

# Uncovering White Settler Colonial Discourse in Curricula with Anticolonial Feminism

SHAWNA M. CARROLL  
*University of Toronto*

**T**HIS PAPER AIMS to uncover oppressive discourses within the Ontario English curricula for secondary schools (OMOE, 2007a, 2007b), but also examines the opportunities or possibilities within the curricula. Although this research focuses on the ‘Ontario’<sup>1</sup> curricula, my hope in writing this paper is that secondary school educators can use this paper to think about the ways in which the curricula and resources they are using in the classroom are also reproducing oppressive discourses. My passion to uncover these oppressive discourses within the curricula came out of my own experiences in the ‘Ontario’ English secondary classroom. Through my schooling experiences, I felt there was a severe lack of fiction that was accessible to me. I did not enjoy reading fiction because I could never connect with the characters, which were always white, male, and heterosexual. As a white, cisgender female with a ‘queer’<sup>2</sup> sexuality, I felt that coming to terms with my sexuality was only possible after it was affirmed in my adulthood.

This frustration I came to understand in my mid-twenties because of my silenced sexuality, turned into research on the lack of fiction and conversations about non-normative sexualities and genders available in secondary schools across ‘Canada’ (Ashcraft, 2012; Blackburn, 2012; Schrader & Wells, 2004). In order to understand the reasoning behind the lack of fiction in secondary schools, I started to understand the many forms of systemic oppression within ‘Canada.’ Understanding the history of ‘Canada’ and the current context of the land as colonized and as a settler colonial state informed the way I viewed the research and context. I realized it is not just genders and sexualities that must conform to the norm, but any subject position outside of what the white settler colonial state reinforces as ‘normal.’ Through my research, I started to understand

---

that this careful (re)production of what is normal helped to strengthen the subject positions of power held by the majority white, heterosexual man and its discourses.

In this paper, I argue that the Ontario English curricula for secondary schools (OMOE, 2007a, 2007b) (re)produce white settler colonial discourse, but there are also possibilities within the same documents. The English curricula are comprised of two documents, mandated by the provincial government in ‘Ontario’ and will be explained more in detail in the methodology section. In the sections that follow, I will explain what white settler colonial discourses are by explaining an anticolonial feminist framework. In order to uncover how white settler colonial discourses in the curricula are (re)produced and subverted, I explain my use of a critical discourse analysis. In the second part of the paper, I explain the findings as well as the implications of these findings. I conclude by summarizing the ways in which the English curricula for secondary schools (OMOE, 2007a, 2007b) (re)produce and create possibilities for the subversion of white settler colonial discourse. I hope this paper can be used as a tool for interrogating multiple other documents in secondary schools in order to find more ways to subvert white settler colonial discourse.

### **Understanding Anticolonial Feminism for This Project**

I explain a specific version of anticolonial feminism, which will be used as a lens for this study. As both a theory and practice, anticolonial feminisms have emerged from postcolonial, decolonial, and anticolonial theories with a strong focus on women of color feminisms within these frameworks (Mendoza, 2016). Each theory has come out of conversations about and against colonialism, or the “political control of a society and its people by a foreign ruling state... [where the] ruling state monopolizes political power and keeps the subordinated society and its people in a legally inferior position” (Herzog, 2013, p. 523). I do not center the terms neocolonialism or postcolonialism to signify an ‘after’ colonial rule in the North American context, as colonialism in North America did not end in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, but still continues today (Wolfe, 2006). I use anticolonial feminisms purposefully to speak against settler colonialism in the ‘Canadian,’ and more specifically the ‘Ontario’ context.

I situate this specific work within an anticolonial feminist framework as a conscious, political choice. Anticolonial feminisms can be defined as any work that seeks to critique colonialism with an understanding of the gendered processes within it. It is through this framing that I understand and take account of my positionality as a queer white woman on stolen land. Echoing Patel (2014), I do not feel comfortable to be in a place of instructing on the ways in which we can decolonize this settler colonial state. As a settler on this stolen land I come from different histories; however, this does not take away the responsibility I have to speak against and oppose settler colonialism, its logics, and its practices. As I come from a place of critique and a lens of anticolonial activism/action, I situate this work within anticolonial feminisms, while noting also my privilege and implicatedness in white privilege within these spaces.

It is my political responsibility as a white, cisgender female to utilize an ‘anti’ ‘colonial’ feminist framework in order to name and critique the white settