriginal peoples in elementary school, it was really

> just surface information and we never really explored the impact of colonizers, you just had to assume what the real harm was and we moved on as if it was a topic far in the past. Maybe I just never gave it much consideration because it didn't directly affect me, but I didn't realize the effects of residential schools are still so pertinent today. (TC14)

These statements point towards slightly more nuanced understandings by the teacher candidates of their own positionalities, through recognizing stereotypes that they held and acknowledging how much they needed to learn. In addition, even though the later teacher candidate does not realize that residential schools also had direct effects on settlers through the promotion and normalization of their worldview, the teacher candidate is starting to understand that 'the impact of the colonizer' has effects that are 'pertinent' today. However, these realizations similarly do not require self-implication in the processes and structures of settler colonialism.

There were also students who showed resistance to learning about Canada's history of settler colonialism and, in particular, White supremacy. As exemplified in one student's response to a focus group question:

> We started off with a lot of the Aboriginal stuff and talking about the First Nations and that kinda thing … but it was also blended with racism, so it's kind of a mixed bag there. … I wasn't very impressed because basically it was, like [another participant] said, there was no dialogue, there was no discussion. So, when we had this guy ranting about White supremacy in Canada and then no chance to rebut or talk or anything, so that actually, for me had a very negative impact on how I thought about that. Not that I think racism is positive, but … no chance to discuss or refute any of the statements he was making. (ON, FG2, S6)

Although this teacher candidate's response is more overtly defiant, other teacher candidates in the focus groups made comments about not wanting to 'offend anyone' and wanting to say the 'right thing', which are both subtle ways of resisting the admission that they themselves are implicated in White supremacy – a phenomenon discussed further in the last section of this chapter.

Broad Area: Future Pedagogy

Teacher candidates were hopeful about incorporating what they had learned in their education foundations course into their future pedagogy, but they were overwhelmed, unsure, and anxious about what this would look like. They also struggled with perceived subject area restrictions, and above all, wanted concrete teaching strategies. The ways that teacher candidates readily conceptualized being able to adjust their pedagogical practices included strategies where an analysis of their own positionality wasn't necessary, primarily through creating inclusive classrooms. Their definitions of inclusivity, however, mirrored diversity and multicultural approaches. Important here to note, is that in part, the framing of my own survey question may have contributed to a conflation of ideas for the teacher candidates; when I was asking about dispositions, self-awareness, and approaches, they may have interpreted this as asking about specific teaching strategies. If I could ask them this question again, I would reframe it to ask about how the course had affected their *thinking* about civic education, social justice, and anti-racist pedagogy.

Theme 6: "If we're allowed": Overwhelmed and Unsure

Teacher candidates were optimistic about their ability to incorporate what they had learned in the course in their future as educators. However, their conceptualizations of what this could look like were unspecific, and produced 'White anxiety' in most cases (DiAngelo, 2018b; Levine-Rasky, 2000b). In the post-course survey, teacher candidates were asked, "Has participating in this course influenced the likelihood that you will use civic engagement, justice-oriented, or anti-racist practices in your future teaching? If yes – what from the course, in particular, do you think is responsible for your willingness to incorporate these approaches?" In response, 11 out of 13 respondents indicated that yes, participating in the course had made it

more likely that they would incorporate the listed practices in some way. However, how the teacher candidates constructed adjusting their pedagogy varied, and it is unclear if they knew what incorporating these approaches might mean. As one participant noted, “Yes. The class readings, discussions, and projects helped me look at *other peoples*' perspectives on sexism, racism, education, amongst others. By doing these things, I was able to open myself up to new ways of teaching and concepts that are important to explore” (ON, Post-course, TC10, emphasis added). This teacher candidate ‘opened themselves up’ to ‘other peoples’ perspectives, but is unspecific about what this means. Another teacher candidate seemed to understand that socially just or anti-racist approaches could be political, or hard to implement without support. As they explained in a focus group:

> We think that [the course] covered a lot of anti-racism but in doing so, because you're more aware of that ... What did you say, it umbrellas all civic engagement, social justice. In talking about anti-racism and things you can do to promote it, you're also promoting how to be more civically engaged and how to provoke social justice. Like [another candidate] said, it's really overwhelming, the power that you have, you're a political figure as a teacher. (ON, FG1, S2)

The teacher candidates in this focus group agreed that it will be an overwhelming task. They also had anxieties about how these kinds of pedagogies would be supported. In response to a participant talking about the need to model acceptance and how to navigate difference with students, this exchange took place:

> Speaker 3: We’re supposed to be encouraging change.
> Speaker 2: Exactly.
> Speaker 1: If we’re allowed to.
> Speaker 3: If we’re allowed to, is that what you said?
> Speaker 1: Yeah.
> Speaker 2: It’s true. (ON, FG1, S1-3)

Although emphasis in this focus group was placed on the importance of teaching students in socially just and anti-racist ways, a sense of apprehension about how to do it, and about

anticipating resistance was apparent in many of their comments about being 'allowed to', anticipating in some way that teaching in these ways would not 'be allowed'. In a separate focus group, the issue of 'being allowed' also surfaced, as one teacher candidate expressed, "what am I supposed to do? … what am I even allowed to teach?" (ON, FG2, S4). Similar to Guo's (2014) findings, these candidates realize on some level that engaging with civic, social justice, and anti-racist pedagogy is political, and are anxious about having to deal with parent and student resistance to these approaches, which may involve feeling uncomfortable (DiAngelo, 2018b).

Theme 7: Perceived Subject Area Restrictions and "that's just not me"

Teacher candidates shied away from taking responsibility to engage with civic, social justice, and anti-racist pedagogy by claiming that doing so was not conducive to their subject areas. For example, one teacher candidate described their practicum placement, saying, "I was very science-y, and so I didn't know, okay, how do I integrate this into my class?" (ON, FG2, S4). In the context of this focus group conversation, this teacher candidate seemed sincere in their efforts, but was struggling to make links between science curricula and social justice issues. Other participants added that "when you're teaching biology, where does social justice come into that?" (ON, FG2, S6), and "I think it will be challenging to incorporate these things in science classes, so if you have any suggestions I'd appreciate it. However, I think that in my health classes I can easily talk about these topics" (ON, Post-course, TC6). Their inability to think about civic engagement, anti-racism, and social justice in a cross-disciplinary or interdisciplinary way is consistent with other studies that have found that teacher candidates see social justice issues as being incompatible with their subjects' curriculum guidelines (McLean et al., 2006; 2008), or as irrelevant to their future teaching (in the case of Indigenous education, see Brandt-Birioukov et al., 2020). These responses also seem to suggest that there is a misconception held

by these students about the purpose of the course; they think that the course was aiming to equip teacher candidates to teach specifically about the 'topic' of racism, rather than to engage them in an analysis of their own internalized racism and social positioning as it relates to their pedagogy.

Other teacher candidates used their subject areas as a shield to justify their resistance to being tasked with integrating civic, social justice, and anti-racist teaching into their future classrooms. As one teacher candidate explained:

> I wouldn't say I'm strong minded on a lot of these topics. Like for example, I am not a feminist at all, I would say. I would have a hard time implementing it, plus I'm biology, so I don't really see how I could be putting it into my lessons per say. But just being a role model, I think, is the most important part for me. And just being inclusive for everybody and treating everyone equally … being more aware of different cultures so I can communicate with them properly and not offend anybody. (ON, FG2, S5)

This teacher candidate affirms that they will treat everyone 'equally,' and would strive to 'not offend anybody'. Unlike the students who were earnestly trying to figure out how to reconcile perceived subject area restrictions with social justice issues, this teacher candidate seems to be absolving themselves of having to engage with 'these topics', using their subject area as justification. Another teacher candidate similarly stated, "I'm not going to say I'm going to be an anti-racist or a feminist teacher … that's just not me … I also have Phys. Ed. as one of my teachables. I think it's important to bring a lot of topics into the conversation … by imparting knowledge not in a way, 'this is good, this is bad', just presenting issues" (ON, FG2, S4). This teacher candidate emphasized that neutrality about issues as a teacher is important, and that anti-racism or feminism 'just isn't them', so they would be choosing not to incorporate these standpoints into their pedagogy. These subtle forms of resistance draw on the discourses of White Canadians as being 'polite', through constructing racism as 'offensive' and not wanting to 'offend' anyone in their future classrooms.

Theme 8: "Give me some tools to solve problems"

One of the biggest areas of consensus among teacher candidates was the desire for concrete teaching strategies. Many teacher candidates were under the impression that the course was meant to prepare them to talk *about* racism or other social issues in their classrooms, instead of interrogating themselves and their own assumptions and positionalities. In the focus groups, teacher candidates were asked, "What do you wish you could have learned more about in this course?", and almost all teacher candidates, at some point during the focus groups, mentioned that they wanted practical strategies, or ways to integrate or implement teaching strategies into their classrooms. Examples from one focus group included: "to learn more about how to integrate more things in our classrooms" (ON, FG2, S2), "how can you actually implement or use different strategies" (S3), "I don't know how to approach it as a teacher" (S4), "anything that they could tell me on what I would do in the classroom would be beneficial" (S5), "I'd like to have some practical; give me some tools to solve problems" (S6), "It would have been nice to have more of a practical application in these concepts" (S7). Although I don't doubt the sincerity of these statements, the desire for 'tools' to solve 'problems' or to apply 'these concepts' suggests that the 'problem' and 'these concepts' are external to the teacher candidates, rather than implicating themselves as part of the 'problem'.

The one conclusive way that teacher candidates saw themselves implementing what they had learned in the course was through building an inclusive classroom. In the post-course survey, teacher candidates were asked the open-ended question, "How do you think that your identity (racialization, sexual orientation, gender, etc.) will impact the way you teach?" Of the 13 responses, eight included language around creating a safe environment, a welcoming school, or an inclusive classroom. For example, one teacher candidate responded, "I will strive to create a

safe and welcoming environment for students" (ON, Post-survey, TC2), while another indicated that, "I want to facilitate an inclusive classroom environment where all students feel welcomed regardless of their race or sexual orientation" (ON, Post-survey, TC10). Although likely well-intentioned, it is also possible that the language around 'inclusivity' may be the new multiculturalism: replacing the language of 'diversity' or multiculturalism with 'inclusivity' may be discouraging a more meaningful systemic analysis on the part of teacher candidates. In one instance, one teacher candidate exemplified this perspective, saying that, "I am a White female; therefore, I will need to be aware of this and ensure that I am creating an inclusive classroom that fosters diversity and multiculturalism" (ON, Post-survey, TC9). Elaborating on this theme, another teacher candidate explained that, "I have to understand that I will connect more easily with students who share my identity. I should try to promote inclusivity in the classroom and hopefully my students will follow my example" (ON, Post-survey, TC7).

Broad Area: Positionality

The final broad area included themes that were closely related to the identities of the teacher candidates. These thematic areas are the most closely linked, as the overlapping discourses centre around the positionality of the participants. The first theme in this broad area includes teacher candidates who are not willing to engage with their role in perpetuating structural injustice, while still trying to maintain their 'goodness' or 'innocence' as a White person. The second, interrelated theme deals with forms of resistance that teacher candidates espoused, including discursive strategies that distance themselves from the 'problem' or being cast as 'part of the problem.' In addition, their reticence to discuss anything that would implicate them in perpetuating structural racism is linked to conceptualizations (and fear) of the 'other'.

Theme 9: 'Desire-Not-to-Know' and Maintenance of Innocence

In contrast to those teacher candidates who understood that teaching is political, some teacher candidates seemed to absolve themselves of having to engage with civic education, social justice, and anti-racism through interrelated concepts of the 'desire-not-to-know' (Alcorn, 2013), and the 'maintenance of innocence' (Dion, 2007; Schick, 2000). The desire-not-to-know refers to the process where people dismiss rational information that contradicts their ideology, beliefs, or makes them emotionally uncomfortable. 'Maintaining innocence' refers specifically to the process where *White* people reject evidence that might implicate them in structural racism. As Schick (2000) describes, "because participants' self-image is based on the construction of their identities as non-racist, innocent helpers, the possibility that this construction might not be true is the shadow that they are keen to deny" (p. 96). Dion (2007) further describes this discourse as being particularly pervasive amongst White teachers who are learning about Indigenous histories. In this study, several teacher candidates offered the claim that they are not 'experts' on 'these topics', and should not be expected to incorporate civic education, issues of social justice, or anti-racism into their teaching. In response to the post-course survey that asked, "Has participating in this course influenced the likelihood that you will use civic engagement, justice-oriented, or anti-racist practices in the future? If yes – what from the course do you think is responsible?" one candidate wrote, "I don't think there is a strong likelihood. At least not right now as *I am just not comfortable* enough with the material myself" (ON, Post-survey, TC6, emphasis added). In a sense, this teacher candidate is prioritising their sense of comfort over the lived realities of those who experience injustice.

Some of the participants' explanations also used the language of 'awareness', where teacher candidates reiterated that it would be hard for them to integrate civic education, social

justice, and anti-racism into their pedagogy, but that they were committed to learning more. This commitment required no real action and no interrogation of structural injustice, but maintained their image as an innocent and well-meaning. As one teacher candidate in one of the focus groups explained, “For me as a future educator, how it’s going to influence me is just more awareness. So, I don’t think I’m an expert in any of those subjects, I still have a hard time figuring out how I’m going to integrate it, but I think the first step is being aware” (ON, FG2, S5). Another teacher candidate said, “I haven’t interacted with a lot of *these things*. So, hearing other peoples’ take on things, like just opening your eyes to what other people experience and that these things are out there” (ON, FG2, S2, emphasis added), while others reiterated that “I am always opened [*sic*] to getting more educated on *these topics*. I still cannot say that I am an expert meaning there is always room to learn more” (ON, Post-survey, TC12, emphasis added), and “I just think I am more aware of my role as an educator to share my knowledge on *these subjects*” (TC14, emphasis added). These latter three participants, in particular, are distancing themselves from issues of justice and racism through being unwilling to even *name* racism as the object of interrogation, perhaps in order to avoid being implicated or remain innocent in the face of structural injustice.

Theme 10: ‘White Talk’ and Resistance

Teacher candidates intentionally, and also likely dysconsciously (King, 1991) espoused discourses of resistance to learning about their own role in settler colonialism, systemic racism, and White supremacy. McIntyre (1997) defines ‘White talk’ as “the infinite number of ways we manage to ‘talk ourselves out of’ being responsible for racism” and as a discourse that “serves to insulate white people from examining their/our individual and collective role(s) in the perpetuation of racism” (p. 45). Characteristics of this discourse include: “derailing the

conversation, evading questions, dismissing counterarguments, withdrawing from the discussion, remaining silent, interrupting speakers and topics, and colluding with each other in creating a 'culture of niceness'" (p. 46). The last resistance strategy, maintaining a 'culture of niceness', was evident in many of the teacher candidates' responses, and also connected to their maintenance of innocence described above. In the post-course survey, teacher candidates were asked, "What do you find useful and/or challenging about developing civic engagement, social justice, and anti-racist education pedagogy?" As one participant noted, "I think it is difficult to develop this type of pedagogy because it is easy to have choices create an unintentional impact, and I personally would be *worried that I may offend* someone through the practice" (ON, Post-survey, TC2, emphasis added). Other participants wrote that, "as someone who is White, there is a risk of being *patronizing* when engaging with racially charged issues. People can be cynical about White people advocating in a racial context" (TC11, emphasis added). Others wrote that "controversial topics are difficult to discuss and explain without *hurting* someone's opinion" (TC9, emphasis added), and "this will make me feel as if I have to *walk on eggshells* whenever I discuss such topics" (TC6, emphasis added). Through not wanting to pierce the veil of nicety, these teacher candidates are avoiding having to deal with issues of racism at all.

In addition, teacher candidates expressed anxiety about using the 'right' language, or 'how much' they should be incorporating social justice issues into their classrooms. For example, one teacher candidate explained:

> We shouldn't just ignore people's different backgrounds, and I don't think anyone is saying we should ignore them but what's the *right amount* to incorporate or how much can you ask someone before it's obvious that you're going too far. (ON, FG2, S2, emphasis added)

In addition to the teacher candidate quoted earlier who said they wanted to be, "more aware of different cultures so I can *communicate with them properly* and not offend anybody" (ON, FG2,

S5, emphasis added), these participants are hinting at a fear of / worrying about 'how much' social justice to incorporate, or how to communicate with 'them'. Combined with the candidates in the previous paragraph who were worried about being patronizing and offensive, these responses both shirk responsibility for dealing with one's own role in structural injustice, exemplify the fear that White people have of the 'other', and point to a fear concerning what they might say about who they have constructed as 'other'. McIntyre (1997) describes this as "a generalized fear of people of color—and about what to say about people of color," which results in "anger, frustration, confusion, defensiveness, guilt, and feelings of victimization" (pp. 73-74). One teacher candidate exemplified this fear concretely, by writing that:

> Being White makes any discussion of race very risky. The potential for being branded racist if my opinions don't mesh with the views of the minority. I hold the same expectations for all my students regardless of the race, sexual orientation or gender and I expect everyone to treat everyone else in the way that I expect to be treated and how I treat others. I don't see how my teaching would be different if I was a different race or gender. (ON, Post-survey, TC10)

Finally, a question on the post-course survey asked participants, "Did this course make you think about how you position yourself within systems of power (patriarchy, settler-colonialism, capitalism)? If yes, how so?" Three teacher candidates responded that no, it had not helped them to consider these positionalities. Two responses were coded as 'it's complicated': participants indicated that they had learned about these systems, but also seemed to indicate that they believed others may be biased against White people. One teacher candidate responded that, "I'm more aware now that as a White male, people make assumptions about the way I think and am likely to behave" (ON, Post-survey, TC10), and the other answered, "Yes, based on what was presented in class I have a better understanding of the bias towards people who are White" (TC14). These teacher candidates do not go as far as claiming 'reverse racism' (Dei, 2001), but

the language of 'bias towards White people' often arises as a resistance strategy when White teacher candidates are being constructed as part of the problem (Case & Hemmings, 2005).

Summary of Ontario Site Findings

The key findings that emerged from the ten themes at the Ontario research site (see Table 3) accurately reflected the historical and ongoing discourses that are reproduced in the Ontario educational landscape, and which were described in the context chapter. In particular, individual understandings of civic engagement and racism contributed to teacher candidates' overconfidence with anti-racist pedagogy, and allowed them to distance themselves from ongoing settler colonialism in the province. Teacher candidates also avoided self-implication in White supremacist systems through a number of forms of resistance, and mainly, wanted to learn teaching strategies in order to teach 'about' racism.

These findings offer a comparative baseline in several areas when looking at similar themes that emerged from the Saskatchewan site data, in particular surrounding the ubiquitous nature of 'maintaining innocence' and the tendency to look outward for teaching strategies and solutions to injustices, instead of examining one's own role in perpetuating injustice. Analysis of the Ontario site data also prompted me to look at programmatic, contextual, and discursive explanations for why teacher candidates at the Ontario site may have particular knowledge gaps in comparison to the Saskatchewan site, in particular concerning knowledge of histories of settler colonialism in their respective provinces. The context for the Saskatchewan research site is discussed next, before moving on to the thematic findings from that site.

***Table 3.* Summary of Ontario Site Findings**

Themes	Findings
1. Individualistic understandings of civic engagement	Teacher candidates understand civic engagement to mean individual acts of responsibility (voting and volunteering), and rely on vague 'positive change' discourses.
2. Aspirational civic involvement	Teacher candidates want to be more civically engaged in the future concerning issues that they care about (poverty, mental health, and the environment), but do not readily conceptualize collective action.
3. Meritocracy and social justice	Teacher candidates' definitions of social justice reproduced meritocratic understandings of society, where access to opportunities and 'fairness' are assumed to be able to mitigate racism.
4. Anti-racism and overconfidence	Teacher candidates who constructed racism as an individual attribute were confident that they would be able to teach in anti-racist ways. Teacher candidates who understood racism as systemic (in addition to the actions of individuals), were much less confident that they would be able to teach in anti-racist ways.
5. Settler colonialism	Teacher candidates' knowledge of historical and ongoing settler colonialism in the province was limited, and they tended to construct settler colonialism as being separate from themselves.
6. "If we're allowed": Overwhelmed and unsure	Teacher candidates did not know if they were 'allowed' to talk about social justice issues in their future classrooms. They exhibited anxiety when thinking about their future teaching, and anticipated resistance if they were to employ social justice pedagogy.
7. Perceived subject area restrictions and "that's just not me"	Teacher candidates whose teaching areas were not in the social sciences struggled to conceptualize social justice or anti-racist pedagogy as a result of perceived subject area restrictions, constructed social justice as optional for White teachers ("just not me"), and didn't want to offend anyone.
8. "Give me some tools to solve problems"	Teacher candidates wanted teaching strategies to talk *about* race and racism, and misunderstood the course as being meant to provide these strategies, rather than to look at their own complicity in systemic injustices. The main way they viewed their future implementation of anti-racist pedagogy was through creating 'inclusive' classrooms.
9. Desire-not-to-know and maintenance of innocence	Teacher candidates exhibited a strong 'desire-not-to-know' about evidence that contradicted their ideology, and 'maintained their innocence' by rejecting evidence that made them feel uncomfortable, including being unable to name racism.
10. 'White talk' and resistance	Teacher candidates drew on 'White talk' discourses, such as maintaining a culture of niceness, fear of the 'other', and resisting implication in White supremacy due to a 'bias towards White people'.

Chapter Seven: Saskatchewan Site Context

Similar to Ontario, my contextual orientation to the Saskatchewan research site included a combination of knowledge based on lived experiences, analyzing statistics, and conducting content and discourse analysis with regional and university documents, historical narratives, and the course syllabus. Due to the size and nature of the Saskatchewan research site (there are only three universities in the province), less contextual specificity can be given about the research site institution in order to protect the identities of the research participants. Robust contextual information for the province as a whole is meant to supplement this restriction. Similar to the Ontario context chapter, the sections that follow outline the relevant discourses operating in the province, in particular concerning the history of the development of public schooling and teacher education. These contexts allowed me to better understand the research participants' responses.

Provincial Discourses

Saskatchewan is part of the Prairie geographical region, and is considered a Western Canadian province. For its area, it is sparsely populated, with just over one million people living in Saskatchewan in 2016 (Statistics Canada, 2016d). Indigenous historical accounts confirm that Indigenous Peoples have been living in the region for more than 10,000 years (Office of the Treaty Commissioner, 2019). There are over 50 distinct First Nations living within the provincial political borders; the larger nations include the Cree, Dene, Saulteaux, Ojibway, Dakota, Sioux, Nakoda, and Assiniboine Nations (Statistics Canada, 2016b). In contrast to Ontario, Indigenous Peoples make up approximately 16% of all people living in Saskatchewan, and the majority identify as having single nation ancestry; 66% of those people who identified as Indigenous were First Nations people, 33% were Métis, and 0.2% were Inuit (Statistics Canada, 2016d). Similar to Ontario, statistics separate non-Indigenous people into 'immigrant' and 'non-immigrant'

categories, without clear definitions about how much time is needed to move from the former to the latter. In 2016, 72% of the province's population were 'non-immigrants'. The three most highly reported ethnic origins in Saskatchewan include German (28%), English (24%), and 'Canadian' (21%). In 2016, 10.5% of people living in Saskatchewan were immigrants, and 1.1% of people were identified as non-permanent residents (Statistics Canada, 2016d). These statistics illuminate the differences in populations between Saskatchewan and Ontario, as Saskatchewan is made up of primarily two groups, namely three-quarters of people who identify as (primarily White) 'non-immigrants', and 16% who identify as Indigenous.

Schick and St. Denis (2005) have argued that racism in Saskatchewan is characterized by tensions between the dominant White population and Indigenous Peoples. The structural roots of this racism reach back to the first waves of settlers. Evidence shows that the early iterations of what is now the Canadian state directed the killing and starvation of Indigenous Peoples in many parts of Canada throughout settlement, but especially in the Prairie region (Daschuk, 2013; Starblanket, 2018), including leading up to and during treaty negotiations. The Canadian federal government (at the time, the Crown), negotiated treaties with Indigenous nations living in the area. The six numbered treaties that cover the land in Saskatchewan, including Treaties 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 10, were all signed between the years of 1871 to 1906 with the newly created Canadian federal government. These treaties outlined land division and use, and made promises to Indigenous Peoples concerning education and healthcare that have largely been misinterpreted and unmet (Cardinal & Hildebrandt, 2000). As mentioned earlier, the passing of the *Indian Act* in 1876 further restricted the land designated specifically for Indigenous Peoples in Saskatchewan through the reserve system, concentrating nations in resource-barren areas. The combination of

unmet treaty promises, and the implications of the *Indian Act*, have resulted in economic structures designed to disadvantage Indigenous Peoples in the province.

These economic divides were further entrenched by political systems and policies that discriminated against all 'non-British' groups. The parliamentary provincial government in Saskatchewan was established in 1905, and for the majority of its existence, was been led by left- or left-centre provincial parties. Until 1930, however, the federal government continued to control the land division in the province; settlers of 'British descent' could obtain a 160-acre homestead for a $10 fee (Provincial Archives of Saskatchewan, n.d.). After 1930, the provincial Department of Immigration and Colonization assessed incoming settler populations and also sold large swaths of land to settlers at low prices. As a result of the stark living and working conditions of these early waves of settlers, and due to the idealization of rural living, Saskatchewan saw the creation of many cooperatives and unions to bolster burgeoning rural life (Lemisko & Clausen, 2017). These organizations, such as the National Farmers' Union, The Canadian Wheat Board, and the Saskatchewan Grain Growers Cooperative, made the ongoing settler colonial project in the province possible. These early farming years are defined by a culture of 'hard work' in the province (Dale-Burnett, 2006), and, coupled with the idealization of rural life, this discourse of 'hard work' remains central to the meritocratic beliefs and identity of many people with settler ancestry in the province.

In recent decades, the consolidation of smaller family farms into larger, corporate farms or 'agribusinesses' saw the number of farms fall from close to 57,000 in 1996 to just over 34,500 in 2016 (Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food, and Rural Affairs, 2019). Meanwhile, the rise of the oil and gas industry in the province eventually saw rural voters moving away from collective organizations towards favoring policies that best served business entities, ushering in the right-

centre Saskatchewan Party in 2007. Although Saskatchewan is largely considered to have strong social democratic roots (Lemisko & Clausen, 2017), this recent turn towards conservatism supports arguments that, despite the existence of political socialism for many decades, Saskatchewan's true history is that of conservatism and self-interest (Brown, 2019). In the context of this study, this self-interested conservatism contributes to discourses of individualism, and a disconnectedness from the efficacy of collective actions.

First Nations and Métis groups have resisted ongoing settler colonialism in the province since its inception, and have generated social and political movements for cultural protection and revitalization. During the Oka resistance of 1990, for example, significant organizing took place as part of coalition work happening across the country to support Mohawk demands at Kanehsatà:ke. A coalition of Indigenous and non-Indigenous people came together in various direct action and organizing activities in order to construct Indigenous and non-Indigenous "solidarity in support of anti-racist structural and ideological transformation" (Regnier, 1995, p. 85). As another example, in 2012, three First Nations women and one non-Indigenous woman in Saskatchewan founded Idle No More, a campaign to resist changes to Bill C-45 (which stripped regulations governing the use of waterways). Idle No More quickly became an internationally supported movement, advocating for Indigenous and land rights across the globe (Kino-nda-niimi Collective, 2014). The goals of the movement continue to include pressuring the federal government to engage in meaningful consultation with Indigenous Peoples, to uphold the principles of the United Nations Declaration on Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), to recognize Indigenous title to lands, to honour the spirit and intent of the treaties, and to investigate the alarmingly high rates of missing and murdered Indigenous women and girls across the county (Idle No More, 2019). The saturation of media attention and public events that took place during

this time may contribute to a different level of awareness of issues affecting Indigenous Peoples in the Saskatchewan region than was present at the Ontario site.

While advocacy for and by Indigenous Peoples in the region is strong (Dhillon, 2017), Saskatchewan remains deeply racist. Again, racism in the province, and in the Prairies more broadly, is characterized primarily by tensions between White settlers and Indigenous Peoples (Schick & St. Denis, 2005). Anti-Indigenous racism can be found across all structures, including the justice system (Jacobs, 2012; Tanovich, 2018), media (McLean, S. et al., 2017), education system (Gebhard, 2017a; 2017b; 2019), health care, and political and economic systems (Starblanket, 2018). This structural racism is exemplified by ongoing police brutality against Indigenous Peoples (Stewart, 2019), disproportionally high rates of incarcerated Indigenous youth and women (Manning, 2018), and high rates of missing and murdered Indigenous women, girls, and non-binary people (NIMMIWG, 2019). The child welfare system routinely apprehends Indigenous children (which, nationally, has apprehended more children than the total number of children that attended residential schools at the height of their tenure, Krugel, 2018). This structural discrimination also proliferates into interpersonal stereotyping, discrimination, and outward acts of violence, in particular against those Indigenous people (often women) who call out the racism and racist structures in the province (McLean, S. et al., 2017).

Provincial Education Discourses

At its inception in 1905, a number of different school systems operated within the newly created borders of Saskatchewan. Lemisko and Clausen (2017) describe the concerted effort at this time to standardize teacher education across the province through the creation of Normal Schools. The authors note that David Goggin, the founder of the centralized schooling system in Saskatchewan, was “a controversial figure following his attempt to use schools as a tool for

assimilating immigrant populations into the norms of the British Empire" (p. 166), and that his influence on the Normal School curriculum saw the imposition of "fairly rigid academic and professional training courses that [were] seen in Ontario at this time" (p. 166). Teacher training during this time stressed assimilation, and was influenced by what the authors term "Country Life" ideology: an idealization of rural life that stressed cooperative discourses and agrarian thought (p. 163).

The formation of Faculties of Education in the province saw shifts in the processes and purposes of teacher education. From their inception, both the Normal Schools and Faculties of Education offered courses in household science and agriculture, but during this time grew to include understanding philosophies of education, psychology, pedagogy, and practice teaching components. These changes coincided with a shift from lecture-based learning to Dewey-inspired project-based learning in teacher training (p. 168). Post-WWII, other changes included the introduction of social studies courses, courses on human growth and development, and a 'Rural Sociology' course, which was meant to aid teacher candidates in understanding the communities that they would be working in. Lemisko and Clausen (2017) note that by the 1950s, this course "became entrenched as 'Social Foundations of Education'—a course that remains in one form or another in teacher education programs in Saskatchewan to this day" (p. 169), and which are the courses that I focussed on for this research project. In 1964, the university assumed formal control of all teacher training in the province and the Board of Teacher Education was established, a move that was negotiated as a collaborative endeavor amongst numerous stakeholders, and which Lemisko and Clausen (2017) argue is reflective of the "agrarian, social democratic, cooperative ideologies circulating in the socio-political context of Saskatchewan" at the time (p. 172).

Similar to other provinces, while the public education system was being constructed and expanded by the provincial government, the federally funded Indian Residential School (IRS) system remained ongoing in the province. Formally beginning in the province with the opening of the federally funded industrial school in Battleford in 1883, (TRC, 2015a, p. 161), the IRS system grew to 22 schools across the province over the next hundred years. The last residential school in Canada operated in Saskatchewan until 1996, on Gordon Reserve in the south of the province (TRC, 2015b). Although the final report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada termed the outcome of these schools “cultural genocide,” Starblanket (2018) contends that this linguistic turn distracts from the reality that the IRS system constituted the intentional attempted genocide of Indigenous Peoples on the part of the Canadian government. Similar to in Ontario, the abuses inflicted on the children who attended these schools in Saskatchewan is horrific, and the intergenerational effects remain ongoing (TRC, 2015b).

Saskatchewan is also home to several First Nations-run and Indigenous-focussed education programs. The First Nations University of Canada (FNUniv) was created in 1976 to serve First Nations students and is First Nations owned and operated (FNUniv, 2019). Alongside the teacher education program at FNUniv, the two other major universities in the province, the University of Regina and the University of Saskatchewan, have specific Indigenous teacher education programs. Saskatchewan has also seen the creation of several language- and culture-based K-12 schools in the province. In 1980, for example, after significant lobbying by parents concerned about public schools failing their urban First Nations and Métis students, the Native Survival School (now Oskāyak High School) was created (Regnier, 1998). This school remains partially controlled by the Kitotiminawak Council (the school's parent advisory council), and has seen a steady increase in graduation rates for First Nations and Métis students (GSCS, 2019).

Despite progress in some areas, teachers in Saskatchewan continue to reassert settler colonial practices and re-inscribe racism in several ways. Many educators are not willing to discuss racism, in particular anti-Indigenous racism, as it is seen by teachers as a 'taboo' subject in the Prairies (Gebhard, 2017a; 2017b). Teachers also perpetuate racism through minimizing the impact of racism in schools, deferring to colour-blind ideological positions, where claiming to 'not see race' is used as a justification by teachers to not engage with the impacts of racialization and racism in their schools and classrooms (McCreary, 2011). Those teachers who do acknowledge race, unfortunately also tend to construct racial and cultural 'others' as the problem (in particular, Indigenous people, Comeau, 2007), contend that racism consists of only individual acts of hatred, or that racialized students are marginalizing and isolating themselves (McCreary, 2011). In addition, those teachers that try to implement cultural approaches to combat inequality in their classrooms, often end up reinforcing their cultural positions as superior and Indigenous students' culture as inferior (Gebhard, 2017a).

Civic Education Discourses

Similar to Ontario, early civic education discourses in Saskatchewan were centered around the production of citizens loyal to Great Britain. One provincial civic education textbook directed students to "study the lives of [their] Anglo-Saxon ancestors," in order to "make [their] Dominion a better and happier place" (McCaig, 1925/1932, pp. 2-4). This textbook assumes that students in public schools will have Anglo-Saxon ancestors, thereby excluding students with other ancestry. Consistent with conceptualizations of settler colonialism as an ongoing project that is directly tied to land, capital, and resources (Arvin et al., 2013), the civic education discourse in this textbook emphasized the benefits of capitalism (McCaig, 1925/1932). In a section on immigration, for example, McCaig (1925/1932) writes that "after the British conquest

of Canada, settlers began to pour into the country … we need settlers, especially those who are interested in farming" (p. 48). Chapters on extractive industries, manufacturing, and capital and labor further stress nation-building, industriousness, and loyalty to the government.

In their review of civic education curricula in Canada, Sears and Hughes (1996) found that for many years, civic education across many jurisdictions was "used to impose a narrow view of national culture on all students" (p. 134). More recent social studies curricula analysis in Saskatchewan have found that citizenship is viewed as an activity (rather than a condition) to support liberal democracy in the early grades, and starting in Grade 7, begins to shift to promote more global/social justice forms of citizenship (Clausen et al., 2008). However, even with the promotion of a more socially just conception of citizenship, Clausen et al. (2008) also found that participation was primarily encouraged *within* existing democratic systems. The newest *Grade 9 Social Studies* curricula, released in 2009, confirmed these findings; the document contained indicators that espouse deliberative and social justice orientations to citizenship, but few that directed participation outside of formal governmental structures (Bergen & McLean, 2014).

In addition to the social studies curricula, the province has several other documents and initiatives that support civic education, including the *Broad Areas of Learning* (Saskatchewan Ministry of Education, 2010a), *Cross-curricular Competencies* (Saskatchewan Ministry of Education, 2010b), and *Concentus* (2019), all of which identify areas for engaged citizenship in every subject area. In addition, the provincial Ministry of Education mandated Treaty education across the province in 2007 (Office of the Treaty Commissioner, 1998; 2019). The outcomes of the mandatory Treaty education curriculum include indicators for all grade levels that detail investigations that students can take into learning about treaties and Indigenous governance systems (Saskatchewan Ministry of Education, 2013). The presence of these two curricular

initiatives, in theory, should impact K-12 teaching and teacher training concerning civic education, nation-building, and racism in the province.

Research Site

The research site consisted of an education foundations course in the Bachelor of Education program at an urban university. The course was mandatory for teacher candidates, and offered in English in the second term (winter). By this point in their program, it is possible that teacher candidates had either taken a course on teaching for reconciliation, or were concurrently enrolled in it, which may have affected some of their learning and understandings in the foundations course.

The instructor who taught the course is an Indigenous woman, and a tenured professor at the university. She has been working in the field of education for three decades and has been teaching education foundations courses for over 25 years. Her teaching philosophy includes an anti-oppressive approach to education, which she asserts involves “examining how multiple forms of oppression and marginalization rely on similar processes, practices, and ideologies to naturalize and normalize violence against particular groups of people” (Saskatchewan Site Document, n.d., p. 1). Her teaching is greatly informed by her own research and scholarship, and she sees teaching as a relational endeavor with her students, and as a work-in-progress. She writes that anti-racist/anti-oppressive education is not easy work, as students may be entering into understandings of inequality for the first time. For both the professor and students, the course content is challenging, but ultimately “encourages us to examine our lives and seek new solutions” (Saskatchewan Site Document, n.d., p. 1). She teaches in both the Indigenous teacher education program and the general Bachelor of Education program at the research site university, and commented that the teacher candidates in the general program are always ‘harder to reach’.

In many ways, her task with Indigenous students is to help name systems that are operating within their lives. In the general program, with primarily White teacher candidates, she must name these systems, but also convince teacher candidates that they are real, unjust, and need changing.

The course consisted of one, three-hour class per week. Typically, the format of the classes consisted of beginning with a lecture (approximately half of the class), a ten-minute break, followed by small group discussions on the course content for that week. Students were expected to produce reflective reading notes for every week, and their discussions were often based on these reflections. Each week included readings and viewings, which typically consisted of short videos and movies, academic articles, and book chapters organized around a weekly theme. Themes included social class, sexuality, gender, disability, race, Whiteness, and discourses. In essence, the course format (a lecture plus small group discussions) was very similar to the Ontario site, in addition to similar reflective written assignments.

The objectives for the course at the Saskatchewan site, as stated in the syllabus, included understanding that teaching is an ethical and political act, understanding what it means to be an educator in an ongoing process of settler-colonialism, understanding how hierarchical structures are maintained, undertaking the process of developing a critical consciousness, and understanding that oppression operates in individual, cultural, and institutional ways. In addition, course outcomes indicated that teacher candidates in the course should be willing to undertake a process of self-reflection, be able to identify structural oppressions, and to integrate new understandings into an evolving teaching philosophy (Saskatchewan Site Syllabus, 2019). Along with weekly reading notes, assignments in the course consisted of three papers. One asked teacher candidates to interrogate the socially constructed nature of identities, another asked them

to draw connections between race and Whiteness, and a final paper asked teacher candidates to explain their own understandings of why learning about the concepts of race, class, and gender are important for educators. The final paper was discussed with the course professor after submission.

Focus groups with teacher candidates revealed a number of factors that contributed to their learning in the course. Relevant here, is that the majority of those who participated in the study found that the identity of the course professor, similar to in Ontario, was responsible for a great deal of their learning. As teacher candidates noted, “she was very knowledgeable” (SK, FG1, S4), and “she was able to bring in her own experiences” (SK, FG1, S6), and that both of these factors enhanced their own learning in the course. Other teacher candidates noted that “it was very obvious that she is super educated in these areas” (SK, FG2, S2), and “the fact that she had experienced the things that she was trying to relay” (SK, FG2, S4), both of which were cited as reasons why teacher candidates thought that their own learning had been deepened. Interestingly, two teacher candidates disagreed that the identity of the course professor aided their learning, remarking that they felt “unsafe” (SK, FG1, S3), or that “any argument against what she was teaching was false” (SK, FG2, S3). These comments are illustrative of a trend in educational foundations courses taught by Black, Indigenous and people of colour (especially women), where teacher candidates construct these professors as ‘angry’ or ‘domineering’, often questioning their areas of expertise (Evans-Winters & Hoff, 2011), an issue which will be explored further under the theme of ‘resistance’ in the Saskatchewan findings chapter.

Similar to the Ontario site, a question in the pre-course survey asked participants at the Saskatchewan site to self-identify in a number of demographic areas: age, gender identity, ethnic / racial identity, sexual orientation, future teaching areas, and future teaching levels. The average

age of teacher candidates was 22 (younger than the average of 24 in Ontario), with outliers of 19 and 44. Fifteen of the teacher candidates identified as women, and seven identified as men. Seventeen of the teacher candidates identified as White, (with 11 of these using the term 'Caucasian'), and one teacher candidate identified as Métis. In their own words, one teacher candidate identified as "non-white", one identified as "Asian, Hindu", one identified as "Brown/Asian", and one teacher candidate left this question blank. Of the 22 teacher candidates who completed the pre-course survey, 17 identified as heterosexual, one identified as bisexual, one identified as homosexual, one identified as 'ambiguous', and two did not specify. The future teaching areas of the respondents spanned a variety of subjects, including chemistry, biology, physics, mathematics, social sciences, English, Indigenous studies, French, modern languages, art, practical and applied arts, and history. Future teaching levels of the participants included 12 at the secondary level (Grades 9-12), seven at the primary level (Pre-Kindergarten - Grade 3), and three at the middle years level (Grades 4-8).

This chapter outlined the discourses operating at the Saskatchewan research site, including the deep settler colonial roots of education, an idealization of rural life and meritocratic beliefs, civic education that served White settler colonial assimilationist goals, and Indigenous resistance being met with further anti-Indigenous racism. In contrast to the Ontario research site, where anti-Black racism has been a focus of educational policy reform, initiatives targeting anti-Indigenous racism dominate the context in Saskatchewan. The continued resistance by Indigenous groups to settler colonialism in the region may also account for different institutional teacher education foci, and contribute to a heightened awareness on the part of teacher candidates concerning issues affecting First Nations, Métis, and Inuit, as would their course on reconciliation. The findings from the Saskatchewan site are discussed next.

Chapter Eight: Saskatchewan Findings

It's a whole cycle, and that just continues back to the discourses, and then so on. I think that was just a really useful framework to kind of sort all this complex stuff, and just understand how that works a little bit. And then also just that all social categories, and all systems of oppression are based on arbitrary difference, like that's just decided by people.

- Saskatchewan Focus Group Participant, 2019

This chapter presents an analysis of the Saskatchewan site data. Analysis of all data collection methods revealed several repeating ideas, 11 thematic areas, and five broad areas under which themes were interrelated (see Table 4). The five broad areas cover many of the same discursive areas as the Ontario site, and are similarly described in terms of how they related to my research question areas. From the teacher candidates' demographic survey question answers, the same pattern of an overrepresentation of White, heterosexual women dominated the course and research participants. Many of the thematic areas at the Saskatchewan site also overlap, and these relational connections are noted wherever possible.

Table 4. **Saskatchewan Site Themes**

Broad Area	Themes
Civic awareness and action	1. Systemic concerns, individual actions
	2. Teaching as political
Knowledge	3. Social construction of identities
	4. System-based understandings
	5. Analytical frameworks
Purpose of the course	6. Looking inward vs. outward: Desire for teaching strategies
	7. “Changing the way we think”
Future pedagogy	8. Aspirational teaching for social justice
	9. “It isn’t my place”
Positionality	10. Diversity discourse: Saying the ‘right’ thing
	11. Resistance

Broad Area: Civic Awareness and Action

The first broad area encompasses teacher candidates' responses that related to their civic awareness, modes of civic action, and the degree to which they viewed teaching as civic engagement in and of itself. Taken together, the Saskatchewan group considered themselves somewhat or very aware of civic issues. When asked in the pre-course survey, "How would you describe your current awareness of democratic processes (knowledge of current events, opinions on current issues, knowledge about campaigns in your community and city)?", only one teacher candidate out of 22 selected *not so aware*, while most teacher candidates selected *somewhat aware* (n = 15) from five options. The remaining teacher candidates indicated that they were either *very aware* or *extremely aware* (n = 6) of democratic processes, current events, and civic issues in their community. In the post-course survey, these self-identified awareness levels remained relatively unchanged. Two teacher candidates indicated that they were *not so aware*, nine teacher candidates again indicated that they were *somewhat aware*, and six teacher candidates again indicated that they were *very aware*.

Theme 1: Systemic Concerns, Individual Actions

Based on the Saskatchewan site data, teacher candidates defined civic engagement on a spectrum from vague statements about community involvement, to very specific definitions about political involvement and staying informed about issues. In total, 15 teacher candidates out of 22 included 'community involvement' in their definition in some way: "working to make a difference in your community" (SK, Pre-survey, TC4), "being engaged in your community and city" (TC5), "engaging oneself into [*sic*] the community" (TC10), etc. In contrast, seven teacher candidates wrote very specifically about democratic processes or political parties, obeying laws, or doing their 'civic duties': "staying informed about the issues affecting your community in

order to participate in the democratic process in a meaningful way" (TC18), "political involvement on a local level" (TC15), and "engagement and involvement within the community; it could be political as well such as paying taxes, working/connected to with mayor or MP of the area, obeying law, voting etc." (TC21). Three out of 22 of the definitions at the Saskatchewan site contained language around 'positive change' or 'making a difference'. An additional three teacher candidates defined civic engagement as staying informed about issues and discussing these issues with others, and one teacher candidate left this question blank.

The most common issues that teacher candidates were concerned with at the Saskatchewan site were issues that would require systemic change, or were systemic injustices. An open-ended question in the pre-course survey asked, "What issues are you concerned about?" Teacher candidates were encouraged to list as many issues as they wished. In response, 14 out of 22 participants listed mental health (including accessibility of services and depression rates in rural Saskatchewan), 11 participants listed poverty (including housing), 10 participants listed the environment (including climate change, food security, the carbon tax, pipelines, and access to safe drinking water), seven participants listed issues affecting First Nations, Métis, and Inuit (including missing and murdered Indigenous women and girls, overrepresentation in the criminal justice system, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, the 60's scoop, and relations between settlers and Indigenous Peoples), and seven participants listed education (including well-being and mental health of students, funding, and decolonizing classrooms). Additional issues that teacher candidates (n = 4, 5 or 6) indicated that they were concerned about included gender equality (including women's rights, sexism, teen pregnancy, abortion, sexual assault, reproductive justice), government policies and politics (including immigration, foreign policy, and trade), and unemployment (including several who indicated anxiety over the loss of oil and

gas industry jobs). To lesser degree, participants also listed physical health, addictions, racism, crime and violence, media, disability, and issues affecting 2SLGBTQ+ people.

The wide variety of concerns amongst teacher candidates stood at odds with the ways that participants identified as being civically engaged. When asked in the pre-course survey, "How are you involved in your community (locally, nationally, or globally)?", 16 teacher candidates out of 22 indicated volunteering in some capacity. Five of these respondents specified volunteering by coaching sports, and three volunteered with their church. In addition to volunteering, half of the teacher candidates who responded said that they voted (n = 11). Three participants indicated that they sat on a board of directors or a committee, and three indicated that they attended community events (knowledge building, protests, rallies). Two people indicated that they were involved with a political party (either as a candidate or member), and two people indicated that they were involved in community organizing (through event organization and program facilitation). Two teacher candidates indicated that they were "not that involved" (SK, Pre-survey, TC8) or "tbh [*sic*] not involved at all" (TC11). Taken together, the ways that teacher candidates indicated that they civically engaged are more individualistic in nature, although some detailed explicit political involvement or community organizing around justice issues.

Theme 2: Teaching as Political

Some teacher candidates considered engaging with social justice, civic engagement, or anti-racist pedagogy to be political, or a form of civic action itself. For example, when asked in the post-course survey, "What do you find useful and/or challenging about developing civic engagement, social justice, and anti-racist education pedagogy?", four teacher candidates alluded to the political nature of anti-racist or social justice-based work. One participant responded, "I

think that the most challenging thing about these topics are fighting against the current, dominant, institutions that are so engrained in Euro-centric and oppressive standards" (SK, Post-survey, TC1), while another said that "it is challenging in the fact that it still goes against the mainstream" (SK, Post-survey, TC11). Another noted that, "it is definitely challenging because racism is so deeply embedded that it will take time to change the mindset of people who have become comfortable with the established racist and prejudicial practices that they have lost the consciousness about its existence" (SK, Post-survey, TC21). Through their responses, it is clear that this cross-section of participants understands that civic, social justice, and anti-racist pedagogy needs to focus on systemic injustices, and that this focus would 'go against the mainstream' and challenge those who have 'become comfortable' with racist practices.

Teacher candidates in the focus groups also pointed to potential resistance they might face. One teacher candidate, when asked if they considered educating for civic action, anti-racism, and social justice to be a form of civic engagement, said:

> I think I would [consider it civic engagement], because … especially in rural [areas] ... you have to take a big step if you're going to teach those matters. You get lots of parents that aren't with you. Sometimes your overseeing teachers or principals are like, 'Don't. You're stepping on the line.' Or whatever. So, to take that step and to know that that is coming back for you, I think that it is a civic action, because you are going through all that tough controversy against you, just to teach this matter, so I do think it is. (SK, FG2, S4)

Other teacher candidates referenced anticipating resistance from parents specifically. As one focus group was coming to a close, a participant asked me earnestly, "what do you do when an angry parent contacts you, or they come storming in your classroom, because they don't want little Johnny learning about this stuff?" (SK, FG2, S5). Another teacher candidate, in response to a pre-course survey question about what they were hoping to learn, asked, "how would I deal with parents who are against gay/lesbian content or different controversial political issues?" (SK,

Pre-survey, TC16). Some teacher candidates also saw resistance as coming from other teachers. In addition to the participant in the block quote above, another participant wrote that, "I think that it is challenging to get everyone on board (specifically parents and other faculty members). When you do not have the support of everyone, it is harder to do exactly what you want to do" (SK, Post-survey, TC12). Both through anticipating the need for systems-level changes, and through identifying the resistance that they would face, many of these teacher candidates understood that developing civic, social justice, and anti-racist pedagogy would be political.

Broad Area: Knowledge

The second broad area includes three thematic areas of knowledge that teacher candidates indicated they had learned about: the social construction of identities; system-based understandings; and analytical frameworks. Twelve out of thirteen of the teacher candidates who participated in the focus groups spoke enthusiastically about the knowledge they gained throughout the course. These teacher candidates noted that the readings, learning from their colleagues' experiences, and learning from the lived experiences of the course professor all contributed to this learning. Included in these three knowledge areas are acknowledgements by teacher candidates about their own biases and positionality within societal structures, and deepened understandings of concepts through their introduction to new language and analytical frameworks.

Theme 3: Social Construction of Identities

The most prominent area of knowledge that teacher candidates referenced in their learning was the socially constructed nature of identities. In response to the mid-point observation prompt, "Based on what you have learned in the lectures, discussions, readings, and assignments in the course so far, what is something that you are glad you learned, are learning

more about, or are struggling with?", 12 participants out of 22 mentioned specifically learning about the social construction of identities. In particular, seven of these teacher candidates referenced learning about societal constructions of ability and disability. As one teacher candidate put it:

> Something that I am glad I learned was to what extent society constructs people's identities. This course has made me more aware to the 'norms' around us that are merely created by society and for some reason we have all bought into for so many years. For example, the idea of who is abled and disabled is very relative, but at some point, someone put a label on what constitutes a disability and for so long we have all just accepted that. (SK, Mid-point, TC7)

Learning about the socially constructed nature of ability and disability was also mentioned in the focus groups, when teacher candidates were asked what their biggest 'take away' was from the course. Half of the focus group participants (n = 7/13) mentioned that they appreciated learning about identity construction, and ableism in particular. One teacher candidate noted that, "there are a few different topics that I didn't consider … for example, ableism. I had never really considered that as a form of oppression" (SK, FG1, S2). Another teacher candidate noted that, "reading that article and understanding the history of [disability] and where that term came from really put things into perspective, and I started noticing things around me, too" (SK, FG1, S6).

In addition to ableism, some teacher candidates (n = 4) who mentioned learning about the social construction of identity in the mid-point survey also mentioned race or Whiteness. One teacher candidate simply wrote, "I'm glad to be learning about the social construction of disability and race" (SK, Mid-point, TC6), while another wrote that, "something that I am glad to be learning about in this class is the myth of race (from a biological standpoint)" (SK, Mid-point, TC12). Two teacher candidates pointed specifically to learning about Whiteness. One teacher candidate wrote that they were "learning about patterns and forms of oppression, especially the ones which go unnoticed; how white ideals are created and perpetuated by systems such as

social, educational, political, economic, etc." (SK, Mid-point, TC21). Another teacher candidate wrote:

> Two areas I am glad I've learned more about are ableism and whiteness. I'm learning more about ableism at the beginning of the term was especially helpful because it laid the groundwork for understanding how labels like 'disability' are created through the establishment and comparison to the norm. Learning this early on gave me the tools I needed to apply that concept to other forms of oppression. As well, this course has expanded my knowledge on what whiteness is, what constitutes whiteness, how whiteness has changed over time, and how your cultural capital influences your status. (SK, Mid-point, TC18)

This particular teacher candidate noted that learning about the social construction of ableism helped them to apply this way of thinking to other forms of oppression. They also describe Whiteness as changing 'over time', signaling an understanding of Whiteness as a socially constructed system, and not just an individual attribute.

In contrast, some of the teacher candidates who identified learning about the social construction of disability struggled to apply this same thinking to race. The teacher candidate quoted at the start of this section, who was glad to have learned about the social construction of disability, later wrote:

> Something I am struggling with is the thinking that we are born without race. I understand that race largely divides the world and so there is a lot of negative feelings towards identifying people based on their race, and I agree, but I think that often race is a very proud aspect of human life so I don't know why we would take that away. I think that race and culture are very linked and if we lump us all into one category and say that we are born without race, to me, that feels like we will all lose our culture and heritage. (SK, Mid-point, TC7)

Although initially the candidate separates race and culture, they then write that 'without race … we will lose our culture and heritage', conflating race with culture. Her answer points to the complexity of the effects that group racializations have over time, where the imposition of the idea of race creates real racisms, and shared group experience as a result. Although this teacher candidate was able to accept that disability was a human-created category, they seemed unable to

separate culture from the process of racialization (another human-created phenomenon), which speaks to how ingrained, and non-negotiable, discourses of race are.

Theme 4: System-based Understandings

Related to the social construction of identities, teacher candidates had varied levels of awareness and knowledge that injustices were systemic. In the mid-point observations, one teacher candidate expressed that their understanding of systems of oppression was changing:

> I have been challenged to think about systems of oppression that are built into education and wider society. This course is making me think about the ways that I unconsciously learned these things and the ways that I perpetuate this system, as well as how thinking critically about this is the start to undoing this system and engaging in anti-oppressive teaching myself. I am learning to see past obvious forms and expressions of oppression and instead seeing the systemic ways this happens. (SK, Mid-point, TC20)

This teacher candidate is both aware that oppression is built into education systems, and that they unconsciously perpetuate this system. When asked in the post-course survey, "Did this course make you think about how you position yourself within systems of power (patriarchy, settler colonialism, capitalism)? If yes, how so?", 15 out of 22 of teacher candidates responded that the course had made them consider their own positionalities. However, when analyzing their answers, only seven of teacher candidates' responses indicated a clear understanding of what system positionality might mean. One candidate wrote that, "the major thing that this course made me aware of that I wasn't already aware of was the great affect that patriarchy and toxic masculinity have on society and the classroom. In that sense, it made me think about how I position myself" (SK, Post-survey, TC7). Two teacher candidates referenced the readings in their rationale, writing that "the readings in particular were very helpful in re-framing how I think about my positionality" (SK, Post-survey, TC14), and that "the readings gave a good picture of the power structures created by society" (SK, Post-survey, TC11). In addition, two teacher candidates wrote specifically about Whiteness, noting that, "it made me reflect on the power of

whiteness in institutions and how it is so important to have diverse teachers in schools so we can move past white privilege" (SK, Post-survey, TC8). Another wrote:

> This course has made me more aware of what constitutes whiteness. It has taught me that the privilege I hold within society is constructed by more than just the colour of my skin, but also the cultural capital I hold and by having traits associated with "whiteness". (SK, Post-survey, TC18)

In the focus groups, two teacher candidates also mentioned learning that racism was a systemic problem. "This course … opened my eyes to racism as a systemic problem, rather than an individual one. It also made me aware that teachers commonly blame racism being an individual problem as an excuse to not addressing that schools are affected by systemic racism" (SK, FG3, S2). Another student echoed this learning, stating that "the course enabled me to see my role in sustaining racism" (SK, FG3, S3). The teacher candidates who were beginning to understand that racism and Whiteness were systemic issues, and that they had a role in perpetuating racism and White supremacy, were becoming 'racially conscious' (Milner, 2013): aware that their Whiteness is also a racialized category, and that they perpetuate racism.

Of the remaining eight out of 22 teacher candidates who answered that, yes, the course had made them think about their positionality, most showed more individualistic understandings of what positionality means. For example, three candidates mentioned White privilege in their explanations, writing that "this class really opened my eyes on the issues of white privilege" (SK, Post-survey, TC16), and "because I am a white woman I definitely see the privilege that I have been awarded in school, work, etc." (SK, Post-survey, TC22). Another answered simply that, "yes I learned I am white so I am a step ahead" (SK, Post-survey, TC6). These answers draw on the discourse that individual White privilege is at the heart of the problem, instead of looking to the White supremist structuring of institutions that make this privilege possible (Lensmire et al., 2013; Leonardo, 2002).

This finding is reinforced by looking at the responses of the same teacher candidates to the question, "How do you think that your identity (racialization, sexual orientation, gender, etc.) will impact the way you teach?" The teacher candidates who had more systems-level understandings also understood that their positionality within these systems would affect the way that they taught. As one teacher candidate responded:

> I believe that my identity as a teacher will be a large factor in what resources I access as I teach my students. For example, as a White identifying person, there are aspects of Indigenous culture which I am not qualified to speak to, because I do not have that lived experience and do not have the knowledge to fulfill all necessary protocols. However, a large piece that we often overlook is that as White-identifying teachers who are reaching out to Indigenous people as resources and teachers, we have to understand that we are asking for their emotional labour. Reaching out to others and asking them to share their lived experiences so that we can learn is asking for someone else to give emotional labour, and therefore it must be asked for respectfully and not in an exploitive way. (SK, Post-survey, TC18)

By acknowledging that they are not well positioned to teach about Indigenous culture and will need to draw on Indigenous Knowledge Keepers in a non-exploitative way, this participant is articulating the complexity of how personal identities are implicated in teaching practices.

Theme 5: Analytical Frameworks

Teacher candidates also expressed that they appreciated learning new language in order to talk about what they were learning, and having access to analytical/conceptual frameworks to help them understand new concepts. As a case in point, one teacher candidate in a focus group articulated:

> I'd say ... two of the biggest overarching takeaways ... the first one is just that framework that we used throughout the whole course, of the discourse and ideologies that filter into the practices, policies, laws. And then, the negative outcomes, and how it's a whole cycle, and that just continues back to the discourses, and then so on. I think that was just a really useful framework to kind of *sort all this complex stuff*, and just *understand how that works* a little bit. And then also just that all social categories, and all systems of oppression are based on arbitrary difference, like that's just decided by people, and it's decided who has social power. (SK, FG2, S2, emphasis added)

This teacher candidate, referring to the structural determinism framework that was introduced in one of the classes, said that it helped them to 'sort all this complex stuff' throughout the progression of the course. Two other students also named this framework. One said that they appreciated learning "the cycle of social construction (discourses, practices, outcomes)" (SK, Mid-point, TC19), while another wrote that their biggest take away from the course was:

> The structural determinism method - how the discourse we use influenced practices and policies which lead to outcomes and consequences socially, economically, and so on. We used this method to examine the different forms of oppression we focused on throughout the course. It was valuable to have a framework to return to throughout all of the lessons. (SK, FG3, S2)

Teacher candidates also noted that they appreciated learning new language to name things they already 'knew' to be true. As one participant wrote, "I think that the readings we were given helped me to gain some *knowledge that I was searching for*. They were full of meaningful and thought-provoking discussions and words that encouraged me to think about the topics more" (SK, Post-survey, TC7, emphasis added). Another wrote that, as a person who grew up in a poor neighborhood, they were "glad that I learned about the *term* and idea of poor bashing" (SK, Mid-point, TC16, emphasis added). Finally, one teacher candidate in the focus groups summarized why it was important to them that they learned new terms:

> We talked about the four frames of color-blind racism … I thought that was [important], because it outlined four different attitudes that I see all the time and I've just never really been able to categorize those or define them. The one that I think was really important to learn about was the abstract liberalism [frame], because it's something that I see a lot, and *I could tell there was something wrong with it* obviously, but I didn't have a defined answer of what attitudes are problematic about that. (SK, FG1, S5, emphasis added)

These teacher candidates discussed being equipped with new terms for phenomenon that they already knew existed (racism, poor-bashing), but were unable to name previously.

Broad Area: Purpose of the Course

For some teacher candidates, the purpose of the course was unclear. While the majority of participants acknowledged that education foundations courses were important, some were frustrated with how little 'classroom application' was discussed. Overwhelmingly, teacher candidates wanted teaching strategies and resources, even while understanding that the course was meant to change their thinking. Even amongst those participants who acknowledged that the course was "more of an overarching class" (SK, FG2, S6), there was still a desire for the course to have provided teaching resources.

Theme 6: Looking Inward vs. Outward: Desire for Teaching Strategies

In response to a pre-course survey asking participants what they were hoping to learn, 10 out of 22 teacher candidates indicated they wanted to know how to incorporate civic engagement, social justice, and anti-racism into their future classrooms. This perspective was reiterated by almost everyone in the focus groups: "I wish I could have learned more about strategies to use in the classroom" (SK, FG3, S1). In addition to wanting 'how-tos', some teacher candidates also misunderstood the course as learning how to teach topics *to students*, similar to a methods course. In the pre-course survey, one teacher candidate said they wanted to learn a "way to teach these issues" (SK, Pre-survey, TC9). Another wrote that, "overall, what I am struggling with the most is the content not being connected back to education. While I understand these issues will be present within our classrooms, I would like to know how to educate my own students about it and be given resources to use" (SK, Mid-point, TC14). At least four other teacher candidates expressed this sentiment in the mid-point observations, and then again in the focus groups. One participant reflected that "we read a whole whack of articles, but you're not gonna assign grade two kids all these articles" (SK, FG2, S5), implying that the course was not

preparing them to teach these topics to their own students. Teacher candidates also mentioned that they felt reassured by the articles assigned in the last two weeks of the course, which were directly about teacher experiences in the classroom.

Theme 7: Changing the Way We Think

While the majority of teacher candidates wanted teaching strategies, some of these teacher candidates also understood that the course was meant to change their own ways of thinking. One teacher candidate wrote, “I felt it didn't offer much in the way of ideas for teaching these areas, I wish it did. It did make me consider my biases and assumptions and my own privilege” (SK, FG3, S1). Another teacher candidate, in response to a participant who mentioned wanting access to more teaching strategies, noted that as teachers they would have to “integrate [what they were learning] into everything. Instead of just taking 20 minutes to talk about it, to just be like, this is a part of your day. … It's not just, ‘This is what happened, it's over. We're done talking about it for today’. You just have it throughout everything, like science, math, your whole day is integrated with this too” (SK, FG2, S4).

Teacher candidates who understood that the course was meant to help them interrogate their own thinking had varied awareness about how this would impact their future teaching. A few teacher candidates said that they knew the course was about interrogating their own biases, but they could not see how changing their own thinking would affect their practice as a teacher. As one teacher candidate mentioned, “personally I didn't really pick up any tips or tricks or how I would present that to students or *change my teaching to exemplify it for students*” (SK, FG1, S2, emphasis added). Another said that, “I found although the content for me taught me kinda how to be anti-racist and stuff, I don't think it was overall helpful to help with it in the classroom really” (SK, FG1, S4).

Many of these teacher candidates did not make the connection between questioning their own biases and how this process would affect their teaching, but four teacher candidates (out of 13) in the focus groups expressed that they understood the class was primarily meant to help them reflect on their own preconceptions, and some had started to understand how this would affect their teaching. As one candidate noted, “I think [the course] was more like just focused on the educator perspective in terms of reflecting on your own biases and your own perspectives” (SK, FG1, S6), while another mentioned that “I think for me, the whole thing, my take away would be just reflecting on personal biases that I have, and the conversations we had during most of our classes” (SK, FG1, S3). Some teacher candidates saw the direct connection between this process and their future teaching. As one noted, “in order to work towards a world with less discrimination and oppression, … I need to first acknowledge my identity, biases, and privileges” (SK, Post-survey, TC12). Still others had started to make the connection more firmly: “I think it's important though, as a White educator, or future White educator, to learn from the students as well. You're not teaching them, allow them to teach you as well. I think that's another big takeaway I learned, too” (SK, FG2, S5). Another teacher candidate reiterated that teachers should “‘Be students of your students.’ Just listening to what's going on in your students' lives and learning from them, and then taking that and modifying or adapting your lessons” (SK, FG1, S3).

Finally, four teacher candidates in the focus groups expressed that they understood the purpose of the course and could articulate how it had affected them. As one explained, “that was another big takeaway, I think that, like yeah, it starts with yourself, and just looking at your own privilege and your own place in the social order. And how you unconsciously play a role in oppression” (SK, FG2, S2), to which another teacher candidate responded, “and then continue to

learn, you never stop. As a White female, I'll never stop learning about how to teach anti-racist education, you know?" (SK, FG2, S4). Another teacher candidate echoed the importance of introspection, writing that "this course [was] the most challenging and enjoyable course I've taken through the college. This course required me to be more introspective than any other course I've taken, and it's made me a better person and professional" (SK, FG3, S2). Lastly, one teacher candidate wrote that they were aware that the course didn't offer teaching strategies, but with their evolving anti-racist knowledge, it was going to be up to them to do that work:

> Since I have realized my role in the perpetuation of racism and identified ways how institutional and systemic racism operates, I will teach lessons with anti-racist content and with social justice. But I am not there where I can say how. I have an intent so 'where there is a will, there is a way'. I will find my way. (SK, FG3, S3)

Broad Area: Future Pedagogy

Teacher candidates' responses regarding their future pedagogy were contradictory. Participants were asked how they would describe their confidence with civic education, social justice, and anti-racist pedagogy both before and after the course. The multiple-choice options included *not at all confident*, *not so confident*, *somewhat confident*, *very confident*, and *extremely confident*. At the beginning of the course, a third of teaching candidates reported being *very confident* or *extremely confident* with anti-racist pedagogy. An analysis of their definitions of anti-racism prior to the course, however, revealed that these teacher candidates misinterpreted what anti-racism is, constructing anti-racist teaching as "not being racist" (SK, Pre-survey, TC13) on the part of teachers, or "not supporting racism in anyway or tolerating it from others" (SK, Pre-survey, TC6). After the course, close to two-thirds of teacher candidates reported being *very confident* or *extremely confident* with anti-racist pedagogy. Although their post-course definitions included knowledge that anti-racist education required action, participants were still vague about what this would look like for them. For example, one teacher candidate noted that

"opposing racism and promoting racial tolerance" (SK, Pre-survey, TC10) was their new definition of anti-racism. Taken together, teacher candidates' confidence with anti-racist pedagogy increased, even though in many cases, these same participants' definitions of racism remained rooted in an understanding of racism as an individual perspective.

Theme 8: Aspirational Teaching for Social Justice

Most teacher candidates recognized that anti-racist pedagogy was important. In response to the post-course question, "Has participating in this course influenced the likelihood that you will use civic engagement, justice-oriented, or anti-racist practices in your future teaching? If yes – what from the course, in particular, do you think is responsible for your willingness to incorporate these approaches?" 13 out of 22 of the participants who filled out the post-course survey answered 'yes'. Explanations offered evidence that many of these respondents were 'aspirational' in tone, meaning that they had answered yes to the question, but it was not clear that they knew what using civic engagement, justice-oriented, or anti-racist approaches involved. In one instance, a candidate wrote that "understanding why racism has come to be and that we can acknowledge the acts of racism rather than trying to burry them in our past, this can allow for healing" (SK, Post-survey, TC4), while another wrote that their approach would include "incorporating different ways to ensure all my students are respected through incorporating diverse material or resources in my classroom" (SK, Post-survey, TC8). These teacher candidates indicated that they understood that avoiding discussions of racism was no longer tenable, but their strategies of 'acknowledging' it or including 'diverse resources' indicate a shallow understanding of the systemic injustice their students may face.

Two teacher candidates asserted that teaching in socially just and anti-oppressive ways was part of their job as a teacher. In the case of one teacher candidate, it was clear that they

understood that there was a difference between striving for an anti-oppressive *orientation* to teaching and teaching students directly about social justice *topics*:

> I would say, in my mind, teaching on the issues [and] providing that education for students is a form of civic action, but actually creating an anti-oppressive environment and having those practices yourself, is not civic action, because that's how it should be. So, I feel like there's a difference between finding the resources for students to learn about this and engage with that stuff themselves, versus just within yourself as a teacher. (SK, FG2, S2)

The other teacher candidate claimed that "part of your job as a teacher is … making sure everyone has an equitable way to learn" (SK, FG1, S2), reminding their colleagues in the first focus group that equitable practices should be part of their work as educators.

Theme 9: "It isn't my place"

This theme connects directly to the 'future pedagogy' broad area, and the 'positionality' broad area discussed next. When teacher candidates were asked about how they thought their identity might impact their future teaching, for some White teacher candidates, their answers pointed towards anxiety that they felt about being tasked with teaching for social justice or in anti-racist ways. Some participants felt that it would be harder to teach in these ways, while others claimed they needed more knowledge before they would be willing to start doing so. As one teacher candidate noted:

> I think that as a white person it will be more difficult for me to discuss sensitive content regarding race. This is somewhat because I think that students will feel that because I am white I don't understand (which is true) and also somewhat because I often feel like *it isn't may place* to share. (SK, Post-survey, TC7, emphasis added)

Other teacher candidates echoed this sentiment. One wrote that, "as a male who is white and straight, I feel that I will be faced with some challenges in my future teaching. One way is be able to confidently and respectfully teach students of Indigenous culture *about* Indigenous content" (SK, Post-survey, TC16, emphasis added), while another noted that, "I am white and

my identity will impact the way I teach because I do not understand what it is like to be a person of color" (SK, Post-survey, TC9). All of these teacher candidates are drawing on discourses that 'maintain their innocence' (Schick, 2000), and are unwittingly putting the responsibility for addressing racism on those who are oppressed by it, rather than those who are privileged by it (James, 2007). Additional teacher candidates were concerned about positioning themselves as 'experts', and wanted more knowledge before they felt they could adjust their pedagogy. One wrote, "as someone who does not identify as FNMI and comes from a more privileged background, I am concerned about positioning myself as an 'expert' when it comes to racial identity" (SK, Post-survey, TC14), while another wrote that, "I think in regards to Indigenous content I need to get more content knowledge before I will be a respected person to talk to about the topic" (SK, Post-survey, TC7). Their claims that they do not 'have enough knowledge' (in one case to teach Indigenous students 'about' their own culture), seemingly absolves them of having to engage with social justice issues, while simultaneously constructing themselves as 'respectful' for having this stance.

Broad Area: Positionality

The final broad area of themes links teacher candidates' understandings of how their own positionalities will affect their pedagogy. As discussed in the previous section, teacher candidates shy away from having to address race and racism in their teaching because they are White. Others, through the desire to appear tolerant, are willing to talk about race and racism, but only if they are equipped with language that will not implicate them as being racist. While some teacher candidates were explicit that they did not feel their positionality would affect their teaching -- at "the risk of sounding arrogant i'd say it won't" (SK, Post-survey, TC19) – other participants were subtler about trying to justify their own positionality. Finally, teacher candidates'

positionalities played a role in their outright or subtle resistance to the class content, specifically about racism.

Theme 10: Diversity Discourse: Saying the 'Right' Thing

For many teacher candidates, the desire to say the 'right' thing was a common theme. In the pre-course survey, teacher candidates expressed that they were "hoping to learn how to get more involved and the *proper language to use* when speaking within those various contexts" (SK, Pre-survey, TC17, emphasis added), and that they wanted to "ensure that my words and actions do not affect people in a negative way" (SK, Pre-survey, TC18). In the mid-point observation, this desire was reiterated. Teacher candidates wrote, "I am struggling with being able to talk about race comfortably because as a white person I am worried that I might *present the wrong way* even if that is not my intention" (SK, Mid-point, TC9, emphasis added), and "there is so much that gets people triggered. Almost anything and everything has the chance to *make someone get offended* regardless of how educated you are about the topic" (SK, Mid-point, TC11, emphasis added). These teacher candidates are concerned with how they appear to their professor, and based on what they say, how they can 'safely' navigate conversations with future students without being considered racist. In the post-survey, some teacher candidates continued to use 'diversity discourses' (Mason, 2016) to describe their future choices. 'Diversity discourses' are attempts by teacher candidates to learn the 'right' language to talk about race and racism in order to avoid self-implication in racism, rather than endeavoring to undo internalized racism within themselves. As one candidate stated, "I will be *more careful* when teaching about certain topics because of its effect it may have on some students" (SK, Post-survey, TC17, emphasis added), indicating that they may watch what they say, depending on who their future students are.

In addition, some teacher candidates, while using the 'proper' language (through acknowledging that they are White, for example), continued to construct race and racism as external to themselves. One candidate wrote that, "identifying as a white educator I hope to just simply be aware of the different races in my classroom and school. Incorporating *other* cultures and backgrounds regularly in the classroom will allow for race and racial difference to be 'normalized' to some extent" (SK, Post-survey, TC10, emphasis added). Their claims to being more aware, and incorporating 'other' cultures casts Whiteness as the unspoken and invisible norm (McIntyre, 1997). In one of the focus groups, another teacher candidate similarly relayed that they wished they knew 'how much' racial knowledge they 'should' incorporate: "I thought it'd be quite helpful, even not how to teach it because I know it's a difficult subject, but maybe how to gently incorporate it into the classroom, because now I don't know how. Should I go full on, should I just slowly … [incorporate] some? Not like, full?" (SK, FG1, S4). One teacher candidate also displayed markers of both 'colour blindness' and meritocratic beliefs in their answer: "I think it will be difficult teaching racialized groups as a white teacher but after this course I realize how important it is to disregard my colour and privilege and teach all students equally" (SK, Post-survey, TC4). This teacher candidate does not include themselves in a 'racialized group', and their desire to appear tolerant by the claim that they 'don't see race' is combined with being the arbiter of what is right and 'fair'.

Theme 11: Resistance

Resistance to the course content and professor by some teacher candidates was revealed in several ways. One participant was very upfront about their problems with the course. They spoke in one of the focus groups about how the course professor did not provide enough 'evidence' for what they were teaching, and that "it was kind of just assumed that any argument

against what she was teaching was false. So, I felt the course was kind of lacking complexity in that way" (SK, FG2, S3). This teacher candidate not only wanted more arguments 'against' the course content, but also felt that the course content was not 'complex' enough for him. Another teacher candidate was less upfront about their dissent, but claimed:

> I didn't necessarily think that the classroom was a super safe environment to express my opinions, and I don't know if ... not even my opinions, but ask questions or anything like that. … I think that there were little portions of each class where we got to reflect upon in a group of four, or wherever we were sitting, and I think that portion of it was good, and that's when I felt safe. But with the participation, like in front of the whole class and just the way [the professor] called on some people ... it just felt very unsafe and a non-welcoming environment, and I don't know, that you don't necessarily feel comfortable with to begin with, it's hard to engage in a class where you don't feel the connection or the welcoming connection with the prof that's teaching it. (SK, FG1, S3)

By using the language of 'safe spaces', this teacher candidate is indicating that their own discomfort while being confronted with some of the class content was the fault of the course professor, and that the way the professor 'called on some people' made it a 'non-welcoming environment'. Both of these examples, through disregarding the professor's subject area expertise and constructing the professor as 'non-welcoming', are common strategies used by White teacher candidates to resist and discount course content. This is particularly problematic (as noted in the context chapter) when foundations courses are taught by Black, Indigenous, and women of colour, who are constructed as 'angry' or 'domineering' in an effort to invalidate their expertise and lived experiences (Evans-Winters & Hoff, 2011; Rodrigues, 2009).

Several other teacher candidates mentioned that they thought the course spent 'too much time' talking about race. One teacher candidate said that:

> I think that personally … she focused solely on racism and considering the class is actually oppressive education, we touched on it when we were talking about ableism, and there's LGBT rights, and there was patriarchy, and so we talked about that I think for a total of four weeks, and the other nine were all racism. So it almost felt as though, because that's what she was an expert on, that that's the sole thing that she wanted to focus on. (SK, FG1, S2)

In reality, just over half of the class was spent on issues surrounding race (six weeks, as opposed to this teacher candidates' claim of 'the other nine'). Further, this foundations course had a specific anti-racism focus, but many of the readings concentrated on intersectional systems of oppression. The opinion that the course spent too much time on race, however, was common. As another teacher candidate wrote, "I wish that we could have spent even more time talking about the subjects which we only spent a week on, such as ability, LGBTQ+ identities, socioeconomic status, and sexism" (SK, FG3, S2). Another teacher candidate said that:

> I also feel the time allocated to different subjects was, like, maybe there's a rhyme or reason, but I also felt like LGBTQ got rushed. And patriarchy got rushed. And then like, Indigenous knowledge - we didn't rush that. Which is important, especially here in [Saskatchewan]. I understand. But it doesn't mean that anything else is less important. So, I feel like we could've balanced our time better, and had an equal time for everything. (SK, FG2, S4)

This teacher candidate classified all of the weeks related to intersectional issues involving race as 'Indigenous' knowledge, even though the readings covered a vast array of topics. The last two teacher candidates' desire for 'equal' time to be spent on other axis of oppression also speaks to a resistance to or uncomfortableness talking about race as much as the course did.

Summary of Saskatchewan Site Findings

The key findings from the 11 thematic areas in the Saskatchewan data are summarized in Table 5. In general, teacher candidates at the Saskatchewan site were slightly more able to articulate structural understandings of race and identity than those in Ontario, likely due in part to readings on the socially constructed nature of identities and their application of a structural determinism framework. In general, however, many themes cut across both sites, including a lack of understanding about collective civic engagement, despite identifying issues that would require this form of action, a desire for concrete teaching strategies, and wanting access to the

'right' language to use in order to avoid offending those that they have constructed as 'other'. Teacher candidates at both sites also exhibited various similar forms of resistance to being implicated in systemic injustice. In the next chapter, the findings from each site are discussed in the context of the discursive categories mapped out in my conceptual framework, making links and connections between them. I then discuss both sites' findings together in a section that addresses my research questions directly.

***Table 5.* Summary of Saskatchewan Site Findings**

Themes	Findings
1. Systemic concerns, individual actions	Teacher candidates were concerned about issues that would require system-level changes (poverty, mental health, and climate change), but the types of civic actions that they engaged in were individual (volunteering, voting), and rarely addressed these issues.
2. Teaching as political	To some degree, teacher candidates were aware that teaching for social justice, or developing anti-racist pedagogy, would be political, in part through their anticipation that they would face resistance.
3. Social construction of identities	Due to specific course content, teacher candidates were able to understand the socially constructed nature of identities, in particular disability, but also race and Whiteness in a few cases.
4. System-based understandings	About half of teacher candidates understood that racism and Whiteness are built into systems, or that they are structural (as in education), in addition to being reinforced by individuals.
5. Analytical frameworks	Observations by teacher candidates about their own learning included outlining the usefulness of applying a structural determinism framework to issues, and appreciating acquiring new language in order to name and decipher concepts that they were learning about.
6. Looking inward vs. outward: Desire for teaching strategies	Teacher candidates wanted concrete teaching strategies in order to tackle racism and social justice issues directly, and some did not understand the course was meant to be about looking ‘inward’.
7. “Changing the way we think”	Some teacher candidates understood that the course was about helping them to change the way they thought about inequality.
8. Aspirational teaching for social justice	Some teacher candidates expressed wanting to be able to teach for social justice in their future careers, but did not articulate what this meant, or how this would look.
9. “It isn’t my place”	White teacher candidates didn’t know if it was “their place” to teach about racism and settler colonialism, and were anxious about being tasked with doing so (they wanted more knowledge ‘first’).
10. Diversity discourse: Saying the ‘right’ thing	Teacher candidates were worried about offending people and saying the ‘right’ thing when talking about race and racism, and considered finding the right language more important than undoing internalized racism.
11. Resistance	Some teacher candidates resisted being implicated in White supremacy or systemic injustice, and questioned the intellectual authority of the course professor.

Chapter Nine: Discussion

At the beginning of this project, I wanted to learn about the relational connections between civic education, social justice education, and anti-racist education, in both the literature and in teacher education. My own experiences have cultivated an understanding of justice-based civic education that holds similar values to social justice education and anti-racist education, namely in the way that these pedagogical approaches seek to enable teacher candidates to be accountable for their own positionality within inequitable systems, and encourage them to teach and act for justice, based on access to power and resources that their positionality may afford them. The necessity for this type of justice-based civic education is clear in the work of many scholars and educators (Andreotti, 2010; Banks, 2004; 2015, Shultz, 2018). However, the more that I learned about these overlapping pedagogies in practice and through my own data collection, it became clear that teacher candidates learning about race and Whiteness, both as social constructions and organizing systems in society, needed to be a central part of this process.

In line with the comparative case study methodology, this chapter compares data "across cases to see if a pattern of variables or themes transcends the cases" (Chmiliar, 2010, p. 583). In order to develop an understanding of how racializations and positionality operate in education foundations courses, I sought out distinctive special cases (Yin, 2009) that could shed light on was is 'working', through identifying Black and Indigenous professors whose pedagogical practice has been refined through decades of classroom, community, and academic experiences. By collecting data during the education foundations courses taught by two such professors, at research sites whose contexts I was familiar with, insights about the crossovers between civic, social justice, and anti-racist education emerged. Teacher candidates face different barriers when

learning about themselves in different contexts, and the findings that were similar amongst the two research sites spoke to the pervasiveness of some of the discourses operating at each site.

The use of both thematic analysis and critical discourse analysis allowed me to first map repeating ideas in the data at each site, and then to connect these thematic categories to the discourses that they reproduce and maintain. The findings chapters for each site look closely at the emerging themes and identify the key discursive areas that these themes exemplify. In the following two sections I discuss the themes, patterns, and commonalities across both sites. I first do this through discussing both sites in the context of my conceptual framework categories, namely: how teacher candidates construct the ‘problem’ that civic education should address, what their understandings are concerning the causes of educational inequality, how they understand their own positionalities, what their understandings are of race, settler colonialism, Whiteness, and White supremacy, and finally, how (or whether or not) teacher candidates imagine they will engage with civic education, social justice, and anti-racist pedagogies going forward. Following this section, a second analytic section looks at the two cases through explicitly addressing my research questions: How do teacher candidates conceptualize civic engagement in relation to their own positionalities as the result of education foundations courses?; How does justice-oriented or anti-racist coursework affect teacher candidates’ understandings of structural injustice and their perceived future pedagogical choices?; and, How does mandatory course content influence teacher candidates’ own identities?

Conceptual Framework

Identifying thematic areas at the research sites allowed me to draw conclusions about the discourses operating in teacher candidates’ prior knowledge and subsequent pedagogical development during their education foundations courses. What follows are propositional answers

to the conceptual framework 'guiding questions' that I adapted from Andreotti's (2006) postcolonial global citizenship education framework in order to pay explicit attention to Whiteness, White supremacy, and settler colonialism. The adapted framework positions teacher candidates as occupying a spectrum from 'uncritical' to 'critical,' based on the discursive formations in the data. More 'uncritical' teacher candidates employ discourses that reinforce individualistic understandings of civic engagement, racism, and Whiteness, whereas more 'critical' teacher candidates navigate discourses that implicate their positionalities in upholding structural injustice.

Problems that Civic Engagement Should Address

At the Ontario site, teacher candidates indicated that they were only somewhat aware of civic issues. Those who identified issues that they cared about typically identified issues that would require significant system-level changes (poverty, mental health, the environment). These issues were sometimes framed in poverty discourses (people are helplessness or needed development) rather than justice discourses (people are exploited or structurally disadvantaged) (Andreotti, 2006). Although most teacher candidates identified being civically engaged through voting and volunteering, few indicated acting on the issues that they identified as being important to them, and did not readily conceptualize collective actions.

The connections that teacher candidates made between civic agency and their own positionalities were few, in part, because understandings of civic engagement by the teacher candidates were limited when they entered the course. For those teacher candidates who did understand what constituted civic engagement, their explanations revealed narrow understandings that deferred to 'positive change' discourses about individual civic action. These understandings of civic engagement position teacher candidates as having largely 'uncritical,'

neoliberal (Pashby et al., 2020; Shultz, 2007), and personally responsible (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004) understandings of what civic engagement includes. What teacher candidates understood that they could ‘do’ also felt external to them; they often noted that campaigns didn’t receive enough support, and none mentioned the need to analyze their own positionality for the ways that access to resources might aid them in changing structures. When asked about their future plans to be civically engaged, the majority of teacher candidates indicated that they had not been more civically engaged during the span of the course, but that they would like to be more engaged in the future.

Prior to the course, teacher candidates at the Saskatchewan site indicated that they were *somewhat*, *very*, or *extremely* aware of civic issues, and these self-reported levels of awareness remained essentially unchanged after having completed the course. Teacher candidates indicated being concerned with the same top three issues as the Ontario site (poverty, mental health, and the environment), in addition to education and issues affecting First Nations, Métis, and Inuit. Their framing of these issues at first seems consistent with a structural understanding of society, however, closer examination revealed that those who indicated that they were concerned about poverty, constructed it as an individual rather than systemic problem. Even the use of the word ‘poverty’ rather than income inequality, as with the Ontario site, indicates a certain level of understanding of the issue as individual (Andreotti, 2006).

When asked to define civic engagement, many participants at the Saskatchewan site also defaulted to vague definitions about ‘community’ involvement and ‘be the change’ that similarly revealed uncritical, personally responsible understandings of civic engagement, in contrast to participatory or justice-based engagement (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004). In addition, much of the civic action taken by teacher candidates did not address the issues of injustice that they listed

as being most important to them. Similar to in Ontario, the majority of their reported engagement was through volunteering or voting, and much of their volunteering was through sports teams or church groups. This finding is consistent with other studies that have observed young people recognizing and grappling with increasing structural injustice caused by neoliberalism, cisheteropatriarchy, and settler colonialism (exploitation of the environment, for example), and at the same time, only understanding (or perhaps only having been taught) how to act in individual- or consumer-based ways (McLean, L. et al., 2017).

After the course, a small number of teacher candidates at the Saskatchewan site (who understood racism as systemic) exhibited more ‘critical’ understandings of civic engagement, indicating that they considered developing civic engagement, social justice, and anti-racist pedagogy to be political, and a form of civic engagement in and of itself. They noted that embodying these pedagogies in rural areas, for example, may be more difficult than in an urban centre. They also anticipated resistance from parents, other teachers, and administration who have “become comfortable with the established racist prejudicial practices” (SK, Post-survey, TC21) in schools, and these teacher candidates anticipated having to make changes to the system itself.

Justifications for Educational Inequality

Both Ontario and Saskatchewan participants continued to hold uncritical ideas about injustice that reinforced ‘fairness’ and ‘equal opportunity’ discourses in their answers, reminiscent of Henry and Tator’s (1994) explanation of democratic racism, where access to equal opportunities is purported to be able to mitigate systemic racism. In particular, even though some teacher candidates readily admitted that racism existed, they overwhelmingly desired to appear tolerant through their insistence that they would be ‘unbiased’ and work towards equal

opportunities for all of their students. One teacher candidate expressed that, “after this course I realize how important it is to disregard my colour and privilege and teach all students equally,” further equating meritocracy with colour-blind discourses (SK, Post-survey, TC4). These intentions only served to reinforce problematic beliefs about how their future students would succeed, echoing a persistent belief in meritocracy amongst both teachers (McCreary, 2011), and teacher candidates (Pirbhai-Illich et al., 2016; Schick & St. Denis, 2003). Fortunately, slight differences in understandings were present in the language that teacher candidates used before and after the course. In the post-course survey, a small (but hopeful) amount of teacher candidates shifted away from ‘fairness’ discourses to indicating that, in order for social justice to be achieved, *systems* would have to be changed.

As a result of specific readings and lectures in the course concerning identity, the majority of teacher candidates at the Saskatchewan site reported learning about the socially constructed nature of identity. In particular, they referenced learning about the social construction of disability: “the idea of who is abled and disabled is very relative, but at some point, someone put a label on what constitutes a disability and for so long we have all just accepted that” (SK, Mid-point, TC7). A few teacher candidates were also able to readily apply this same thinking to race, however, most struggled with this correlation. As previously illustrated, while one teacher candidate noted that they were glad to be learning about the socially constructed nature of both disability *and* race, the teacher candidate quoted above later wrote that they were “struggling with … thinking that we are born without race” (SK, Mid-point, TC7). The ability of some teacher candidates to be able to connect what they were learning about the social construction of identities to effects on education systems speaks to a potential strategic inroad, similar to the ‘analogies’ strategy suggested by DiAngelo and Sensoy (2014). As one

teacher candidate noted, the process challenged them to "think about systems of oppression that are built into education and wider society" (SK, Mid-point, TC20), and another noted how structural injustices might affect the classroom, describing that they were beginning to become aware of "the great affect that patriarchy and toxic masculinity have on society and the classroom" (SK, Post-survey, TC7). By being guided through an analogous example that they may not have been directly affected by, teacher candidates were, in some cases, more readily able to apply this thinking to situations where they were personally implicated.

Justifications for Positionality

When analyzing how teacher candidates positioned themselves within societal structures, including those that they had studied in their courses, participants at the Ontario site varied in their ability to describe their understandings of their own positionality. In general, those teacher candidates that indicated that the course had made them think somewhat about their positionality still described their own position in individualistic rather than systemic terms. For example, one teacher candidate said that they learned that they were "a descendent of the colonizer," and that they thought this made them "more apologetic" (ON, Post-course, TC9). On some level, they understand that settler colonialism has given them advantages as someone with settler ancestry, but being apologetic also falls within what Levine-Rasky (2000a) and others have termed 'White privilege pedagogy', where a willingness to name that they have benefitted from racism is where they assume their anti-racist actions can end. While some teacher candidates gained some language to talk about their positionality, for the most part, the more nuanced responses could be classified as 'performing' social justice language, where teacher candidates perform the identities that they think they are expected to take on in education foundations courses (Mason, 2016). As Schick (2000) describes, teacher candidates gain access to and employ "various ideological

practices with which to escape uncomfortable identifications" (p. 86). In essence, teacher candidates who know that they may be implicated in systems of oppression, and who even admit as much through using particular language, can then shift the focus of conversations to other teacher candidates who do not have a strong grasp of this language, thereby deflecting any further responsibility on their own part.

A majority of teacher candidates at the Saskatchewan site indicated that the course had made them think about how they position themselves within systems of power, including cisheteropatriarchy, settler colonialism, and neoliberal capitalism. Their understandings of what their positionality meant, similar to the Ontario site, varied from gaining individual 'awareness' about their own identities, to understanding their role in perpetuating oppressive structures. Several teacher candidates understood their White privilege to be the problem, noting that "this class really opened my eyes on the issues of white privilege" (SK, Post-survey, TC16). However, the students who understood their positionalities as a matter of individual privilege did not indicate any intentions for action. White teacher candidates getting 'stuck' (or feeling guilty for) their White privilege (DiAngelo, 2018b), or believing that this is an anti-oppressive action in itself, is why Lensmire et al. (2013) advocate for moving beyond the 'privilege' discourse in education foundations courses, and why Leonardo (2002) argues that the focus of the 'problem' needs to shift to the White supremacist structures that make White privilege possible.

Three teacher candidates at the Saskatchewan site did show an awareness of how their positionality was implicated in systemic oppression. One teacher candidate wrote that "the course enabled me to see my role in sustaining racism" (SK, FG3, S3), while another imagined what the implications this would have for them, by writing that "this course is making me think about the ways that I unconsciously learned [about racism] and the ways that I perpetuate this

system, as well as how thinking critically about this is the start to undoing this system and engaging in anti-oppressive teaching myself" (SK, Mid-point, TC20). Still another teacher candidate viewed their positionality as contributing to a life-long process of unlearning, saying that 'as a White woman', she would never be able to stop learning about anti-racist education. Their statements, although in the minority, provide insight about the effects that education foundations courses can have on teacher candidates who were 'ready' to hear and learn from the content.

Understandings of Race, Racism, and Settler Colonialism

The majority of teacher candidates continued to believe that racism is an individual attribute, showing a resistance to the theory and perspectives that had been presented within the course. Sleeter (2017), Dion (2007), and Schick (2000) have all identified that teacher candidates are unwilling to accept new knowledge that contradicts their ideology and ideas about who they are; their 'desire-not-to-know' overrides uncomfortable realizations (Alcorn, 2013). Problematically, understandings of racism as individual rather than systemic affected teacher candidates' confidence with respect to anti-racist pedagogy. When racism is constructed as an individual attribute, anti-racism is confined to educating people about racial bias (an individual-level solution). Those teacher candidates who constructed racism as being 'in the head' rather than 'in the world' (Lichtenberg, 1992/2002) continued to define anti-racism as 'not supporting racism', or by using the language of 'tolerance'. Teacher candidates who constructed racism in this way were overly confident that they would be able to teach in anti-racist ways, since all that it would require, as one teacher candidate put it, was 'being against racism' as a personal value stance. For the few students who indicated that, on some level, they understood racism to be a systemic problem, rather than an individual attitude (or *in addition* to individual attitudes), they

were much less confident that they would be able to develop robust anti-racist pedagogy. Systemic racism would require that anti-racist interventions include dismantling racist structures – a much harder task than 'not being racist.'

Teacher candidates also stated that they were glad to be learning about issues facing Indigenous Peoples and the history of settler colonialism in Canada, but largely detached themselves from historical and ongoing settler colonialism, and viewed race as separate from themselves. In some cases, teacher candidates also essentialized Indigenous Peoples. Some educators and researchers have cautioned that education foundations courses can have the unintended consequence of reinforcing racial stereotypes (Milner, 2013), making White teacher candidates believe that they are no longer racist, homophobic, etc., when in reality they have only acquired 'social justice' language (Mason, 2006) that masks their true understandings and shields them from their fear of the 'other'. A case in point is the desire by many White teacher candidates (at both the Saskatchewan and Ontario sites) to attain the 'right' language to talk about race and racism, signalling that they still constructed racism as being external to themselves through comments about 'how much' of 'other' races they should be including in their classrooms.

As a relatively successful intervention, the introduction of new discursive frameworks could be added to the cadre of 'disrupting denial' (Lund & Carr, 2018) and 'every-day' (Pollock, 2008) good practices identified in the literature review, and contributed to more 'critical' understandings in some teacher candidates. At the Saskatchewan research site, these new frameworks helped teacher candidates to understand race as constructed, and racism as systemic. After the course, teacher candidates noted that the introduction of the structural determinism framework had a particular impact on allowing them to see *how* injustices are made structural.

As one teacher candidate said, they appreciated “the structural determinism method - how the discourse we use influenced practices and policies which lead to outcomes and consequences socially, economically, and so on. We used this method to examine the different forms of oppression … it was valuable to have a framework to return to throughout all of the lessons” (SK, FG3, S2). As highlighted in the findings chapter, other teacher candidates said that the framework had helped them to ‘sort out all of this complex stuff’ and to see ‘the cycle’ of social construction. In addition, introducing teacher candidates to new discursive frames, such as discussions and language describing color-blind racism and poor-bashing, helped participants to name what they ‘already knew’ was wrong, and gave them language to deconstruct these discourses.

Beliefs about Whiteness and White Supremacy

At the Ontario site, the teacher candidates that spoke about being White or being a settler did so in ‘uncritical’ ways, which, similar to race, revealed that they believe Whiteness to be an individual attribute, based on skin color, and not an ideological construction or racial discourse (Leonardo, 2002, p. 31). Teacher candidates admitted that they were White: “this is going to sound outrageous, I’m White. That’s what I learned in this course” (ON, FG1, S3), but these admissions were often accompanied by language indicating that teacher candidates wanted to reaffirm that they were not ‘experts’ on ‘these issues.’ These claims served as justification for those teacher candidates who wanted to be absolved of having to engage with teaching that made them feel uncomfortable. In addition, several White participants feared that they would offend people (whom they construct as ‘other’), or sound patronizing if they talked about race, and so resisted having to do so. The phenomenon of teachers not wanting to talk about or name race is

widespread, and as Gebhard (2017a) notes, is one of the ways that racism continues to operate, through insidious invisibility.

After the course, at the Saskatchewan site, there were four teacher candidates (out of 22) that understood Whiteness as an ideological system and not an individual attribute. One teacher candidate wrote that, "this course has made me more aware of what constitutes whiteness. It has taught me that the privilege I hold within society is constructed by more than just the colour of my skin, but also the cultural capital I hold and by having traits associated with 'whiteness'" (SK, Post-survey, TC18). Although these participants did not use the term 'White supremacy', the way that they describe Whiteness aligns with an understanding of Whiteness as an ideological construction. Despite this, many teacher candidates at the Saskatchewan site, similar to in Ontario, learned about their White privilege, and their analysis of race seemed to end there. The lack of depth in their understandings of race was similarly used as a justification for why White teacher candidates felt that it was not 'their place' to teach for social justice, or in particular about race and racism. They cited being worried about 'triggering' people, and instead preferred to maintain a 'culture of niceness', a common tactic that upholds discourses of a peaceful, tolerant, and polite Canadian society (Mitchell, 2018; Solomon & Daniel, 2007). These claims also seek to entrench the discourse that White teachers are 'good' and 'innocent' (Schick, 2000), and that engaging with anti-racist pedagogy could potentially call this 'goodness' into question.

While the examples described above could be instances of dysconscious racism (King, 1991), as teacher candidates may not have overtly 'known' about the racist discourses that they were reproducing, there were also teacher candidates who outwardly resisted being implicated in structural injustice caused by White supremacy. These teacher candidates simultaneously wanted

more evidence to prove that systemic racism existed, and also thought that the course spent too much time on race and racism. Some teacher candidates additionally resisted the course content through questioning the professor's expertise at one site, by claiming that they were 'unwelcoming', which is a common critique from White teacher candidates who do not want to be confronted with the possibility of their own role in perpetuating racism (Rodrigues, 2009).

Personal Responsibility

Pedagogical development amongst the participating teacher candidates was dualistic, and their responses upheld both 'uncritical' and 'critical' discursive patterns. Although many teacher candidates indicated in the post-course survey that participating in the course had made it more likely that they would use anti-racist, civic engagement, or social justice pedagogy in their future teaching, their conversations in the focus groups contradicted these answers. Here, teacher candidates indicated being overwhelmed and apprehensive about being tasked with teaching for social justice, and remained immobilized by this White anxiety (DiAngelo, 2018b; Levine-Rasky, 2000b). Other teacher candidates offered various personal or subject area related justifications for avoiding taking responsibility for civic, anti-racist, or social justice education, instead of holding themselves accountable to using their positionality to change structures, and their own assumptions (Andreotti, 2006). Their claims suggest that particular subject areas are disconnected from or not implicated in racist structures, and McLean et al. (2008) note that this type of subject-specific thinking is a major barrier in global citizenship education work.

Teacher candidates at both sites identified that the course did not offer them teaching strategies or resources, and this left them frustrated and anxious about having to teach 'these topics' to their future students. Hawkman (2017) found a similar desire amongst White teacher candidates for 'quick fixes', which are easily implementable anti-racist solutions that they can

apply in the classroom, and Pollock et al. (2010) have documented teacher candidates' potent desire for strategies that connect theory and practice. As Ladson-Billings (1998) notes, "classroom teachers are engaged in a never-ending quest for '*the* right strategy or technique' to deal with (read: control) 'at-risk' … students" (p. 19), often grounded in deficit-thinking, but in this case, could also signal teacher candidates' desire for control when engaging with 'uncomfortable' topics. Many teacher candidates identified that the way this course was likely to affect their pedagogy was through promoting 'inclusive' classrooms and using 'diverse' resources. Despite some likely having good intentions, the ways that they discussed creating inclusive classrooms drew heavily on 'diversity' or 'multicultural' approaches that would not require any significant depth of analysis.

A small number of students indicated that they understood that the course was meant to 'change the way they think'. Interestingly, however, some of these teacher candidates did not see how this process would affect their future pedagogy, while some were firmly aware of how it would. Those participants that were unable to make the connection between their course learning and future teaching offered comments such as "I found [al]though the content for me taught me kinda how to be anti-racist and stuff, I don't think it was overall helpful to help with it in the classroom really" (SK, FG1, S4). Those that did firmly make the connection were able to articulate how their pedagogy was evolving, noting that "like yeah, it starts with yourself, and just looking at your own privilege and your own place in the social order. And how you unconsciously play a role in oppression" (SK, FG2, S2), and "I think it's important though, as a White educator, or future White educator, to learn from the students as well. You're not teaching them, allow them to teach you as well" (SK, FG2, S5).

Summary of Perspectives on the Research Questions

Through comparing the thematic findings of both of the research sites in the context of my conceptual framework, I was able to understand how each discursive area was connected to answering my research questions. Not all of these findings are specific to answering just one research question, but I have categorized them as such in the following section for ease of comprehension (see Table 6). Although teacher candidates at both research sites largely reproduced 'uncritical' discourses about civic engagement, social justice, racism, and Whiteness, the presence of a few 'critical' discourses provided hope, and insight into potentially effective strategies for education foundations courses with primarily White teacher candidates.

Table 6. **Summary of Findings by Research Question**

1. How do teacher candidates conceptualize civic engagement in relation to their own positionalities as the result of education foundations courses?
Teacher candidates' civic knowledge remained unchanged after taking the course, regardless if their initial self-assessments were *somewhat aware* or *very aware.*
After the course, civic engagement definitions shifted slightly towards 'equity' discourses, but overall, teacher candidates indicated personally responsible or neoliberal understandings of civic action.
Teacher candidates were primarily concerned about poverty, mental health, and the environment. However, teacher candidates' individualistic civic actions (voting and volunteering) rarely addressed these larger issues, and they did not readily conceptualize collective action.
Some teacher candidates understood that developing anti-racist pedagogy would be political, since it would be subverting mainstream perspectives, and they anticipated resistance from administrators, other teachers, parents, and students.
While many teacher candidates understood that identities are socially constructed (in particular disability), very few applied this same understanding to race, or knew how their positionalities might affect civic action or their future civic engagement pedagogy.

2. How does justice-oriented or anti-racist coursework affect teacher candidates' understandings of structural injustice and their perceived future pedagogical choices?
Social justice was conflated with meritocracy-based discourses: teacher candidates wanted to be 'fair', treat everyone 'equally', and facilitate 'equal opportunities' for their students in the hopes that these avenues would mitigate injustices.
Teacher candidates positioned themselves as separate from historical and ongoing settler colonialism, and constructed race as external to themselves or 'other' than them.
Individual understandings of racism as 'in the head' contributed to teacher candidates' overconfidence that they would be able to develop anti-racist pedagogy. Systemic understandings of racism as 'in the world' made teacher candidates much less confident in their ability to develop anti-racist pedagogy.
Access to new conceptual frameworks at the Saskatchewan site allowed teacher candidates to 'name' structural injustices, and their application of a structural determinism framework allowed them to understand *how* racism is maintained via structures.
Participants perceived that subject area restrictions would prevent them from engaging with anti-racism, and positioned engaging with justice issues in education as a personal choice.
Participants wanted concrete teaching strategies, and the pedagogy that they considered implementing included building inclusive classrooms, which often replicated 'diversity' and 'multicultural' discourses.

3. How does mandatory course content influence teacher candidates' own identities?
Discourses of Whiteness equating 'goodness' or 'innocence' helped teacher candidates avoid self-implication in structural racism, showing a strong 'desire-not-to-know' about evidence that contradicted their current ideology.
Through 'White talk', teacher candidates used a variety of strategies to shirk responsibility for racism, including the strategy of 'maintaining a culture of niceness'.
Teacher candidates wanted to know the 'right' way to talk about racism, had fears of the 'other', and often used 'diversity discourses' or social justice language in order to perform anti-racism and avoid feeling uncomfortable.
Resistance to the course material took on many forms, including through the aversion strategies described above, and through questioning the expertise of the course professor.

1. Civic Engagement & Positionality

How do teacher candidates conceptualize civic engagement in relation to their own positionalities as the result of education foundations courses?

At both research sites, teacher candidates reported that their civic knowledge remained essentially unchanged before and after taking their education foundations course, regardless if their initial assessments were *somewhat aware* or *very aware*. In addition, teacher candidates' definitions of civic engagement, at the beginning of the course at both sites, centered around 'make a difference' and 'positive change' discourses, but were unspecific about what this meant. Slight differences at both sites included the shift towards 'equity' language in the post-course definitions, but overall, the majority of definitions continued to indicate that teacher candidates had more personally responsible (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004) or neoliberal (Pashby et al., 2020; Shultz, 2007) conceptualizations of civic engagement.

Intriguingly, the top three issues that teacher candidates at both sites indicated that they were the most concerned about were the same: mental health, poverty (including income inequality at one site), and the environment (interestingly, these are also the same three issues identified by high school-aged youth from across Canada, see McLean, L. et al., 2017). 'Education' was in the top five concerns at both sites, and the Saskatchewan site additionally indicated that issues affecting First Nations, Métis, and Inuit were important to them. In contrast to these issues, when asked about their own modes of civic engagement at both sites, the top two actions taken by teacher candidates were volunteering and voting. Very few of their volunteering experiences engaged with or tackled the issues that they identified as being important to them. Only one participant across both sites indicated being involved in what could be considered community organizing-centered civic engagement, and it was not clear that the remaining

teacher candidates understood the realm of collective actions that could be considered 'civic engagement'.

At the Saskatchewan site, some teacher candidates considered developing justice- and anti-racist-based pedagogies to be a form of civic action in itself. Their responses indicated that they understood developing such pedagogies would be subverting the 'mainstream' perspectives in (especially rural) schools, based on an understanding of injustice as systemic and ingrained. They also anticipated resistance, in particular from parents, but also from other teachers and administrators. So too, at the Ontario site, the few teacher candidates that indicated that they felt 'overwhelmed' were those that realized that teaching is political.

Some teacher candidates at both research sites (but in particular at the Saskatchewan site) understood that identities are constructed, in part due to specific analogies about how identities are constructed and reinforced through discourses. A very small number of teacher candidates also understood that this process could be applied to race, and that these identities afford power to individuals within systems. However, very few made the connection that their positionalities might have an effect on the types of civic action that they could take, or the forms of civic, social justice, and anti-racist pedagogy that they would engage their future students in. Unfortunately, unless teacher candidates are aware of and accountable to their own positionalities within settler colonialism and other oppressive structures, they risk reinforcing these structures through the types of civic engagement that benefit White people and uphold structures of Whiteness (Urrieta & Reidel, 2008).

2. Anti-racist Coursework, Structural Injustice, and Pedagogy

How does justice-oriented or anti-racist coursework affect teacher candidates' understandings of structural injustice and their perceived future pedagogical choices?

Liberal individualist discourses were pervasive across teacher candidates' responses. In addition to constructing civic engagement in personally responsible terms, participants at both sites largely equated social justice with meritocracy-based discourses. In their responses, their language centered around the idea that they would be 'fair' and treat everyone 'equally', and that 'equal opportunities' could mitigate injustice for their students. Their responses constructed social justice as a matter of individual responsibility; if every student is given equal opportunities, there is no reason that they should not succeed, given that Canada is a democratic society (a phenomenon described in the literature review as 'democratic racism'). After the course, even though this group of teacher candidates' views on some other justice issues had changed, their definitions of social justice changed only slightly.

Teacher candidates at the Ontario site also expressed their embarrassment with their ignorance about issues affecting Indigenous Peoples, and viewed their own previous (K-12) education as having 'failed' them, a common finding amongst teacher candidates (Hare, 2020), considering the exclusion of Indigenous histories from public school experiences and curricula (Ng-A-Fook & Milne, 2014). Unfortunately, even though they were glad to be learning about settler colonialism, the way that they discussed their learning tended to locate themselves as separate or removed from the history and ongoing dispossession of Indigenous Peoples in Canada. In part, this positioning may flow from a more general positioning by White people, of race as external to themselves or 'other' to them, reaffirming the idea that Whiteness is the

default or assumed 'neutral' to which all other racialized people are compared (Levine-Rasky, 2000a).

One of the most pervasive examples of individualist discourses in my findings concerned those teacher candidates (at both sites) who viewed racism as being only 'in the head', and not 'in the world' (Lichtenberg, 1992/2002). Believing that racism was the fault of individual racist people only, contributed to teacher candidates' confidence that they would be able to develop anti-racist pedagogy. Those teacher candidates that understood racism to be systemic, or 'in the world', (such as those discussed earlier who viewed developing anti-racist pedagogy as a form of civic action), tended to be less confident in their ability to engage with social justice and anti-racist pedagogy. On the contrary, one of the teacher candidates who recognized during the course that teaching is political, referred to this newfound responsibility as 'overwhelming'.

Fortunately, at the Saskatchewan site in particular, some students moved from an understanding of racism as an individual attitude to an understanding that racism was built into their classrooms, schools, and communities. In part, these shifts may be owed to the teacher candidates' new-found understandings about the socially constructed nature of identities, and through having access to new language and new frameworks in order to think about injustice in new ways. Teacher candidates noted that they appreciated being able to 'name' things that they previously knew were wrong, but could not previously define. In addition, their application of a structural determinism framework allowed them to understand *how* racism is produced and maintained via structures. In the absence of these new frameworks and rhetorical structures, teacher candidates may not be able to challenge the frameworks and discourses that they were socialized with. Through practicing systems-level analysis (of how disability, racism, or sexism are reproduced through discourses, policies, and laws), teacher candidates started applying new

language and frameworks in order to make sense of what they are learning, and these abilities contribute to the process of White people becoming racially conscious (Milner, 2013).

Even though some systems-level analysis was beginning to happen at one site, very seldom did teacher candidates at either site understand how their education foundations courses were meant to affect their future practice as educators. For example, participants perceived that subject area restrictions, particularly for those teacher candidates in sciences, would prevent them from engaging with civic engagement, social justice, and anti-racism. These candidates' inability to see the interdisciplinarity of social justice issues is not uncommon, however (see McLean et al., 2008). Some teacher candidates additionally used the justification that their subject area was not conducive to 'these issues' as rationale for why they weren't planning to engage with social justice issues at all, positioning justice issues in education as a 'choice', and as an approach that 'just wasn't them'.

Participants at both sites wanted 'tools to solve problems', in the form of concrete teaching strategies that they could use in their future classrooms. The tangible pedagogical practices that teacher candidates at both sites identified they would implement in the future centered around building 'inclusive' classrooms. The task of building an inclusive classroom, although an honorable goal, depends on educators' understandings of what equity is. Answers offered by teacher candidates in this regard only included general ideas about what 'inclusive' would look like. None pointed towards understandings of equity, and one went as far as to point directly to 'diversity': "ensure that I am creating an inclusive classroom that fosters diversity and multiculturalism" (OS Post-survey, TC9). If inclusive is interpreted as 'diverse' or 'multicultural', teacher candidates risk replicating classrooms that do not necessarily deconstruct Whiteness, or the way that out-of-school injustices are being replicated within their schools and

classrooms. In addition, it should be made clear to teacher candidates that these courses are not about how to teach 'about' racism to their future students, but are about learning how to identify and undo racism within oneself, and understanding one's own role in perpetuating racism and other forms of oppression, as this process is what will affect their future pedagogical choices.

3. Education Foundations & Teacher Candidates' Identities

How does mandatory course content influence teacher candidates' own identities?

Discourses of Whiteness equating 'goodness' or 'innocence' (Schick, 2000) were prevalent across both sites. In order to avoid being implicated in structural racism, participants showed characteristics of a strong 'desire-not-to-know' (Alcorn, 2013). By using claims that they didn't feel comfortable with the material or didn't think they had enough knowledge, teacher candidates were, in a sense, rejecting the very real and rational information that their courses had provided about the role that White people play in perpetuating systemic injustices. This desire not to know, as Alcorn (2013) explains, manifests when people are faced with information that contradicts their ideology or beliefs. In these cases, the admission of complicity in structural racism would contradict what these White teacher candidates have come to believe about themselves as being 'non-racist, innocent helpers' (Schick, 2002). Unfortunately some teacher candidates, in their efforts to avoid discomfort, unwittingly positioned their own comfort as being more important than tackling injustices faced by minoritized groups of people. Solomon et al. (2005) stress the importance of preparing teacher candidates to experience uncomfortableness in education foundations courses, so that they understand that these are normal and expected reactions. Preparing White teacher candidates for the reality that they will feel uncomfortable also "prevents them from using their experience and emotions as a rationale for not engaging in the anti-racism work that needs to be done" (Solomon et al., 2005, p. 164).

In addition to constructing ongoing settler colonialism as separate from themselves, teacher candidates also constructed racism as external to themselves. Through what McIntyre (1997) describes as 'White talk', teacher candidates used a variety of strategies to 'talk themselves out of being responsible' for racism. The strategy of 'maintaining a culture of niceness' showed particular prevalence in teacher candidates' answers. Participants described feeling like that had to 'walk on eggshells', being worried that they would 'offend someone', and not wanting to sound 'patronizing' when talking about race and racism. They simultaneously constructed themselves as not wanting to engage with anti-racist pedagogy, and as being 'respectful' for wanting to learn more before doing so. Teacher candidates' statements about wanting to maintain their 'niceness' also suggested that the rationale for avoiding conversations about race and racism was that they were afraid that they would be 'called out' for being racist by whichever students, colleagues, or professors they had constructed as 'other.' Teacher candidates cited being anxious about communicating with 'them' properly and that discussions were 'risky' if they disagreed with the 'views of the minority.' McIntyre (1997) describes this particular kind of White talk as being grounded in a "fear of the 'other'" that manifests as guilt, feelings of victimization, defensiveness, and confusion (pp. 73-74). While this fear can be overt, the instances described in this study are examples where this fear is covert, or potentially masked by teacher candidates who are not consciously aware of their own fears.

Through their fears about being called out as racist, and through wanting to maintain their innocence, many White teacher candidates wanted to know what the 'right' way to talk about racism was, in order to gain access to what Mason (2016) terms 'diversity discourses'. Diversity discourses encapsulate the terminology that is typically used in social justice spaces, but where this terminology is empty of any intentions for action or change. It allows for the appearance of

being a justice-minded person, in order to re-inscribe one's dominant position as the 'knower,' without any commitment to change individual ideas or unjust systems. Wanting access to these discourses suggests that teacher candidates viewed racism as something that they just need to identify the right 'vocabulary' to talk about, and not as something they need to personally work to undo within themselves, their classrooms, and schools.

Resistance to the course material took on many forms, including through the aversion strategies described above. More overt resistance took the form of teacher candidates claiming they needed more evidence that structural racism was a problem, while simultaneously misconstruing the course as focussing too much on race (at the Saskatchewan site). Pete (2017) has noted this problem in her own experiences teaching education foundations courses, that (mostly White) teacher candidates thought that "there was already too much Aboriginal content in [their] teacher education program" (p. 55), and that students just wanted her to 'teach them how to teach'. Teacher candidates also often used their White identity as a reason why they should *not* be expected to engage with social justice issues and anti-racism. In a few cases, participants also weaponized 'safe space' language in order to assert that they should not be made to feel uncomfortable, and that these feelings were caused in part by the non-welcoming nature of the course professor. At the Ontario site, a small number of students also expressed resistance to being constructed as part of the 'problem', by claiming that they now knew about the 'bias towards people who are White' – a common resistance strategy used by White teacher candidates (Case & Hemmings, 2005; Dei, 2001). I discuss the contributions that these findings make to several areas of research, in addition to summarizing and reflecting on the project as a whole, in the next and final chapter.

Chapter Ten: Conclusion

Calls for more critical and anti-oppressive forms of civic education seem to be increasing in urgency as neoliberal policies, practices, and discourses continue to infiltrate and restructure public education, including higher education. In addition, as outlined in the introduction, faced with the reality of a starkly White teaching force in Canada (only 11% of teachers identified as visibly minorities in 2016, Statistics Canada, 2016g), teacher education programs must consider how pervasive liberal individualist discourses amongst these teachers will continue to uphold racist understandings of civic education that primarily serve White people and uphold White structures (Urrieta & Reidel, 2008). If teacher education programs take seriously the task of destabilizing White nationalism (Dei, 2001), and preparing teacher candidates to teach about the history of residential schools and the ongoing reality of settler colonialism in Canada (TRC, 2015b), then education foundations courses will continue to be on the front-lines of this work.

Summary of Project

Through this research project, I sought to investigate how civic engagement, social justice, and anti-racist education overlapped in education foundations courses in two different contexts, recognizing that if holistic democratic and anti-racist education are being taught together, these courses are typically where this intersection occurs (Kerr et al., 2011). I drew on conceptualizations of citizenship that tie the history of settler colonialism to White supremacy and structural racism in Canada. I also reviewed selective scholarly literature in order to situate my study in the related fields of civic education and anti-racist education in teacher education. Here, a tension emerged concerning whether or not civic education that evolved from unfettered nationalism (Osborne, 2006) can actually adapt to question nationalism, and the way that it upholds racism, settler colonialism, and White supremacy (Harney, 1996; Stanley, 2011). In

exploring potential answers to this problem, I reviewed current trends in civic education in Canada, how practicing teachers currently interpret curricula, and endeavored to understand research in civic education for social justice (Peterson et al., 2016), global citizenship education (Davies et al., 2018; Harshman et al., 2015; Shultz, 2011), and how education scholars are conceptualizing postcolonial and decolonial forms of global citizenship education (Abdi et al., 2015; Andreotti & de Souza, 2012). I also traced studies of civic education, global citizenship education, and anti-racist education initiatives in teacher education programs in Canada and internationally, in order to understand and to draw connections between practices in these fields.

Methodologically, the comparative case study approach allowed me to ask similar research questions in two different and unique contexts, and the use of multiple forms of online, document, and in-person data collection added rigor to the study. In order to theorize a way to understand my data, I turned to conceptualizations of postcolonial global citizenship education (Andreotti, 2006; 2010), and how the intersections of Critical Race Theory (Delgado & Stefanic, 2001; Ladson-Billings, 1998; Solórzano, 1998) and Critical Whiteness Studies (Carr & Lund, 1997; Fine et al., 1997; 2004; Matias et al., 2014) could help me to understand the discourses operating in my (almost exclusively White) participants' answers, and specifically how discourses of Whiteness operated to impede learning about social justice in teacher education (Sleeter, 2017). Building a conceptual framework that could attend to the integration of these three fields allowed me to better understand the complexities of the data while moving through my themes, using thematic analysis and critical discourse analysis (Fairclough, 1992; 2010).

Key Findings

This study suggests that cultivating critical, anti-racist conceptualizations of civic engagement with White teacher candidates first requires overcoming pervasive neoliberal

discourses of individualism, meritocracy, and Whiteness-as-innocent amongst these candidates. Here, I will again note that, although there are findings specific to this study, these findings also reinforce the previous work of other scholars, in particular Schick (2000), Schick and St. Denis (2003), Solomon et al. (2005), and McIntyre (1997). A strength of this study is the way that it maps and expands on how these discourses continue to operate in teacher education.

Revisiting my research questions, specifically, the first research question looked at how teacher candidates conceptualize civic agency in relation to their own positionalities as the result of mandatory educational foundations courses. Teacher candidates at both sites conceptualized civic agency in individualistic ways, primarily through volunteering and voting, despite identifying that they cared about issues that stem from structural injustices, such as concerns about climate change and the environment. Teacher candidates also struggled to define civic engagement, relying on generic phrases about 'making a difference' and 'positive change', and their levels of civic awareness did not change significantly as a result of their courses. A small number of teacher candidates foresaw their positionalities as affecting the kinds of civic action or civic education pedagogy they may implement in their future classrooms. These participants understood, on some level, that developing civic engagement, social justice, and anti-racist pedagogy would be political. The realization that teaching is political left a few teacher candidates at the Ontario site overwhelmed, and prompted a few teaching candidates at the Saskatchewan site to believe that enacting these pedagogies would be a civic action in and of itself.

The second research question explored how justice-oriented coursework affected teacher candidates' understandings of structural injustice and their perceived future pedagogical choices. Changes in teacher candidates' understandings of structural injustice were research site-specific.

At the Ontario site, social justice was largely described through discourses of meritocracy. Teacher candidates expressed wanting to be fair, to treat students equally, and that access to equal opportunities for students would curb educational injustice. Although some teacher candidates started to use 'equity' language after the course, for the most part, teacher candidates at the Ontario site lacked understandings of structural injustice. At the Saskatchewan site, more (but still a minority) of teacher candidates left the course with some understanding of how injustices were built into systems. These teacher candidates may have benefit, in part, from two specific tools used in their course: learning about the social construction of identities and utilizing a structural determinism framework. Although some participants had difficulty applying the social construction of identities to the idea of race, they cited understandings of the socially constructed nature of ability as having changed the way they thought about (dis)ability. Those participants who cited using the structural determinism framework, appreciated being able to 'sort out' all of 'this complex stuff,' and to be able to name concepts and processes for which they were previously unable (colour-blind racism and poor bashing, for example).

Teacher candidates at both research sites viewed racism and settler colonialism as separate from themselves. These assumptions led to overconfidence, and viewing social justice as a choice. The teacher candidates who were confident in their abilities to develop anti-racist pedagogy constructed racism as an individual attribute. Those who were less confident in their ability to develop anti-racist pedagogy understood racism as structural. In addition, perhaps as a result of the individualization of civic engagement, social justice issues, and through meritocratic discourses, some teacher candidates at the Ontario site viewed engaging with social justice issues in education as a choice, and not a necessity. In addition, teacher candidates perceived that their subject areas (in particular those teacher candidates who were training to teach sciences) would

restrict them from engaging in social justice or anti-racist pedagogy, and at both sites, teacher candidates overwhelmingly wanted teaching strategies to use in their future classrooms. Both of these desires point to a misinterpretation of the course content; participants wanted to know how to teach *about* social justice issues, instead of looking inward at the role that they play in perpetuating injustice. In the ways that they did imagine implementing civic education, social justice, and anti-racist pedagogy, participants indicated that their future classrooms would be inclusive. In actuality, most of their explanations of inclusion harkened back to multicultural discourses and approaches to injustice where representation of minoritized groups is prioritized over changing school and classroom structures that uphold Whiteness and settler colonialism as the norm.

The final research question probed how mandatory course content influenced teacher candidates' own identities. At the Ontario site, some teacher candidates had realizations that they were 'White,' and at the Saskatchewan site, a focus on the social construction of identities meant that many teacher candidates understood that aspects of their identities were fluid and based in discursive constructions, but many also struggled to apply this thinking when it came to race and racializations. Regardless if they knew they were White or not, teacher candidates did not feel like it was 'their place' to teach for civic engagement, social justice and anti-racism, as profiled through several discourses of Whiteness that placed them as external to systemic injustice (McIntyre, 1997), and reified their positionality as 'innocent helpers' (Schick, 2000). Teacher candidates used feelings of uncomfortableness and distancing strategies to justify not having to engage with anti-racist pedagogy. Moreover, their insistence that they did not want to offend anyone, and that 'these discussions are risky' revealed their fears about *who*, exactly, it was that they were afraid they would offend – those students, teacher candidates, and professors that they

had constructed as 'other.' Perhaps, it is no surprise then, that teacher candidates wanted access to language that would allow them to talk about social justice issues ('diversity discourses') without being implicated in sustaining injustice (Mason, 2016). In addition to these distancing strategies, teacher candidates resisted the course material by claiming that they wanted more evidence that structural racism existed, while simultaneously asserting that their course spent too much time discussing race. Finally, participants also resisted the course content by questioning the expertise of the course instructor at the Saskatchewan site, citing their uncomfortableness as evidence that the course was not a safe space. Outwardly, some teacher candidates also noted that what they had learned in the course was that there is 'bias towards White people'.

Contributions

The contributions of this study are all premised on one, glaring assumption, which is that if teacher education programs in Canada are going to continue in their current structure, and also continue to admit primarily White women, then efforts to disrupt White supremacy in education will need to become much more intentional. Many of my findings echo the work of previous scholars, and in keeping with Critical Race Theory's emphasis on changing racist policies and practices, in this section I briefly describe the four areas that this study contributes to, all of which are practical contributions and fall under the umbrella of teacher education. These areas include civic education and global citizenship education, anti-racist education, education foundations courses, and my own pedagogical praxis.

Contributions to Civic and Global Citizenship Teacher Education

Teacher candidates need access to collective action, community organizing, and action research opportunities, in order to be able to imagine and practice making change in their teaching careers and with their future students. The rise of neoliberal policies in education has

affected the way that civic education curricula is conceptualized, how civic education is taught, and the discourses and language that teachers use when engaging with civic education pedagogy (Kennelly, 2009; Kennelly & Llewellyn, 2011; Wilkinson, 2007). If White teachers continue to encourage state-centered engagement, or actions that support existing political structures (Llewellyn et al., 2010), they will continue to replicate White reality systems. Consistent with neoliberalism's emphasis on consumer-based or individual actions, rather than collective actions, my study suggests that White teacher candidates do not have access to (or experiences with) forms of civic engagement that challenge settler colonial state structures or seek to change racist policies. If they are only exposed to particular forms of civic action, how is it that we can ask them to think and operate outside of these conceptualizations? In this study, for example, it was not clear that the nuances of the range of avenues for civic action were known to most teacher candidates. Their definitions of civic engagement covered only 'being involved in their communities', but with very few specifics about what this involvement looked like. In one sense, I wondered if this lack of knowledge was the result of terminology. Would asking these participants what 'resisting injustice' or 'solidarity' looked like potentially produce different associations than asking about 'civic engagement'?

At both sites, the teacher candidates' foundation courses changed neither their level of civic awareness, nor their amount or type of involvement (although at one site many teacher candidates acknowledged that being more civically engaged in the future was to be desired). In addition, this study also found that, although teacher candidates indicated that their own involvement typically included individual acts such as voting and volunteering, they were concerned about a number of areas of structural injustice, including mental health, the environment and climate change, and poverty (sometimes framed as income inequality). The

same has been found to be true with high school students in Canada (McLean, L. et al., 2017); students were concerned about a number of growing global injustices, but they only have access to typical and individual forms of acting, such as volunteering and school clubs. If teacher education programs continue to endorse or only provide access to individual forms of civic engagement, the implicit message to teacher candidates will continue to be that injustice is also an individual failing.

Contributions to Anti-racist Teacher Education

Teacher candidates must be guided through specific processes in order to understand racism as systemic, or teacher education programs risk reproducing teacher candidates that leave their programs with confidence that they have developed anti-racist or anti-oppressive pedagogy, when in fact, they continue to hold individualistic views about injustice that are masked by an acquisition of 'diversity' or social justice discourses, as was the case for some teacher candidates in this study. However, cultivating system-based understandings is no small task, as teacher candidates resisting anti-racist pedagogy in teacher education programs is well documented (Schick, 2000; 2002; Schick & St. Denis, 2003; Sleeter, 2017). The ways that White teacher candidates, in particular, resist learning about their own complicity in unjust systems has become a growing field of study in teacher education (Jupp et al., 2016), and one which Critical Whiteness Studies seeks to tackle. My study confirms that the discourses of meritocracy, individualism, and Whiteness-as-innocent (and unconnected to racism), continue to be pervasive in teacher education. The extent to which anti-racism is successful requires identifying and interrupting these discourses, which prevent a structural analysis or a grounded understanding of one's own positionality. Teacher education programs that make the difference between White people and Whiteness as an ideology explicit may better equip teacher candidates to understand

the connection between Whiteness and capital (Dei, 2001), and thereby open a door to understanding structural injustice. In addition, utilizing the good practices identified in the literature review (disrupting denial through critical self-reflection, action research, every-day anti-racist strategies, media literacy, silence breakers, analogies, and vignettes) might aid in breaking through to those students who resist learning about Whiteness in an attempt to distance themselves from complicity in settler colonialism or racism. These race-evasive patterns and identities stand in the way of teacher candidates becoming informed, racially-conscious allies (Jupp et al., 2016), and developing anti-racist pedagogy in their future classrooms.

Meritocratic and individualistic discourses also need to be interrupted intentionally. Two of the 'tools' that had an impact on White teacher candidates' understandings of meritocracy included learning about the social construction of identities, and about the cycle of structural determinism. Understanding the interconnectivity and relationships in these two processes pierced individualistic discourses held by teacher candidates. It stands to reason that we cannot simply 'tell' White teacher candidates that structural racism exists, when years of socialization have only equipped them to think about oppression in individual terms. Equipping teacher candidates with new frameworks in order to understand injustice as structural was an important part of undoing the individualistic discourses that these teacher candidates had been socialized with, and gave language to some participants that 'knew there was something wrong', but were previously unable to name it.

Contributions to Education Foundations

Teacher candidates need to understand that education foundations courses are about looking inward. At both of the research sites in this study, teacher candidates mistook the objectives of the course as being concerned with enabling them to teach *about* social justice

issues, rather than to investigate their role in perpetuating injustice, and they were frustrated with the lack of teaching strategies offered as a result. As other researchers have found, teacher candidates were surprised that foundations courses are to learn 'about themselves' and not to learn 'about the other' (Schick & St. Denis, 2003). Even for those teacher candidates who understood that the course was meant to 'change the way they think', these participants had trouble articulating how changing their thinking would affect their pedagogy. This study confirms that education foundations courses need to be clear about their purpose, including articulating to teacher candidates that the salient part of these courses is, at the very least, to make teacher candidates aware of how they perpetuate injustice in schools, and at their very best, to enable teacher candidates to imagine how they can use their positionality to advocate for structural changes to racist policies and processes in their classrooms and schools.

Contributions to My Pedagogical Praxis

One of the crucial contributions of this study are the effects that the research project has had on my own pedagogical praxis, and may have on other educators working in teacher education. As I continue to teach history and social studies methods courses, I am better equipped with the knowledge of forms of resistance that will arise from White and/or settler teacher candidates. Deliberately and purposefully interrupting discourses that uphold Whiteness, through decentering nationalistic grand narratives (Stanley, 2006), emphasizing relational and ecological forms of learning across groups (St. Denis, 2007), drawing on 'disrupting denial' (Lund & Carr, 2018) and 'every-day' (Pollock, 2008) anti-racist strategies, and engaging in perspective-taking vignettes to develop ethical understandings of the other (Andreotti & de Souza, 2008) can all reinforce the learning that is happening in education foundations courses. Readings, in-class workshops, and inquiries led by the teacher candidates can tackle the

questions of how social justice pedagogy, anti-racist pedagogy, and civic education pedagogy intersect, and we can continue to learn that looking 'inwards' is just as important as looking 'outwards' for solutions.

Limitations

This research project has several limitations, including epistemological limitations and limitations inherent in both the case study methodology and the research area. Epistemologically, the first limitation is that this study draws only on research written in English. This limitation not only stands as a language-based limitation when looking at empirical research, but also stands as a limiting factor through my access to theory and other ways of conceptualizing and knowing my topic. Only being able to read theorists who are communicating their ideas in English excludes other ways of generating knowledge, thinking through structural injustice, and engaging with histories of oppression. Although several of the texts that I engaged with had been translated into English, even the act of translating obfuscates some theorists' ways of thinking and knowing, and contributes to the continued supremacy of Whiteness insofar as it is connected to the English language.

In terms of case study methodology, one limitation of the study is my inability to claim that the findings are generalizable to other contexts outside of themselves (other teacher education programs, for example). While nomic generalizability is not typically a goal of case study research, including in this study, this limitation must still be noted since I do offer working hypotheses (Lincoln & Guba, 2009), or what some term 'analytic generalizability' amongst the two cases (Yin, 2013). Analytic generalizability holds that there is enough of a 'fit' between the two cases that I can make analytic judgements concerning both (Yin, 2013). As discourses change over time and are expressed differently based on contextual evolutions, however, the

discourses that emerged in my study will manifest differently in other institutions or programs. In addition, given the short time-span of this project, any conclusions about which course interventions ‘worked’ are only preliminary. Significant findings would need to come from a multi-year study that includes many courses, and adjustments year over year to the research and its structure, based on teacher candidate input and feedback. These findings would be strengthened by being framed within the context of what teacher candidates are learning in courses other than their foundations courses, in their practica, through community service-learning, action research, and through their program experiences more generally.

The second limitation due to scope includes the arbitrary boundaries that I had to draw in order to be able to review literature and undertake an accomplishable project. The fields of both civic / global citizenship education and anti-racist and anti-oppressive education have no borders; they weave through the fields of critical multicultural education, decolonial pedagogy, postcolonial education, critical race feminism, intersectional education, and beyond. A career of study may enable me to better understand the histories and linkages in these fields, but in this study, I had to make assumptions based on my current experience and knowledge-base about how best to situate the study, build a conceptual framework, and analyze the data. Fortunately, as Lincoln et al. (2011) note, researchers can reserve the right to either get smarter or change their minds (p. 116). My hope is that this study can serve as a benchmark for my thinking at this particular moment in time, and also a modest launchpad for future learning.

Further Research

It is easy to wonder if the findings of this study have more to do with the structure of the research site teacher education programs than the content and pedagogy of the education foundations courses. In conversation with a scholar who has been teaching education foundations

courses for many years, they remarked that often subject area methods courses are taught in a scaffolded way, encouraging teacher candidates to build their content knowledge and skills over multiple semesters and years, often building relationships with mentors in these areas. Foundations and equity courses are not afforded the same platform, scaffolding, or relationship building, and the 'one off' nature of these (often four-month) courses does little to disrupt problematic discourses and practices in teacher education (St. Denis, 2019). In essence, the format of trying to include deep learning about all societal issues into one mandatory foundations course has not changed in 25 years, since Young (1995) first observed that this one-course approach was the norm (scholars are also critical of the depth of relationships that can be developed by similarly short practica placement, see Butler, Kane, & Morshead, 2017). Further research that considers the effectiveness of scaffolded equity and foundations courses within teacher education programs in Canada will be useful in understanding how programs can meaningfully disrupt discourses of racism, Whiteness, liberal individualism, and meritocracy amongst teacher candidates.

As mentioned earlier, this study (and studies like it) is also premised on a pessimistic assumption that the structure of teacher education programs and the teaching force in Canada will continue to be sites where Whiteness is inevitably reproduced and maintained. Research that traces the impacts of equity and inclusion policies in teacher education programs in Canada will be another useful pillar in understanding how to advance anti-racist and social justice goals in teacher education (both in terms of who is admitted and the professors themselves). Although representation does not necessarily equate justice, or inherently change the structure of these programs, non-White professors and teacher candidates may be better positioned to lessen the

gap between the critical theorizing that is taking place in the anti-racist and civic education fields and actual system, school, and classroom policies and practices.

Final Thoughts on Process and Content

The process of conceiving a project, conducting research, and writing this dissertation was humbling. Just when I thought I was beginning to understand a field of knowledge, I would stumble upon another area of study that dwarfed what I thought I knew. As an example, my earlier understandings of civic education had very little to do with understanding how Whiteness operates, and my proposal lacked this central focus. When a mentor asked about who my participants were likely to be, it became clear that who they were, and who I am (including the discourses that we reproduce as a result) was going to be just as important as what teacher candidates would be learning in their education foundations courses. This realization shifted the focus of the study, and the utilization of Critical Whiteness Studies was the result. This shift in focus required a reconceptualization of my research questions, and ultimately, revealed the insidiousness of how racism operates through White researchers, and the necessity of engaging in constant and intentional processes of listening, un/learning, and acting.

A main tension in the content of the study was evident in the individual-to-structural continuum. Whereas teacher candidates believed that they, and their future students, were individually responsible for their own successes (as evidence by their adoption of meritocratic discourses), many would not concede to being individually responsible for perpetuating the systemic racism and White supremacy that is woven into the fabric of education systems in Canada (Battiste, 2013; Stanley, 2011). If educators and researchers believe that these settler colonial educational systems are worth saving (and not all do), then learning how to create race-conscious teachers who are willing "to take action *against* discriminatory educational practices

and take action *for* liberatory educational practices" (McIntyre, 1997, p. 14, emphasis in original) is one way to begin to dismantle the racist, White supremacist, and settler colonial legacies in education. My hope is that the contributions of this study can serve as one step in this direction, and I look forward to participating in future research, teaching, and actions that further this goal and interrogate my own complicity in these systems.

References

Abdi, A. A., Shultz, L., & Pillay, T. (Eds.). (2015). *Decolonizing global citizenship education.* Sense Publishers.

Abdul-Jabbar, W. (2015). Reclaiming the citizen and renouncing citizenship. In A. A. Abdi, L. Shultz, & T. Pillay (Eds.), *Decolonizing global citizenship education* (pp. 131-140). Sense Publishers.

Aitken, A. (2020). Accounting for the self: Teacher education in a post–truth and reconciliation context. In A. M. Phelan, W. F. Pinar, N. Ng-A-Fook, & R. Kane (Eds.), *Reconceptualizing teacher education: A Canadian contribution to a global challenge* (pp. 67-90). University of Ottawa Press.

Alcorn, M. W. (2013). *Resistance to learning: Overcoming the desire-not-to-know in classroom teaching.* Palgrave Macmillan.

Alfred, T., & Corntassel, J. (2005). Being Indigenous: Resurgences against contemporary colonialism. *Government and Opposition, 40*(4), 597-614.

Amadahy, Z., & Lawrence, B. (2009). Indigenous Peoples and Black people in Canada: Settlers or allies? In A. Kempf (Ed.), *Breaching the colonial contract: Anti-colonialism in the US and Canada* (pp. 105-136). Springer Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-9944-1_7

Anderson, B. (1983/2006). *Imagined communities.* Verso.

Anderson, V., McKenzie, M., Allan, S., Hill, T., McLean, S., Kayira, J., Knorr, M., Stone, J., Murphy, J., & Butcher, K. (2015). Participatory action research as pedagogy: Investigating social and ecological justice learning within a teacher education program. *Teaching Education, 26*(2), 179-195.

Andreotti, V. (2006). Soft versus critical global citizenship education. *Policy and Practice: A Development Education Review, 3*, 40-51.

Andreotti, V. (2010). Glimpses of a postcolonial and postcritical global citizenship education. In G. Elliott, C. Fourali, & S. Issler (Eds.), *Education and social change: Connecting local and global perspectives* (pp. 238-250). Continuum.

Andreotti, V., & de Souza, L. M. T. M. (2008). *Learning to read the world through other eyes.* Global Education.

Andreotti, V., & de Souza, L. (Eds.). (2012). *Postcolonial perspectives on global citizenship education.* Routledge.

Angus, C. (2017). *Children of the broken treaty: Canada's lost promise and one girl's dream.* University of Regina Press.

Apple, M. W. (2004). *Ideology and curriculum* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Appleyard, N., & McLean, L. (2011). Expecting the exceptional: Pre-service professional development in global education. *International Journal of Progressive Education, 7*(2), 6-32.

Arvin, M., Tuck, E., & Morrill, A. (2013). Decolonizing feminism: Challenging connections between settler colonialism and heteropatriarchy. *Feminist Formations, 25*(1), 8-34. http://www.jstor.org/stable/43860665

Auerbach, F., & Silverstein, L. B. (2003). *Qualitative data: An introduction to coding and analysis.* New York University Press.

Aveling, N. (2004). Critical Whiteness Studies and the challenges of learning to be a 'White ally'. *Borderlands, 3*(2), 1-10.

Aveling, N. (2006). 'Hacking at our very roots': Rearticulating White racial identity within the context of teacher education. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 9*(3), 261–274. https://doi.org/10.1080/13613320600807576

Bakan, A. B. (2016). Multiculturalism and its contradictions: Education for citizenship and social justice in Canada. In A. Peterson, R. Hattam, M. Zembylas, & J. Arthur (Eds.), *The Palgrave international handbook of education for citizenship and social justice* (pp. 347-368). Palgrave Macmillan.

Bakan, A. B., & Dua, E. (Eds.). (2014). *Theorizing anti-racism: Linkages in Marxism and Critical Race Theories*. University of Toronto Press.

Baldwin, A., Cameron, L., & Kobayashi, A. (Eds.). (2011). *Rethinking the great White north: Race, nature, and the historical geographies of Whiteness in Canada.* UBC Press.

Baldwin, J. (1962, November 10). *Letter from a region in my mind.* The New Yorker. Retrieved July, 12, 2020, from: https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/1962/11/17/letter-from-a-region-in-my-mind

Banks, J. A. (2004). Teaching for social justice, diversity, and citizenship in a global world. *The Educational Forum, 68*(4)*,* 289–298. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131720408984645

Banks, J. A. (2015). Failed citizenship, civic engagement, and education. *Kappa Delta Pi Record, 51(*4), 151-154. https://doi-org.proxy.bib.uottawa.ca/10.1080/00228958.2015.1089616

Battiste, M. (1998). Enabling the autumn seed: Toward a decolonized approach to Aboriginal knowledge, language, and education. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, 22*(1), 16-27.

Battiste, M. (2000). Maintaining Aboriginal identity, language and culture in modern society. In M. Battiste (Ed.), *Reclaiming Indigenous voice and vision* (pp. 192-208). University of British Columbia Press.

Battiste, M. (2013). *Decolonizing education: Nourishing the learning spirit.* University of British Columbia Press.

Battiste, M. (2018, May 28). *Negotiated, stolen, and forced citizenship: Cognitive justice and being in Canada* [Conference session]. Canadian Society for the Study of Education Conference, Regina, SK, Canada.

Battiste, M., & Semaganis. H. (2002). First thoughts on First Nations citizenship: Issues in education. In Y. M. Hebert (Ed.), *Citizenship in transformation in Canada* (pp. 93-111). University of Toronto Press.

Bell, N. (2013). Anishinaabe bimaadiziwin: Living spiritually with respect, relationship, reciprocity, and responsibility. In A. Kulnieks, R. D. Longboat, & K. Young (Eds.), *Contemporary studies in environmental and Indigenous pedagogies: A curricula of stories and place* (pp. 89-107). SensePublishers. https://books-scholarsportal-info.proxy.bib.uottawa.ca/uri/ebooks/ebooks3/springer/2013-08-13/1/9789462092938

Bergen, J., & McLean, L. R. (2014). Students as citizens: Conceptions of citizenship in a social studies curriculum. *Transnational Curriculum Inquiry, 11*(2), 1-24.

Bergen, J., Cook, S. A., & McLean, L. R. (2020). Critical global citizenship education in Canada, England, and the United States: Interrogating (in)justice and self-reflexivity in teacher education programs. In D. Schugurensky & C. Wolhuter (Eds.), *Global citizenship education and teacher education: International perspectives and practices* (pp. 45-63). Routledge.

Beyer, L. E. (1998). Schooling for democracy: What kind? In L. E. Beyer & M. W. Apple (Eds.), *The curriculum: Problems, politics, and possibilities* (2nd ed., pp. 245-263). University of New York Press.

Bickmore, K. (2006). Democratic social cohesion (assimilation)? Representations of social conflict in Canadian public school curriculum. *Canadian Journal of Education, 29*(2), 359-386.

Bickmore, K. (2008). Social justice and the social studies. In L. Levstik & C. Tyson (Eds.), *Handbook of Research in Social Studies Education* (pp. 155-171). Routledge.

Bickmore, K. (2014). Citizenship education in Canada: 'Democratic' engagement with differences, conflicts and equity issues? *Citizenship Teaching & Learning, 9*(3), 257-278.

Bishop, P. (2010). Multisite case study. In A. J. Mills, G. Durepos, & E. Wiebe (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of case study research* (pp. 588-591). SAGE Publications, Inc. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412957397.n219

Blimkie, M., Vetter, D., & Haig-Brown, C. (2014). Shifting perspectives and practices: Teacher candidates' experiences of a First Nation, Métis, and Inuit infusion in mainstream teacher education. *Brock Education Journal, 23*(2), 47-66.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2006). *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in the United States* (2nd ed.). Rownman & Littlefield Publishers.

Boyle-Baise, M. (1998). Community service learning for multicultural education: An exploratory study with preservice teachers. *Equity & Excellence of Education*, *31*(2), 52-60.

Boyle-Baise, M., & Kilbane, J. (2000). What really happens? A look inside service-learning from multicultural teacher education. *Michigan Journal of Community Service-Learning*, *7*(1), 54-64.

Boyle-Baise, M., & Sleeter, C. (2000). Community based service-learning for multicultural teacher education. *Educational Foundations*, *14*(2), 33-50.

Brandt-Birioukov, K., Ng-A-Fook, N., & Kane, R. (2020). Reconceptualizing teacher education in Ontario: Civic particularity, ethical engagement, and reconciliation. In A. M. Phelan, W. F. Pinar, N. Ng-A-Fook, & R. Kane (Eds.), *Reconceptualizing teacher education: A Canadian contribution to a global challenge* (pp. 39-66). University of Ottawa Press.

Brown, N. (2019). *Protecting the individual: The origins and development of Saskatchewan conservatism, 1905-1944.* [Doctoral dissertation, Western University]. Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository. https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd/6277

Butler, J. K., Ng-A-Fook, N., Vaudrin-Charette, J., & McFadden, F. (2015). Living between truth and reconciliation: Responsibilities, colonial institutions, and settler scholars. *Transnational Curriculum Inquiry, 12*(2), 44-63. http://nitinat.library.ubc.ca/ojs/index.php/tci

Butler, J. K., Kane, R. G., & Morshead, C. E. (2017). 'It's my safe space': Student voice, teacher education, and the relational space of an urban high school. *Urban Education, 52*(7), 89-916. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085915574530

Campbell, S. (2010). Comparative case study. *Encyclopedia of case study research*, *1*, 174-176.

Cardinal, H., & Hildebrandt, W. (2000). *Treaty Elders of Saskatchewan.* University of Calgary Press.

Carr, P. R., & Lund, D. E. (Eds.). (2007). *The great White north? Exploring Whiteness, privilege and identity in education.* Sense Publishers.

Carr, W., & Kemmis, S. (2009). Educational action research: A critical approach. In S. Noffke & B. Somekh (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of educational action research* (pp. 74-84). SAGE

Publications, Ltd.

Case, K. A., & Hemmings, A. (2005). Distancing strategies: White women preservice teachers and antiracist curriculum. *Urban Education, 40*(6), 606-626.

Chadderton, C., & Torrance, H. (2011). Case study. In B. Somekh & C. Lewin (Eds.), *Theory and methods in social research* (2nd ed., pp. 53-60). SAGE Publications Inc.

Chikoko, V., Gilmour, J. D., Harber, C., & Serf, J. (2011). Teaching controversial issues and teacher education in England and South Africa. *Journal for Education and Teaching*, *37*(1), 5-19.

Chin, K., & Barber, C. E. (2010). A multi-dimensional exploration of teachers' beliefs about civic education in Australia, England, and the United States. *Theory & Research in Social Education, 38*(3), 395-427.

Chmiliar, L. (2010). Multiple-case designs. In A. J. Mills, G. Durepos, & E. Wiebe (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of case study research* (pp. 583-584). SAGE Publications, Inc. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412957397.n216

Chomsky, N. (2018). An interview with Dr. Noam Chomsky on neoliberalism, society, and higher education. In M. Spooner & J. McNinch (Eds.), *Dissident knowledge in higher education* (pp. 55-62). University of Regina Press.

Christou, T. M. (Ed.). (2017). *The curriculum history of Canadian teacher education.* Routledge. https://doi-org.proxy.bib.uottawa.ca/10.4324/9781315411378

Clausen, K. W., Horton, T. A., & Lemisko, L. S. (2008). Democracy and diversity: A content analysis of selected contemporary Canadian social studies curricula. *Citizenship Teaching and Learning, 4*(1), 35-49.

Comeau, L. (2007). Re-inscribing Whiteness through progressive constructions of 'the problem' in anti-racist education. In P. R. Carr & D. E. Lund (Eds.), *The great White north? Exploring Whiteness, privilege and identity in education* (pp. 151-160). Sense Publishers.

Concentus. (2019). *About.* Retrieved March 7, 2020, from https://www.concentus.ca/about/

Cone, N. (2012). The effects of community-based service learning on preservice teachers' beliefs about the characteristics of effective science teachers of diverse students. *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, *23*(8), 889-907.

Cook, S. A. (2008). Give peace a chance: The diminution of peace in global education in the United States, United Kingdom, and Canada. *Canadian Journal of Education, 31*(4), 889-914.

Cooper, H. M. (1988). Organizing knowledge syntheses: A taxonomy of literature reviews. *Knowledge in Society, 1*, 104-126. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03177550

Council of Ministers of Education, Canada. (2001). *Education for peace, human rights, democracy, international understanding and tolerance: Report of Canada.* Council of Ministers of Education, Canada.

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Identity politics, intersectionality, and violence against women. *Stanford Law Review*, *43*(6), 1241-1299.

Creswell, J. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research.* Pearson.

Dale-Burnett, L. (Ed.). (2006). *Saskatchewan agriculture: Lives past and present.* Canadian Plains Research Center.

Daschuk, J. (2013). *Clearing the plains: Disease, politics of starvation, and the loss of Aboriginal life.* University of Regina Press.

Davies, I., Flanagan, B., Hogarth, S., Mountford, P., & Philpott, J. (2009). Asking questions about participation. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, *4*(1), 25–39.

Davies, I., Gregory, I., & Riley, S. C. (2005). Teachers' perceptions of citizenship in England. In W. O. Lee & J. T. Fouts (Eds.), *Education for social citizenship: Perceptions of teachers in the USA, Australia, England, Russia, and China* (pp. 131–173). Hong Kong University Press.

Davies, I., Ho, L., Kiwan, D., Peck, C. L., Peterson, A., Sant, E., & Waghid, Y. (Eds). (2018). *The Palgrave handbook of global citizenship and education.* Springer Nature. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-59733-5

Davies, L. (2006). Global citizenship: Abstraction or framework for action? *Educational Review, 58*(1), 5-25.

Deer, F. (2013). Integrating Aboriginal perspectives in education: Perceptions of pre-service teachers. *Canadian Journal of Education, 36*(2), 175-210.

Dei, G. J. S. (1995). Integrative anti-racism: Intersection of race, class, and gender. *Race, Gender & Class, 2*(3), 11-30. www.jstor.org/stable/41674706

Dei, G. J. S. (1996). *Anti-racism education: Theory and practice*. Fernwood.

Dei, G. J. S. (2001). Rescuing theory: Anti-racism and inclusive education. *Race, Gender & Class, 8*(1), 139-161.

Dei, G. J. S., & Karumanchery, L. K. (2001). School reforms in Ontario: The 'marketization of education' and the resulting silence on equity. In J. P. Portelli & R. P. Solomon (Eds.), *The erosion of democracy in education: From critique to possibilities* (pp. 189- 216). Detselig Enterprises.

Delgado, R., & Stefanic, J. (2001). *Critical race theory: An introduction*. New York University Press.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. The Macmillan Company.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education.* Kappa Delta Pi.

Dhillon, J. K. (Ed.). (2017). *Prairie rising: Indigenous youth, decolonization, and the politics of intervention.* University of Toronto Press.

Diamond, J., & Lewis, A. (2015). *Despite the best intentions: How racial inequality thrives in good schools.* Oxford University Press.

DiAngelo, R. (2018a). Nothing to add: A challenge to White silence in racial discussions. In V. Lea, D. E. Lund, & P. R. Carr (Eds.), *Critical multicultural perspectives on Whiteness* (pp. 233-247). Peter Lang.

DiAngelo, R. (2018b). *White fragility: Why it's so hard to talk to White people about racism.* Beacon Press.

DiAngelo, R., & Sensoy, Ö. (2014). Calling in: Strategies for cultivating humility and critical thinking in antiracism education. *Understanding & Dismantling Privilege, 4*(2) 191-203.

Dion, S. D. (2007). Disrupting molded images: Identities, responsibilities and relationships—teachers and Indigenous subject material. *Teaching Education, 18*(4), 329-342. https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210701687625

Donald, D. (2012). Forts, colonial frontier logics, and Aboriginal-Canadian relations: Imagining decolonizing educational philosophies in Canadian contexts. In A. A. Abdi (Ed.), *Decolonizing philosophies of education* (pp. 91-111). Sense Publishers.

Du Bois, W. E. B. (1903/2017). *The souls of Black folk.* Oxford University Press.

Eidoo, S., Ingram, L., MacDonald, A., Nabavi, M., Pashby, K., & Stille, S. (2011). 'Through the kaleidoscope': Intersections between theoretical perspectives and classroom implications in critical global citizenship education. *Canadian Journal of Education, 34*(4), 59-85.

Eisenstein, Z. (1977). *Capitalist patriarchy and the case for socialist feminism.* Monthly Review Press.

Ellsworth, E. (1989). Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review, 59*(3), 297-334.

Ellsworth, E. (1997). Double binds of whiteness. In M. Fine, L. Weis, L. Powell, & L. M. Wong (Eds.), *Off white: Readings on race, power, and society* (pp. 259-269). Routledge.

Estellés, M., & Fischman, G. E. (2020). Who needs global citizenship education? A review of the literature on teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 00*(0), 1-14. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0022487120920254

Evans, M. (2006). Educating for citizenship: What teachers say and what teachers do. *Canadian Journal of Education, 29*(2), 410-435.

Evans, M., Evans, R., & Vemic, A. (2019). Youth civic engagement and formal education in Canada: Shifting expressions, associated challenges. In A. Peterson, G. Stahl, & H. Soong (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Citizenship and Education.* Palgrave Macmillan

Evans, M., Ingram, L., MacDonald, A., & Weber, N. (2009). Mapping the 'global dimension' of citizenship education in Canada: The complex interplay between theory, practice, and context. *International Journal of Citizenship, Teaching and Learning, 5*(2), 16-34.

Evans-Winters, V. E., & Hoff, P. T. (2011). The aesthetics of White racism in pre-service teacher education: A Critical Race Theory perspective. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 14*(4), 461-479.

Fairclough, N. (1992). Discourse and text: Linguistic and intertextual analysis within discourse analysis. *Discourse and Society, 3*(2), 193-217.

Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language* (2nd ed.). Pearson Education Limited.

Farver, S. D. (2019). *Beliefs. Barriers. Beckys: Using Critical Whiteness Studies to examine teaching and teacher education*. [Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (2228876963). Retrieved June 20, 2020, from https://search-proquest-com.proxy.bib.uottawa.ca/docview/2228876963?accountid=14701

Fine, M., Weis, L., Powell, L. C., & Wong, L. M. (Eds.). (1997). *Off white: Readings on power, privilege, and resistance*. Routledge.

Fine, M., Weis, L., Pruit, L. P., & Burns, A. (Eds). (2004). *Off white: Readings on power, privilege, and resistance* (2nd ed). Routledge.

First Nations University of Canada. (2019). *Overview*. Retrieved March 7, 2020, from http://fnuniv.ca/overview

Frankenberg, R. (1993a). White feminism, racism, and the social geography of childhood. *Feminist Review*, 45, 51-84. https://doi.org/10.1057/fr.1993.38

Frankenberg, R. (1993b). *White women, race matters: The social construction of whiteness.* University of Minnesota Press.

Frankenberg, R. (2001). Mirage of an unmarked Whiteness. In B. Rasmussen, E. Klinerberg, I. Nexica, & M. Wray (Eds.), *The making and unmaking of Whiteness* (pp. 72-96). Duke University Press.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* The Continuum Publishing Company.

Freire, P. (2014). *Pedagogy of hope: Reliving pedagogy of the oppressed*. Bloomsbury Academic.

Gaffield, C. (1991). Children, schooling, and family reproduction in nineteenth-century Ontario. *Canadian Historical Review, 72*(2), 157-191.

Gebhard, A. (2017a). ‘Let’s make a little drum’: Limitations and contradictory effects of cultural approaches in Indigenous education. *Race, Ethnicity, and Education, 21*(6), 757-772. https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2017.1377172

Gebhard, A. (2017b). Reconciliation or reconciliation? Contemporary discourses about residential schools in the Canadian Prairies. *Canadian Journal of Education, 40*(1), 1-30.

Gebhard, A. (2019). Discursive (re)productions of (im)possible students in the Canadian Prairies. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 40*(6), 902-916.

Geboers, E., Geijsel, F., Admiraal, W., & Dam, G. (2013, June). Review of the effects of citizenship education. *Educational Research Review, 9*, 158-173.

Gibson, S. (2012). ‘Why do we learn this stuff?’ Students’ views on the purpose of social studies. *Canadian Social Studies, 45*(1), 43–58.

Gillen, J., & Peterson, A. (2005). Discourse analysis. In B. Somekh & C. Lewin (Eds.), *Research methods in the social sciences* (pp. 139-146). SAGE Publications Ltd.

Gillborn, D. (2004). Anti-racism: From policy to praxis. In G. Ladson-Billings & D. Gillborn (Eds.), *The RoutledgeFalmer reader in multicultural education* (pp. 35-48). RoutledgeFalmer.

Gillborn, D. (2006). Critical Race Theory and education: Racism and anti-racism in educational theory and praxis. *Discourse*, *27*(1), 11-32. http://doi.org/10.1080/01596300500510229

Giroux, H. (2002). Neoliberalism, corporate culture, and the promise of higher education: The university as a democratic public sphere. *Harvard Educational Review, 72*(4), 425-464.

Giroux, H. (2004a). Critical pedagogy and the postmodern/modern divide: Towards a pedagogy of democratization. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 31*(1), 31-47.

Giroux, H. (2004b). Public pedagogy and the politics of neo-liberalism: Making the political more pedagogical. *Policy Futures in Education, 2*(3-4), 494-503.

Giroux, H. (2013). *On critical pedagogy.* Bloomsbury Publishing Inc.

Government of Canada. (2018). *Indian Act.* Ottawa: Ministry of Justice. http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca

Government of Canada. (2019). *Anishinabek Nation Education Agreement.* Retrieved October 21, 2019, from https://www.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca/eng/1502376429223/1542741448397

Government of Ontario. (2016, May 3). *High school graduation rate reaches all-time high of 85.5 per cent.* Queen's Printer for Ontario. Retrieved June 27, 2020, from: https://news.ontario.ca/opo/en/2016/05/high-school-graduation-rate-reaches-all-time-high-of-855-per-cent.html

Grant, N. E. (2018) 'Does it make me White if…?' Registers of Whiteness in the blog 'Stuff White People Like'. In V. Lea, D. E. Lund, & P. R. Carr (Eds.), *Critical multicultural perspectives on Whiteness* (pp. 363-370). Peter Lang.

Greater Saskatoon Catholic Schools (GSCS). (2019). *Oskāyak High School.* Retrieved December 24, 2019, from https://www.gscs.ca/studentsandfamilies/schools/OSK/Pages/History.aspx

Grossman, P., Hammerness. K., & McDonald, M. (2009). Redefining teaching, re-imagining teacher education. *Teachers and Teaching, 15*(20), 273-289. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540600902875340

Guo, L. (2014). Preparing teachers to education for 21st century global citizenship: Envisioning and enacting. *Journal of Global Citizenship & Equity Education, 4*(1), 1-23.

Haig-Brown, C. (2010). Indigenous thought, appropriation, and non-Aboriginal people. *Canadian Journal of Education, 33*(4), 925-950.

Hall, S. (1997a). Race, the floating signifier featuring Stuart Hall [Transcript]. *Media Education Foundation.* https://www.mediaed.org/transcripts/Stuart-Hall-Race-the-Floating-Signifier-Transcript.pdf

Hall, S. (1997b). *Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices.* Sage.

Harber, C., & Serf, J. (2006). Teacher education for a democratic society in England and South Africa. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *22*, 986-997.

Hare, J. (2020). Reconciliation in teacher education: Hope or hype? In A. M. Phelan, W. F. Pinar, N. Ng-A-Fook, & R. Kane (Eds.), *Reconceptualizing teacher education: A Canadian contribution to a global challenge* (pp. 19-38). University of Ottawa Press.

Harney, S. (1996). Anti-racism, Ontario style. *Race and Class, 37*(3), 35-45.

Harris, A., & Leonardo, Z. (2018). Intersectionality, race-gender subordination, and education. *Review of Research in Education, 42*, 1-27.

Harshman, J., Augstine, T., & Merryfield, M. (Eds.). (2015). *Research in global citizenship education*. Information Age Publishing, Inc.

Hawkman, A. M. (2019). *Swimming through Whiteness: Exploring non-racism and anti-racism in social studies teacher education.* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri-Columbia]. (11012815). ProQuest Dissertations.

Hébert, Y. M. (Ed.). (2002). *Citizenship in transformation in Canada.* University of Toronto Press, Inc.

Hébert, Y. M., & Wilkinson, L. (2002). The citizenship debates: Conceptual, policy, experiential, and educational issues. In Y. M. Hébert (Ed.), *Citizenship in transformation in Canada* (pp. 4-36). University of Toronto Press, Inc.

Henderson, A., Brown, S., Pancer, S. M., & Ellis-Hale, K. (2007). Mandated community service in high school and subsequent civic engagement: The case of the 'double cohort' in Ontario, Canada. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 36*(7), 849-860. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-007-9207-1

Henry, F., & Tator, C. (1994). The ideology of racism: democratic racism. *Canadian Ethnic Studies, 26*(2), 1-14.

Hollander, J. A. (2004). The social contexts of focus groups. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 33*(5), 602-637.

Holly, M. L., & Altrichter, H. (2011). Research diaries. In B. Somekh & C. Lewin (Eds.), *Theory and methods in social research* (2nd ed., pp. 43-52). SAGE Publications Inc.

hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom.* Routledge.

hooks, b. (2003). *Teaching community: A pedagogy of hope.* Routledge.

hooks, b. (2015). *Feminism is for everybody: Passionate politics.* Routledge.

Howard, B., & Smith, S. E. K. (2011). *The Little Black School House*: Revealing the histories of Canada's segregated schools – A conversation with Sylvia Hamilton. *Canadian Review of American Studies, 41*(1), 63-73. http://dx.doi.org/10.3138/cras.41.1.63

Hughes, A. S., Print, M., & Sears, A. (2010). Curriculum capacity and citizenship education: A comparative analysis of four democracies. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 40*(3), 293-309.

Ibrahim, A. (2008). Operating under erasure: Race/language/identity. *Canadian and international education, 37*(2), 56-76.

Idle No More. (2019). *Call for change*. Retrieved November 2, 2019, from http://www.idlenomore.ca/calls_for_change

Irizarry, J. G. (2009). Reinvigorating multicultural education through youth participatory action research. *Multicultural Education, 11*(4), 194-199.

Isin, E. F. (Ed.). (2008). *Recasting the social in citizenship.* University of Toronto Press.

Jacobs, M. C. (2012). *Assimilation through incarceration: The geographic imposition of Canadian law over Indigenous Peoples.* [Doctoral dissertation, Queen's University]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. https://search-proquest-com.proxy.bib.uottawa.ca/docview/1511468092?accountid=14701

James, C. (1995). Multicultural and anti-racism education in Canada. *Race, Gender & Class, 2*(3), 31-48. www.jstor.org/stable/41674707

James, C. (2007). Who can/should do this work? The colour of critique. In. P. R. Carr, & D. E. Lund (Eds.), *The great White north? Exploring Whiteness, privilege, and identity in education* (pp. 119-131). Sense Publishers.

Johnson, L., & Morris, P. (2010). Towards a framework for critical citizenship education. *Curriculum Journal*, *21*(1), 77-96.

Journell, W. (2010). Standardizing citizenship: The potential influence of state curriculum standards on the civic development of adolescents. *PS, Political Science & Politics, 43*(2), 351-358.

Journell, W. (2013). What preservice social studies teachers (don't) know about politics and current events – and why it matters. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 41*(3), 316-351.

Jupp, J. C., Berry, T. R., & Lensmire, T. J. (2016). Second-wave white teacher identity studies: A review of white teacher identity literatures from 2004 through 2014. *Review of Educational Research*, *86*(4), 1151-1191. http://doi.org/10.3102/0034654316629798

Kahne, J., & Sporte, S. (2008). Developing citizens: The impact of civic learning opportunities on students' commitment to civic participation. *American Educational Research Journal, 45*(3), 738-766.

Kane, R., Sandretto, S., & Heath, C. (2002). Telling half the story: A critical review of research on the teaching beliefs and practices of university academics. *Review of Educational Research, 72*(2), 177-228. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543072002177

Kanu, Y. (2011). *Integrating Aboriginal perspectives into the school curriculum: Purposes, possibilities, and challenges.* University of Toronto Press.

Keating, A., Kerr, D., & Lopes, J. (2009). *Embedding citizenship education (CE) in secondary schools in England (2002–2008), citizenship education longitudinal study: 7th annual report*. Department for Communities, Schools, and Families.

Kelly, D. M., & Brandes, G. M. (2010). 'Social justice needs to be everywhere': Imagining the future of anti-oppression education in teacher preparation. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 56*(4), 388-402.

Kennelly, J. (2009). Good citizen/bad activist: The cultural role of the state in youth activism. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies, 21*(2-3), 127-149. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10714410902827135

Kennelly, J., & Llewellyn, K. R. (2011). Education for active compliance: Discursive constructions in citizenship education. *Citizenship Studies, 15*(6-7), 897-914.

Kerr, D., Mandzuk, D., & Raptis, H. (2011). The role of the social foundations of education in programs of teacher preparation in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Education, 34*(4), 118-134.

Kincheloe, J. (2008). *Critical pedagogy primer*. (2nd ed). Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.

King, J. E. (1991). Dysconscious racism: Ideology, identity, and the miseducation of teachers. *The Journal of Negro Education, 60*(2), 133-146. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2295605

King, L. G., & Chandler, P. T. (2016). From non-racism to anti-racism in social studies teacher education: Social studies and racial pedagogical content knowledge. In A. R. Crowe & A. Cuenca (Eds.), *Rethinking social studies teacher education in the twenty-first century* (pp. 3-21). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-22939-3_1

Kino-nda-niimi Collective. (2014). *The winter we danced: Voices from the past, the future, and the Idle No More movement.* ARP Books.

Krugel, L. (2018, October 26). *Residential school 'monster' now lives in child-welfare system: Sinclair.* CTV. https://www.ctvnews.ca/canada/residential-school-monster-now-lives-in-child-welfare-system-sinclair-1.4151517

Kumashiro, K. (2000). Toward a theory of anti-oppressive education. *Review of Educational Research, 70*(1), 25-53.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children.* Jossey-Bass.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1998). Just what is Critical Race Theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education? *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 11*(1), 7-24. https://doi.org/10.1080/095183998236863

Ladson-Billings, G. (2000). Fighting for our lives: Preparing teachers to teach African American students. *Journal of Teacher Education, 51*, 206-214.

Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. (1995). Toward a Critical Race Theory of education. *Teachers College Record*, *97*(1), 47-68. http://doi.org/10.1080/10282580701850413

Lamoureux, K. (2018, January 18). *Walking in a good way in the academy: Indigenous perspectives of safety in post-secondary education* [Public lecture]. University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Ontario.

Larsen, M. A., & Searle, M. J. (2017, April). International service learning and critical global citizenship: A cross-case study of a Canadian teacher education alternative practicum. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 63,* 196-205.

Lather, P. (1991). *Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy with/in the postmodern*. Routledge.

Lather, P. (2006). Paradigm proliferation as a good thing to think with: Teaching research in education as a wild profusion. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 19*(1), 35-57.

Lawrence, B. (2003). Gender, race, and the regulation of Native identity in Canada and the United States: An overview. *Hypatia, 18*(2), 3-31.

Lea, V., Lund, D. E., & Carr, P. R. (Eds.). (2018). *Critical multicultural perspectives on whiteness: Views from the past and present.* Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.

Ledesma, M. C., & Calderón, D. (2015). Critical Race Theory in education: A review of past literature and a look to the future. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *21*(3), 206–222. http://doi.org/10.1177/1077800414557825

Lemisko, L., & Clausen, K. (2017). Born of cooperation? Teacher education curriculum in Saskatchewan. In T. M. Christou (Ed.), *The curriculum history of Canadian teacher education* (pp. 161-176). Routledge. https://doi-org.proxy.bib.uottawa.ca/10.4324/9781315411378

Lensmire, T., McManimon, S., Tierney, J. D., Lee-Nichols, M., Casey, Z., Lensmire, A., & Davis, B. (2013). McIntosh as synecdoche: How teacher education's focus on white privilege undermines antiracism. *Harvard Educational Review, 83*(3), 410-431. https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.83.3.35054h14l8230574

Leonardo, Z. (2002). The souls of white folk: Critical pedagogy, whiteness studies, and globalization discourse. *Race, Ethnicity, and Education, 5*(1), 29-50.

Leonardo, Z. (2004). The color of supremacy: Beyond the discourse of 'white privilege'. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 36*(2), 137-152.

Leonardo, Z. (2013). *Race frameworks: A multidimensional theory of racism and education*. Teachers College Press.

Leonardo, Z., & Vafai, M. M. (2016). Citizenship education and the colonial contract: The elusive search for social justice in US education. In A. Peterson, R. Hattam, M. Zembylas, & J. Arthur (Eds.), *The Palgrave international handbook of education for citizenship and social justice* (pp. 613-634). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi-org.proxy.bib.uottawa.ca/10.1057/978-1-137-51507-0_29

Levine-Rasky, C. (2000a). Framing whiteness: Working through the tensions in introducing whiteness to educators. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *3*(3), 271-292. http://doi.org/10.1080/713693039

Levine-Rasky, C. (2000b). The practice of whiteness among teacher candidates. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, *10*(3), 263-284. http://doi.org/10.1080/09620210000200060

Lichtenberg, J. (1992/2002). Racism in the head, racism in the world. In W. Galston (Ed.), *Philosophical Dimensions of Public Policy* (pp. 91-96). Routledge. https://doi-org.proxy.bib.uottawa.ca/10.4324/9781315126357

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (2009). The only generalization is: There is no generalization. In R. Gomm, M. Hammersley, & P. Foster (Eds.), *Case Study Method* (pp. 27-44). SAGE Publications Ltd. https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9780857024367.d6

Lincoln, Y. S., Lynham, S. A., & Guba, E. G. (2011). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences, revisited. In C. A. Mertler (Ed.), *Introduction to educational research* (pp. 97-128). Pearson Education, Inc.

Llewellyn, K. R., Cook, S. A., & Molina, A. (2010). Civic learning: Moving from the apolitical to the socially just. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *42*(6), 791-812.

Losito, B., & Mintrop, H. (2001). The teaching of civic education. In J. Torney-Purta (Ed.), *Citizenship and education in twenty-eight countries: Civic knowledge and engagement at age fourteen* (pp. 157-173). The International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.

Lowman, E. B., & Barker, A. J. (2015). *Settler: Identity and colonialism in 21st century Canada*. Fernwood Publishing.

Lund, D. E., & Carr, P. R. (2018). Disrupting denial and white privilege in teacher education. In V. Lea, D. E. Lund, & P. R. Carr (Eds.), *Critical multicultural perspectives on whiteness: Views from the past and present* (pp. 193-206). Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.

Madden, B. (2015). Pedagogical pathways for Indigenous education with/in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 51*, 1-15. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2015.05.005

Manning, N. (2018). *Exploring Indigenous youth incarceration in Canada.* [Undergraduate thesis, University of Guelph]. University of Guelph. https://atrium.lib.uoguelph.ca/xmlui/bitstream/handle/10214/13022/Manning_ExploringIndigenousYouthIncarceration.pdf?sequence=3&isAllowed=y

Marshall, P., Manfra, M. M., & Simmons, C. (2015). No more playing in the dark: Twenty-first century citizenship, Critical Race Theory, and the future of the social studies methods course. In A. Crowe & A. Cuenca (Eds.), *Rethinking social studies teacher education in the twenty-first century* (pp. 61–79). Springer.

Marshal, T. H. (1950). *Citizenship and social class, and other essays.* Cambridge University Press.

Mason, A. M. (2016). Taking time, breaking codes: moments in white teacher candidates' exploration of racism and teacher identity. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *29*(8), 1045-1058. http://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2016.1174899

Matias, C. E., Viesca, K, Garrison-Wade, D. F., Tandon, M., & Galindo, R. (2014). What is Critical Whiteness doing in OUR nice field like Critical Race Theory?" Applying CRT and CWS to understand the White imaginations of White teacher candidates. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 47*(3), 289-304.

Maynard, R. (2017). *Policing Black lives: Sate violence in Canada from slavery to the present.* Fernwood Publishing.

Maynes, N., Hatt, B., & Wideman, R. (2013). Service learning as a practicum experience in a pre-service education program. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 43*(1), 80-99.

McCaig, J. (Ed.) (1925/1932). *Studies in Citizenship.* The Educational Book Company, Limited.

McCreary, T. (2011). Colour-blind: Discursive repertoires teachers used to story racism and Aboriginality in urban Prairie schools. *Brock Education, 21*(1), 16-33.

McIntyre, A. (1997) *Making meaning of whiteness: Exploring racial identity with white teachers*. State University of New York Press.

McLean, L. (2010). 'There is no magic whereby such qualities will be acquired at the voting age': Teachers, curriculum, pedagogy and citizenship. *Historical Studies in Education, 22*(2), 39-57.

McLean, L., Bergen, J., Truong-White, H., Rottman, J., & Glithero, L. (2017). Far from apathetic: Canadian youth identify the support they need to speak about and act on issues. *Citizenship, Teaching, and Learning, 12*(1), 91-108.

McLean, L., & Cook, S. (2011). Viability for sustainability: Two sides of the coin for global education in a faculty of education. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning, 3*(2), 39-56.

McLean, L., Cook, S. A., & Crowe, T. (2006). Educating the next generation of global citizens through teacher education, one new teacher at a time. *Canadian Social Studies Journal, 40*(1), 1-10.

McLean, L., Cook, S. A., & Crowe, T. (2008). Imagining global citizens: Teaching peace and global education in a teacher-education programme. *Citizenship, Teaching and Learning (UK), 4*(1), 50-64.

McLean, L., & Truong-White, H. H. (2016). Toward self-authoring a civic teacher identity: Service-learning in teacher education. *McGill Journal of Education, 51*(3), 1081-1101.

McLean, S., Wilson, A., & Lee, E. (2017, July). The Whiteness of Redmen: Indigenous mascots, social media, and an antiracist intervention. *Australasian Journal of Information Systems, 21*, 1-16. https://doi.org/10.3127/ajis.v21i0.1590

Mercer, J. (2007). The challenges of insider research in educational institutions: Wielding a double-edged sword and resolving delicate dilemmas. *Oxford Review of Education, 33*(1), 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1080/03054980601094651

Merriam, S. (2001). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education.* Jossey-Bass.

Metatawabin, E., & Shimo, A. (2015). *Up Ghost River: A Chief's journey through the turbulent waters of Native history.* Random House of Canada, Limited.

Miller, S. (2016). Trans*+ing classrooms: The pedagogy of refusal as mediator for learning. *Social Sciences, 5*(3), 1-17.

Milner, H. R. (2013). Analyzing poverty, learning, and teaching through a Critical Race Theory lens. *Review of Research in Education*, *37*(1), 1-53. http://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X12459720

Milner, H., & Lewis, J. P. (2011). It's what happens on the front lines of civic education policy that matters: Reflection on a natural experience on youth turnout in Ontario. *Canadian Political Science Review, 5*(2), 136-146.

Mirra, N., Morrell, E. D., Cain, E., Scorza, D., & Ford, A. (2013). Educating for a critical democracy: Civic participation reimagined in the council of youth research. *Democracy & Education, 21*(1), 1-10.

Mitchell, T. (2018). 'We acted like a genocidal country when we are clearly not one': Exploring the complexities of racialization and the structuring forces of Whiteness in a high school classroom. In V. Lea, D. E. Lund, & P. R. Carr (Eds.), *Critical multicultural perspectives on Whiteness* (pp. 301-310). Peter Lang.

Montgomery, K. (2005). Imagining the antiracist state: Representations of racism in Canadian history textbooks. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 26*(4), 427-442.

Moreton-Robinson, A. (2015). *The White possessive: property, power and Indigenous sovereignty.* University of Minnesota Press

Mundy, K., & Manion, C. (2008). Global education in Canadian elementary schools: An exploratory study. *Canadian Journal of Education, 31*(4), 941-974.

Mundy, K., Manion, C., Masemann, V., & Haggerty, M. (2007). *Charting global education in Canada's elementary schools.* UNICEF.

National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls (NIMMIWG). (2019). *A legal analysis of genocide: Supplementary report of the National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls.* https://www.mmiwg-ffada.ca/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Supplementary-Report_Genocide.pdf

Neuman, W. L. (2011). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. (7th ed.). Allyn & Bacon.

Ng-A-Fook, N. (2013). Fishing for knowledges beyond colonial disciplines: Curriculum, social

action projects, and Indigenous communities. In A. Kulnieks, R. D. Longboat, & K. Young (Eds.), *Contemporary studies in environmental and Indigenous pedagogies: A curricula of stories and place* (pp. 285-305). SensePublishers. https://books-scholarsportal-info.proxy.bib.uottawa.ca/uri/ebooks/ebooks3/springer/2013-08-13/1/9789462092938

Ng-A-Fook, N., & Milne, R. (2014). Unsettling our narrative encounters within and outside of Canadian social studies. *Canadian Social Studies, 47*(2), 88-109.

Ng-A-Fook, N., Ingham, M., & Burrows, T. (2017a). Reconciling 170 years of settler curriculum policies: Teacher education in Ontario. In T. M. Christou (Ed.), *The curriculum history of Canadian teacher education* (pp. 125-143). Routledge. https://doi-org.proxy.bib.uottawa.ca/10.4324/9781315411378

Ng-A-Fook, N., Kane, R., Crowe, T., Karagiozis, N., & Hagerman, M. S. (2017b). Reconceptualizing teacher education at the University of Ottawa. In D. Petrarca & J. Kitchen (Eds.), *Initial teacher education in Ontario: The first year of four-semester teacher education programs* (pp. 217-242). Canadian Association for Teacher Education.

Office of the Treaty Commissioner. (1998). *Statement of Treaty Issues: Treaties as a Bridge to the Future*. Office of the Treaty Commissioner.

Office of the Treaty Commissioner. (2019). *About the treaties.* Retrieved October 30, 2019, from http://www.otc.ca/pages/about_the_treaties.html

Ohito, E. O. (2016). Making the emperor’s new clothes visible in anti-racist teacher education: Enacting a pedagogy of discomfort with white preservice teachers. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 49*(4), 454-467.

Oluo, I. (2017, June 1). *I am drowning in whiteness* [Speech]. Seattle Central Library & KUOW Public Radio 'Interrupting Whiteness' Event, Seattle, WA, United States. http://archive.kuow.org/post/ijeoma-oluo-i-am-drowning-whiteness

Omi, M., & Winant, H. (1994). *Racial formations in the United States* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Ontario's Anti-Racism Directorate. (2020). *Ontario's Anti-Black Racism Strategy.* Queen's Printer for Ontario. Retrieved June 27, 2020, from https://www.ontario.ca/page/ontarios-anti-black-racism-strategy#section-0

Ontario College of Teachers. (2018). *2018 Annual report: Setting the standard for great teaching.* Ontario College of Teachers. Retrieved December 17, 2019, from https://www.oct.ca/-/media/PDF/Annual%20Report%202018/2018AnnualReport_complete_EN_web.pdf

Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food, and Rural Affairs. (2019). *Number and area of census farms, Canada and the provinces, 1996, 2001, 2006, 2011, and 2016.* Retrieved October 30, 2019, from http://www.omafra.gov.on.ca/english/stats/census/number.htm

Ontario Ministry of Education. (1993). *Antiracism and ethnocultural equity in school boards: Guidelines for policy development and implementation.* Retrieved June 10, 2019, from http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/document/curricul/antiraci/antire.pdf

Ontario Ministry of Education. (2005). *The Ontario Curriculum Grades 1-8: Mathematics.* Queen's Printer for Ontario.

Ontario Ministry of Education (2006). *The Ontario Curriculum Grades 1-8: Language.* Queen's Printer for Ontario.

Ontario Ministry of Education. (2013a). *The Ontario Curriculum Grades 9 and 10: Canadian and world studies, geography, history and civics (politics).* Queen's Printer for Ontario.

Ontario Ministry of Education. (2013b). *The Ontario Curriculum: Social Studies, Grades 1 to 6, History and Geography, Grades 7 and 8.* Queen's Printer for Ontario.

Ontario Ministry of Education. (2019a). *Education in Ontario*. Retrieved December 16, 2019, from https://www.ontario.ca/page/education-ontario

Ontario Ministry of Education. (2019b). *The Ontario Curriculum: Health and Physical Education, Grades 1-8.* Queen's Printer for Ontario.

Ontario Ministry of Education. (2019c). *Preparing students for the future.* Retrieved December 16, 2019, from https://www.ontario.ca/page/preparing-students-future

Ontario Site Program Document. (2017).

Ontario Site Syllabus. (2018).

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., Dickinson, W. B., Leech, N. L., & Zoran, A. G. (2009). A qualitative framework for collecting and analyzing data in focus group research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 8*(3), 1-21. https://doi.org/10.1177/160940690900800301

Osborne, K. (2003). Teaching history in schools: A Canadian debate. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *35*(5), 585-626.

Osborne, K. (2006). To the past: Why we need to teach and study history. In R. Sandwell (Ed.), *To the past: History education, public memory and citizenship in Canada* (pp. 103-131). University of Toronto Press, Inc.

Osborne, K. (2010). Political education and citizenship: Teaching for civic engagement. *Education Canada, 45*(1), 13-16.

Osler, A. (2011). Teacher interpretations of citizenship education: National identity, cosmopolitan ideals, and political realities. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 43*(1), 1-24.

Pasek, J., Feldman, L., Romer, D., & Hall, J. K. (2008). Schools as incubators of democratic participation: Building long-term political efficacy with civic education. *Applied Developmental Science, 12*(1), 26-37.

Pashby, K. (2012). Questions for global citizenship education: Education in the context of the 'new imperialism': For whom, by whom? In V. Andreotti & L. de Souza (Eds.), *Postcolonial perspectives on global citizenship education* (pp. 9-26). Routledge.

Pashby, K., & Andreotti, V. (2015). Critical global citizenship in theory and practice: Rationales and approaches for an emerging agenda. In J. Harshman, T. Augustine, & M. Merryfield (Eds.), *Research in global citizenship education* (pp. 9-34). Information Age Publishing.

Pashby, K., da Costa, M., Stein, S., & Andreotti, V. (2020). A meta-review of typologies of global citizenship education. *Comparative Education*, 1-21. https://doi.org/10.1080/03050068.2020.1723352

Pete, S., Schneider, B., & O'Reilly, K. (2013). Decolonizing our practice – Indigenizing our teaching. *First Nations Perspectives, 5*(1), 99-115.

Pete, S. (2017). Idle No More: Radical Indigeneity in teacher education. In F. Pirbhai-Illich, S. Pete, & F. Martin (Eds.), *Culturally responsive pedagogy: Working towards decolonization, Indigeneity, and interculturalism* (pp. 53-72). Palgrave Macmillan.

Peters, M. A. (2012). Neoliberalism, education, and the crisis of Western capitalism. *Policy Futures in Education, 10*(2), 134-141.

Peterson, A., Durrant, I., & Bentley, B. (2015). Student teachers' perceptions of their role as civic educators: Evidence from a large higher education institution in England. *British Educational Research Journal*, *41*(2), 343-364.

Peterson, A., Hattam, R., Zembylas, M., & Arthur, J. (Eds). (2016). *The Palgrave international handbook of education for citizenship and social justice.* Palgrave Macmillan.

Phelan, A. M., Pinar, W. F., Ng-A-Fook, N., & Kane, R. (2020). Introduction. In A. M. Phelan, W. F. Pinar, N. Ng-A-Fook, & R. Kane (Eds.), *Reconceptualizing teacher education: A Canadian contribution to a global challenge* (pp. 1-18). University of Ottawa Press.

Phillips, N., & Hardy, C. (2002). *Discourse analysis: Investigating processes of social construction.* Sage.

Pike, G. (2008). Peddling humbug and false piety: Reflections on the road to educating global citizens. In A. A. Abdi & G. Richardson (Eds.), *Decolonizing democratic education* (pp.77-86). Sense.

Pinto, L. E. (2012). *Curriculum reform in Ontario: Common sense policy processes and democratic possibilities.* University of Toronto Press.

Pirbhai-Illich, F., Pete, S., & Martin, F. (2016). *Culturally responsive pedagogy: Working towards decolonization, Indigeneity, and interculturalism*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Pollock, M. (Ed.). (2008). *Everyday antiracism: Getting real about race in school.* The New Press.

Pollock, M., Deckman, S., Mira, M., & Shalaby, C. (2010). ‘But what can I do?’: Three necessary tensions in teaching teachers about race. *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*(3), 211-224.

Ponder, J., Vander Veldt, M., & Lewis-Ferrell, G. (2011). Citizenship, curriculum, and critical thinking beyond the four walls of the classroom: Linking the academic content with service-learning. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 38*(4), 45-72.

Provincial Archives of Saskatchewan. (n.d.). *Homesteading.* https://www.saskarchives.com/collections/land-records/history-and-background-administration-land-saskatchewan/homesteading

Randolph, J. (2009). A guide to writing the dissertation literature review. *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation, 14*(13), 1-13. https://doi.org/10.7275/b0az-8t74

Razack, S. (Ed.). (2002). *Race, space, and the law: Unmapping a White settler society.* Between the Lines.

Regnier, R. H. (1995). Warrior as pedagogue, pedagogue as warrior: Preliminary reflections on Aboriginal anti-racist pedagogy. In R. Ng, P. Staton, & J. Scane (Eds.), *Anti-racist, feminism, and critical approaches to education* (pp. 67-86). Greenwood Publishing Group Inc.

Regnier, R. H. (1998). Acting and taking care of people at the Saskatoon Native Survival School. *Our Schools Our Selves, 1*(1), 22-44.

Reid, A., Gill, J., & Sears, A. (2010). Forming of citizens in a globalising world. In A. Reid, J. Gill, & A. Sears (Eds.), *Globalization, the nation-state and the citizen: Dilemmas and directions for civics and citizenship education* (pp. 3-18). Routledge.

Reimer, K., & McLean, L. (2009). Conceptual clarity and connections: Peace and global education and pre-service teachers. *Canadian Journal of Education, 32*(4), 903-926.

Rodriguez, D. (2009). The usual suspect: Negotiating White student resistance and teacher authority in a predominantly white classroom. *Cultural Studies - Critical Methodologies, 9*(4), 483-508. https://doi.org/10.1177/1532708608321504

Rogers, R., Malancharuvil-Berkes, E., Mosley, M., Hui, D., & O'Garro, J. G. (2005). Critical discourse analysis in education: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research, 75*(3), 365-416.

Ross, A., & Davies, I. (2018). Europe and global citizenship. In I. Davies et al. (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of global citizenship and education* (pp. 21-36). Springer Nature. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-59733-5

Ryan, J., Pollock, K., & Antonelli, F. (2009). Teacher diversity in Canada: Leaky pipelines, bottlenecks, and glass ceilings. *Canadian Journal of Education, 32*(3), 591-617.

Saskatchewan Site Document. (n.d.). *Course Professor's teaching philosophy statement.*

Saskatchewan Site Syllabus. (2019).

Saskatchewan Ministry of Education. (2008). *Mathematics 5.* Government of Saskatchewan.

Saskatchewan Ministry of Education. (2009). *Social Studies 9.* Government of Saskatchewan.

Saskatchewan Ministry of Education. (2010a). *Broad Areas of Learning*. Government of Saskatchewan.

Saskatchewan Ministry of Education. (2010b). *Cross-curricular Competencies.* Government of Saskatchewan.

Saskatchewan Ministry of Education. (2013). *Treaty Education.* Government of Saskatchewan.

Schick, C. (2000). 'By virtue of being white': Resistance in anti-racist pedagogy. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *3*(1), 83-101. http://doi.org/10.1080/713693016

Schick, C. (2002). Keeping the ivory tower white: Discourses of racial domination. In S. Razack (Ed.), *Race, space and the law: Unmapping a white settler society* (pp. 99-119). Between the Lines.

Schick, C. & St. Denis, V. (2003). What makes anti-racist pedagogy in teacher education difficult? Three popular ideological assumptions. *Alberta Journal of Education, 49*(1), 1-14.

Schick, C. & St. Denis, V. (2005). Troubling national discourses in anti-racist curricular planning. *Canadian Journal of Education, 28*(3), 295-317.

Schuguresnky, D., & Myers, J. P. (2003). Introduction: Citizenship education: Theory, research and practice. *Encounters on Education, 4*, 1-10. https://doi.org/10.24908/eoe-ese-rse.v4i0.655

Schweisfurth, M. (2006). Education for global citizenship: Teacher agency and curricular structure in Ontario schools. *Educational Review, 58*(1), 41-50.

Sears, A. (1994). Social studies as citizenship education in English Canada: A review of research. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 22*(1), 6-43.

Sears, A. (2004). In search of good citizens: Citizenship education and social studies in Canada. In A. Sears & I. Wright (Eds.), *Challenges and prospects for Canadian social studies* (pp. 90-106). Pacific Educational Press.

Sears, A. (2014). Measuring what matters: Citizenship domain. *Measuring what matters, people for education.* Toronto: People for Education.

Sears, A., & Hughes, A. (1996). Citizenship education and current educational reform. *Canadian Journal of Education, 21*(2), 123-142.

Sears, A., & Hughes, A. (2006). Citizenship: Education or indoctrination? *Citizenship Teaching and Learning*, *2*(1), 3-17.

Seixas, P., & Morton, T. (2012). *The big six historical thinking concepts.* Nelson Education.

Sensoy, Ö., & DiAngelo, R. (2017). *Is everyone really equal? An introduction to key concepts in social justice education* (2nd ed.). Teachers College Press.

Shultz, B., & Baricovich, J. (2010). Curriculum in the making: Theory, practice, and social action curriculum projects. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, *26*(2), 46-61.

Shultz, L. (2007). Educating for global citizenship: Conflicting agendas and understandings. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 53*(3), 248-258.

Shultz, L. (2011). Engaging the multiple discourses of global citizenship education within a Canadian university: Deliberation, contestations, and social justice possibilities. In L. Shultz, A. A. Abdi, & G. H. Richardson (Eds.), *Global citizenship education in post-secondary institutions: Theories, practices, policies* (pp. 13-24). Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.

Shultz, L. (2018). Global citizenship and equity: Cracking the code and finding decolonial possibility. In I. Davies et al. (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of global citizenship and education* (pp. 245-256). Springer Nature. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-59733-5

Shultz, L., Abdi, A. A., & Richardson, G. H. (Eds.). (2011). *Global citizenship education in post-secondary institutions: Theories, practices, policies.* Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.

Sleeter, C. E. (2001). Preparing teachers for culturally diverse schools: Research and the overwhelming presence of Whiteness. *Journal of Teacher Education, 52*(2), 94-106.

Sleeter, C. E. (2004). How White teachers construct race. In G. Ladson-Billings & D. Gillborn (Eds.), *The RoutledgeFalmer reader in multicultural education* (pp 163-177).

Sleeter, C. E. (2017). Critical Race Theory and the whiteness of teacher education. *Urban Education, 52*(2), 155-169. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085916668957

Smith, B., & Rogers, P. (2015). Towards a theory of decolonizing citizenship. *Citizenship Education Research Journal*, *5*(1), 59-71.

Smith, B., Ng-A-Fook, N., Berry, S., & Spence, K. (2011). Deconstructing a curriculum of dominance: Teacher education, colonial frontier logics, and residential schooling. *Transnational Curriculum Inquiry, 8*(2), 53-70. http://nitinat.library.ubc.ca/ojs/index.php/tci

Smith, C. (Ed.). (2010). *Anti-racism in education: Missing in action. Our Schools/Our Selves.* Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.

Smith, K. (2016). *Curriculum, culture and citizenship education in Wales: Investigations into the curriculum cymreig*. Macmillan Publishers Ltd.

Smith, L. T. (2012). *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (2nd ed.). Zed Books Ltd.

Solomon, R. P., & Daniel, B. J. (2007). Discourses of race and 'White privilege' in the next generation of teachers. In P. R. Carr & D. E. Lund (Eds.), *The great white north? Exploring whiteness, privilege and identity in education* (pp. 161-172). Sense Publishers.

Solomon, R. P., Portelli, J. P., Daniel, B. J., & Campbell, A. (2005). The discourse of denial: How White teacher candidates construct race, racism and 'white privilege.' *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *8*(2), 147-169. http://doi.org/10.1080/1361332050011059

Solórzano, D. G. (1998). Critical Race Theory, race and gender microaggressions, and the experience of Chicana and Chicano scholars. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 11*(1), 121-136.

Solórzano, D. G., & Yosso, T. (2009). Critical race methodology: Counter-storytelling as an analytical framework for educational research. In E. Taylor, D. Gillborn, & G. Ladson-Billings (Eds.), *Foundations of critical race theory* (pp. 131-147). Routledge.

Sonn, C. C. (2008). Educating for anti-racism: Producing and reproducing race and power in a university classroom. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 11*(2), 155-166.

Spooner, M., & McNinch, J. (2018). *Dissident knowledge in higher education.* University of Regina Press.

St. Denis, V. (2007). Uniting Aboriginal education with anti-racist education: Building alliances across cultural and racial identity politics. *Canadian Journal of Education, 30*(4), 1068-1092.

St. Denis, V. (2009). Rethinking cultural theory in Aboriginal education. In C. Levine-Rasky, (Ed.), *Canadian perspectives on the sociology of education* (pp. 163-182). Oxford University Press.

St. Denis, V. (2011). Silencing Aboriginal curricular content and perspectives through multiculturalism: 'There are other children here'. *The Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies, 33*, 306-317.

St. Denis, V. (2019). *Personal communication.*

Stanley, T. J. (2006). Whose public? Whose memory? Racism, grand narratives, and Canadian history. In R. Sandwell (Ed.), *To the past: History education, public memory, and citizenship in Canada* (pp. 32-49). University of Toronto Press, Inc.

Stanley, T. J. (2011). *Contesting white supremacy: school segregation, anti-racism, and the making of Chinese Canadians.* UBC Press

Stanley, T. J. (2014). Antiracism without guarantees: A framework for rethinking racism in schools. *Critical Literacy: Theories and Practices, 8*(1), 4-19.

Stanley, T. J. (2016). John A. Macdonald, 'the Chinese' and racist state formation in Canada. *Journal of Critical race Inquiry, 3*(1), 6-34.

Starblanket, T. (2018). *Suffer the little children: Genocide, Indigenous nations and the Canadian state.* Clarity Press, Inc.

Statistics Canada. (2016a). *Aboriginal population profile, 2016 census: Province of Ontario*. https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/dp-pd/abpopprof/details/Page.cfm?Lang=E&Geo1=PR&Code1=35&Data=Count&SearchText=Ontario&SearchType=Begins&B1=All&C1=All&GeoLevel=PR&GeoCode=35&SEX_ID=1&AGE_ID=1&RESGEO_ID=1

Statistics Canada. (2016b). *Aboriginal population profile, 2016 census: Province of Saskatchewan.* https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/dp-pd/abpopprof/details/page.cfm?Lang=E&Geo1=PR&Code1=47&Data=Count&SearchText=Saskatchewan&SearchType=Begins&B1=All&C1=All&SEX_ID=1&AGE_ID=1&RESGEO_ID=1

Statistics Canada. (2016c). *Focus on geography series, 2016 census: Immigration and ethnocultural diversity, province of Ontario.* https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/as-sa/fogs-spg/Facts-PR-Eng.cfm?TOPIC=7&LANG=Eng&GK=PR&GC=35

Statistics Canada. (2016d). *Focus on geography series, 2016 census: Immigration and ethnocultural diversity, province of Saskatchewan*. https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-

recensement/2016/as-sa/fogs-spg/Facts-PR-Eng.cfm?TOPIC=7&LANG=Eng&GK=PR&GC=47

Statistics Canada. (2016e). *Census profile*. https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/dp-pd/dt-td/Rp-eng.cfm?TABID=2&LANG=E&APATH=3&DETAIL=0&DIM=0&FL=A&FREE=0&GC=0&GK=0&GRP=1&PID=112126&PRID=10&PTYPE=109445&S=0&SHOWALL=0&SUB=0&Temporal=2017&THEME=124&VID=0&VNAMEE=&VNAMEF=

Statistics Canada. (2016f). *Visible minorities, among the school age population, in and out of census metropolitan areas.* https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/t1/tbl1/en/tv.action?pid=3710009803

Statistics Canada. (2016g). *Visible minority, labour force status.* https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/dp-pd/dt-td/Rp-eng.cfm?TABID=2&LANG=E&APATH=3&DETAIL=0&DIM=0&FL=A&FREE=0&GC=0&GK=0&GRP=1&PID=112125&PRID=10&PTYPE=109445&S=0&SHOWALL=0&SUB=0&Temporal=2016&THEME=124&VID=0&VNAMEE=&VNAMEF=

Statistics Canada. (2018). *Proportion of educators in public elementary and secondary schools by sex*. https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/dp-pd/dt-td/Rp-eng.cfm?LANG=E&APATH=3&DETAIL=0&DIM=0&FL=A&FREE=0&GC=0&GID=0&GK=0&GRP=1&PID=110696&PRID=10&PTYPE=109445&S=0&SHOWALL=0&SUB=0&Temporal=2017&THEME=124&VID=0&VNAMEE=&VNAMEF=

Stein, S. (2015). Mapping global citizenship. *Journal of College & Character, 16*(4), 242-252

Stein, S., & Andreotti, V. (2016). Postcolonial insights for engaging difference in educational approaches to social justice and citizenship. In A. Peterson, R. Hattam, M. Zembylas, &

J. Arthur (Eds.), *The Palgrave international handbook of education for citizenship and social justice* (pp. 229-245). Palgrave Macmillan.

Stenhouse, V. L., & Jarrett, O. S. (2012, Winter). In the service of learning and activism: Service learning, critical pedagogy, and the Problem Solution Project. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 51-76.

Stewart, M. (2019, December 5). Remembering Neil Stonechild and exposing systemic racism in policing. *The Conversation.* Retrieved June 23, 2020, from https://theconversation.com/remembering-neil-stonechild-and-exposing-systemic-racism-in-policing-128436

Strong-Boag, V. (2002). Who counts? Late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century struggles about gender, race, and class in Canada. In Y. M. Hebert (Ed.), *Citizenship in transformation in Canada* (pp. 37-56). University of Toronto Press.

Sulentic Dowell, M. M. (2008). Academic service learning as pedagogy: An approach to preparing preservice teachers for urban classrooms. *Journal of Teaching and Learning*, *5*(2), 1-21.

Sunal, C., Kelley, L., & Sunal, D. (2009). Citizenship education in the elementary classroom: Teacher candidates photograph and describe their perceptions. *The Journal of Social Studies Research*, *33*(1), 33-70.

Tanovich, D. M. (2018, October 2). Safeguarding trials from racial bias. *Policy Options*. SSRN. Retrieved March 7, 2020, from https://ssrn.com/abstract=3453272

Tatum, B. D. (1997). *Why are all the Black kids sitting together in the cafeteria? And other conversations about race.* Basic Books.

Taylor, D. (1989). Citizenship and social power. *Critical Social Policy, 9*(26), 19-31.

Thomas, A-R. (2019, February 15). *Who is a settler, according to Indigenous and Black scholars: Descendants of slaves in Canada don't fit into our common definition.* Vice Canada. Retrieved March 12, 2019, from https://www.vice.com/en_ca/article/gyajj4/who-is-a-settler-according-to-indigenous-and-black-scholars?fbclid=IwAR3zoYgWCSA5NFIZMmc8csSF7A_zrEazZwFYJRiBx_WfrTqg0Jl21dg3jvQ

Tinkler, B., & Tinkler, A. (2013). Experiencing the other: The impact of service-learning on preservice teachers' perceptions of diversity. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *40*(4), 41-62.

Tomkins, G. S. (1986). *A common countenance: Stability and change in the Canadian curriculum.* Prentice-Hall Canada Inc.

Torney-Purta, J. (2002). A school's role in developing civic engagement: A study of adolescents in twenty-eight countries. *Applied Developmental Science, 6*(4), 203-212.

Tremblay, P. C. (2001). *First Nations educational jurisdiction: National background paper.* Assembly of First Nations.

Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. (2015a). *Final report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada: Canada's Residential Schools: The history, part 1, origins to 1939.* Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada.

Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. (2015b). *Final report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada: Summary: Honouring the truth, reconciling for the future.* Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada.

Tuck, E. (2009). Re-visioning action: Participatory action research and Indigenous theories of change. *Urban Rev, 41*, 47-65.

Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society, 1*(1), 1-40.

Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2014). Introduction to youth resistance research and theories of change. In E. Tuck & K. W. Yang (Eds.), *Youth resistance research and theories of change* (pp. 2-23). Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Tupper, J. (2011). Disrupting ignorance and settler identities: The challenges of preparing beginning teachers for treaty education. *In Education, 17*(3), 38-55.

Tupper, J., & Cappello, M. (2010). Locating citizenship: Curriculum, social class and the 'good' citizen. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 38*(3), 298-327.

Tupper, J., & Cappello, M. (2012). (Re)creating citizenship: Saskatchewan high school students' understanding of the 'good' citizen. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 44*(1), 37-59.

Ullucci, K., & Battey, D. (2011). Exposing color blindness/grounding color consciousness. *Urban Education, 46*(6), 1195-1225. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085911413150

Urrieta, L. Jr., & Reidel, M. (2008). Citizenship normalizing and White preservice social studies teachers. *Social Justice, 35*(1), 91-108.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Discourse and Society, 4*(2), 249-283.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Critical Discourse Analysis. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (pp. 352-371). Blackwell Publishers, Inc.

Veracini, L. (2010). *Settler colonialism.* Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230299191

Veracini, L. (2019). Containment, elimination, endogeneity: Settler colonialism in the global present. *Rethinking Marxism, 31*(1), 118-140. https://doi.org/10.1080/08935696.2019.1577611

Warren, C. A. (2018). Empathy, teacher dispositions, and preparation for culturally responsive pedagogy. *Journal of Teacher Education, 69*(2), 169-183.

Watters, J. A. (2007). *Reproducing Canada's colonial legacy: A critical analysis of Aboriginal issues in Ontario high school curriculum.* [Master's thesis, Queens University]. Queen's Graduate Theses and Dissertations. http://hdl.handle.net/1974/656

Westheimer, J. & Kahne, J. (2004). What kind of citizen? The politics of educating for democracy. *American Educational Research Journal, 41*(2), 237-269.

Wilkinson, G. (2007). Civic professionalism: Teacher education and professional ideals and values in a commercialised education world. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 33*(3), 379-395. https://doi.org/10.1080/02607470701450593

Winton, S. (2010). Character development and critical democratic education in Ontario, Canada. *Canada, Leadership and Policy in Schools, 9*(2), 220-237. https://doi.org/10.1080/15700760903100758

Wolfe, P. (1999). *Settler colonialism and the transformation of anthropology: The politics and poetics of an ethnographic event.* Cassell.

Wolfe, P. (2006). Settler colonialism and the elimination of the native. *Journal of Genocide Research, 8*(4), 387-409.

Wolfe, P. (2016). *Traces of history: elementary structures of race.* American Indian Studies Center.

Woons, M. (2014). Decolonizing Canadian citizenship: Shared belonging, not shared identity. *Settler Colonial Studies, 4*(2), 192-208. https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2013.809838

Yemini, M. (2017). *Internationalization and global citizenship.* Springer International Publishing AG.

Yin, R. K. (1982). Studying phenomenon and context across sites. *American Behavioral Scientist, 26*(1), 84-100.

Yin, R. K. (2009). How to do better case studies. In L. Bickman & D. J. Rog (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of applied social research methods* (2nd ed., pp. 254-282). SAGE Publications, Inc. https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781483348858.n8

Yin, R. K. (2013). Validity and generalization in future case study evaluations. *Evaluation, 19*(3), 321-332. https://doi.org/10.1177/1356389013497081

Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research: Design and method* (5th ed.). SAGE.

Young, I. M. (2011). *Justice and the politics of difference*. Princeton University Press.

Young, J. (1995). Multicultural and anti-racist teacher education: A comparison of Canadian and British experience in the 1970s and 1980s. In R. Ng., P. Staton, & J. Scane (Eds.), *Anti-racism, feminism, and critical approaches to education* (pp. 45-63). Greenwood Publishing Group Inc.

Young, M. J. (2010). Problems with global education: Conceptual contradictions. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 56*(2), 143-156.

Zahabioun, S., Yousefy, A., Yarmohammadian, M. H., & Keshtiaray, N. (2013). Global citizenship education and its implications for curriculum goals in the age of globalization. *International Education Studies, 6*(1), 195-206.

Appendices

Appendix A - Soft versus Critical Global Citizenship Education Spectrum (Andreotti, 2006, pp. 46-48).

	Soft Citizenship Education	Critical Citizenship Education
Problem	Poverty, helplessness.	Inequality, injustice.
Nature of Problem	Lack of 'development', education, resources, skills, culture, technology, etc.	Complex structures, systems, assumptions, power relations and attitudes that create and maintain exploitation and enforced disempowerment and tend to eliminate difference.
Justification for positions of privilege (in the North and in the South)	'Development', 'history', education, harder work, better organization, better use of resources, technology.	Benefit from and control over unjust and violent systems and structures.
Basis for caring	Common humanity/being good/sharing and caring. Responsibility FOR the other (or to teach the other).	Justice/complicity in harm. Responsibility TOWARDS the other (or to learn with the other) accountability.
Grounds for acting	Humanitarian/moral (based on normative principles for thought and action).	Political/ethical (based on normative principles for relationships).
Understanding of interdependence	We are all equally interconnected, we all want the same thing, we can all do the same thing.	Asymmetrical globalization, unequal power relations, Northern and Southern elites imposing own assumptions as universal.
What needs to change	Structures, institutions and individuals that are a barrier to development.	Structures, (belief) systems, institutions, assumptions, cultures, individuals, relationships.
What for	So that everyone achieves development, harmony, tolerance and equality.	So that injustices are addressed, more equal grounds for dialogue are created, and people can have more autonomy to define their own development.

Role of 'ordinary' individuals	Some individuals are part of the problem, but ordinary people are part of the solution as they can create pressure to change structures.	We are all part of the problem and part of the solution.
What individuals can do	Support campaigns to change structures, donate time, expertise, and resources.	Analyze own position/context and participate in changing structures, assumptions, identities, attitudes and power relations in their contexts.
How does change happen	From the outside to the inside (imposed change).	From the inside to the outside.
Basic principle for change	Universalism (nonnegotiable vision of how everyone should live what everyone should want or should be).	Reflexivity, dialogue, contingency and an ethical relation to difference (radical alterity).
Goal of citizenship education	Empower individuals to act (or become active citizens) according to what has been defined for them as a good life or ideal world.	Empower individuals to reflect critically on the legacies and processes of their cultures, to imagine different futures and to take responsibility for decisions and actions.
Strategies for citizenship education	Raising awareness of global issues and promoting campaigns.	Promoting engagement with global issues and perspectives and an ethical relationship to difference, addressing complexity and power relations.
Potential benefits of citizenship education	Greater awareness of some of the problems, support for campaigns, greater motivation to help/do something, feel good factor.	Independent/critical thinking and more informed, responsible and ethical action.
Potential problems	Feeling of self-importance and self-righteousness and/or cultural supremacy, reinforcement of colonial assumptions and relations, reinforcement of privilege, partial alienation, uncritical action.	Guilt, internal conflict and paralysis, critical disengagement, feeling of helplessness.

Appendix B - Consent Form

CONSENT FORM: Teacher Candidate Participants

Researcher:	Advisor:
Jenn Bergen, MPA	Dr. Lorna McLean
PhD Candidate	Professor
Faculty of Education, U of O	Faculty of Education, U of O

Study: Teacher Candidates' Civic Identities

Invitation to Participate: You are invited to participate in Teacher Candidates' Civic Identities, a study conducted by Jennifer Bergen, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of doctorate in Education.

Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this research study is to understand how participating in mandatory coursework that discusses justice-oriented education will affect the civic identities and pedagogical choices of teacher candidates.

Participation: Your participation in this study will consist of completing two online surveys (10-minutes each) at the start and completion of the project, submitting co-researcher observations by email throughout the course (four, 10-minute responses), and participating in a post-project focus group or interview (one hour, audio recorded). The total estimated time for project participation is two hours (including surveys, co-researcher observations, and focus groups or interviews).

Benefits: Your participation in this study will allow the researcher to gain a better understanding of the development of civics and justice-oriented teaching pedagogy. Further, your participation will allow you to reflect on the development of your own teaching practices.

Compensation: All participants will receive a $20.00 gift certificate during the focus groups or interviews. Participants who choose to withdraw earlier in the project will still be eligible to receive and keep the compensation.

Confidentiality: All surveys and co-researcher observations will be confidential. The contents of the surveys and focus group or interview will be used only for the purposes explained above. Further, in publications related to the research, your confidentiality will be protected using pseudo names.

Risks: Participant confidentiality will be protected partially: pseudo names will be used on surveys, co-researcher observations, and in reference to information collected during the focus groups or interviews. The researcher guarantees that they will keep information confidential, however, full confidentiality cannot be guaranteed given the nature of a focus group setting.

Conservation of data: Electronic survey data will be stored online in the researcher's password protected SurveyMonkey account. Once data collection is complete, this information will be downloaded and removed from the server. A copy of the digital data will then be kept by the researcher in a password-protected file on their personal computer. All data will be securely destroyed five years after the completion of this research project.

Voluntary Participation: You are under no obligation to participate in this research. If you choose to participate, you may withdraw from the study at any time. Your choice to participate will not influence

your course grades and your course professor will not know which students have participated. You may request to have your survey and co-researcher data withdrawn after it has been submitted. Due to the inter-dependent nature of the focus group transcripts, data from the focus groups cannot be withdrawn. You may refuse to answer any questions, without suffering any negative consequences.

Acceptance: By agreeing to participate in the above research study through completing surveys, co-researcher observations, and focus groups or interviews, I understand that I am in no way waiving my rights to withdraw from the study at any time.

Please select one option:

☐ I agree to participate in the above mentioned study, and to keep identities and information discussed in the focus group confidential.

Name (printed): ____________________________ Signature: _____________________

Email address: _____________________________

☐ I respectfully decline participation in the above mentioned study.

If you have any questions about the study you may contact the researcher (Jenn) at the coordinates listed above.

If you have any ethical concerns regarding your participation, you may contact the Protocol Officer for Ethics in Research, University of Ottawa, 550 Cumberland St., Room 154, Ottawa, ON, K1N 6N5, (613) 562-5387, ethics@uottawa.ca.

Appendix C - Pre-course Survey and Post-course Survey Questions

1. Online pre-course survey with teacher candidates in Ontario and Saskatchewan:

* Remember, your responses are strictly confidential, and your participation in this study will not affect your course grade.*

1. Your participation in this research study will help the researcher understand how participating in mandatory coursework that discusses various critical approaches to education will affect your own identity and future pedagogical choices.
   - ☐ I agree to participate in this study.
   - ☐ I respectfully decline participation in this study.

2. In order to maintain anonymity, please create a pseudo name for yourself. Write this pseudo name down, and use the same pseudo name throughout this project.

3. Please provide the following demographic information:
   - ☐ Age:
   - ☐ Gender:
   - ☐ Ethnic / racial identity:
   - ☐ Sexual orientation:
   - ☐ Your future teaching areas (English, biology, etc.):
   - ☐ Your future teaching levels (primary, secondary, etc.):

4. How would you describe your current awareness of democratic processes (knowledge of current events, opinions on current issues, knowledge about campaigns in your community and city)?
   - ☐ Not at all aware
   - ☐ Not so aware
   - ☐ Somewhat aware
   - ☐ Very aware
   - ☐ Extremely aware

5. What issues are you concerned about? Please list as many as you wish!

6. How are you involved in your community (locally, nationally, or globally)? This can include anything from volunteering, sitting on committees or boards or councils, voting, going to rallies, public engagement work, etc.

7. How would you define the following?
   - Civic engagement?
   - Social justice?

- Anti-racism?

8. Describe your current confidence teaching:
    - Civic education
    - Social justice education
    - Anti-racist education

    Not at all confident - Not so confident - Somewhat confident - Very confident - Extremely confident

    Comments:

9. What are you hoping to learn about societal issues, civic engagement, social justice, and anti-racism (knowledge about specific issues, particular skills, etc.)? Is there anything you are hoping to learn, more generally, in this course?

2. Online post-course survey with teacher candidates in Ontario and Saskatchewan:

* Remember, your responses are strictly confidential, and your participation in this study will not affect your course grade.*

1. Please select your pseudo name from the dropdown list. If you do not see your name, or if you are new to the project, please create one for yourself below:
    - Pseudo Name:
    - Create:

2. How do you think that your identity (racial, sexual orientation, gender, etc.) will impact the way you teach? (For example, if you identify as white, what will this mean when you are teaching differently racialized students, or about Indigenous content? If you are heterosexual, what will this mean when you are striving for gender and sexual diversity in your classroom?)

3. How would you describe your current awareness of democratic processes (knowledge of current events, opinions on current issues, knowledge about campaigns in your community and city)?
    - ☐ Not at all aware
    - ☐ Not so aware
    - ☐ Somewhat aware
    - ☐ Very aware
    - ☐ Extremely aware

4. As a result of your coursework, have you become more civilly engaged in your community (local, national, or global), or do you plan to be? Please elaborate.

5. Did this course make you think about how your position yourself within systems of power (patriarchy, settler colonialism, capitalism)? If yes, how so?

6. How would you define the following now?
   - Civic engagement?
   - Social justice?
   - Anti-racism?

7. After this course, describe your current confidence teaching:
   - Civic education
   - Social justice education
   - Anti-racist education

   Not at all confident - Not so confident - Somewhat confident - Very confident - Extremely confident

   Comments:

8. Has participating in this course influenced the likelihood that you will use civic engagement, justice-oriented, or anti-racist practices in your future teaching? If yes – what from the course, in particular, do you think is responsible for your willingness to incorporate these approaches?

9. What do you find useful and/or challenging about developing civic engagement, social justice, and anti-racist education pedagogy?

Appendix D - Co-researcher Observation Prompts

Mid-point co-researcher observation prompt with Ontario and Saskatchewan teacher candidates:

1. Please select your pseudo name from the dropdown list. If you do not see your name, or if you are new to the project, please create one for yourself below:
    - Pseudo Name:
    - Create:

2. Based on what you have learned in the lectures, discussions, readings, and assignments in the course so far, what is something you are glad you learned (or are learning more about)? This can be anything from terminology, an idea, a concept, a realization, to a more nuanced understanding of a topic, system, the structure of schooling, etc. Please elaborate!

Appendix E - Focus Group Questions

Questions used with teacher candidates in Ontario:

1. As a future educator, how did this course influence your ideas about teaching for civic engagement, social justice, and/or anti-racism?

2. What was the most impactful thing you learned (the biggest 'take away' from this course)?

3. Do you consider planning and teaching lessons with anti-racist content or with a social justice component a form of civic action? Please elaborate.

4. What do you wish you could have learned more about?

Questions used with teacher candidates in Saskatchewan:

1. As a future educator, how did this course influence your ideas about teaching for civic engagement, social justice, and/or anti-racism?

2. What was the most impactful thing you learned (the biggest "take away" from this course)?

3. Do you consider planning and teaching lessons with anti-racist content or with a social justice component a form of civic action? Please elaborate.

4. How do you think the course professor's expertise influenced your learning in the course?

5. What do you wish you could have learned more about?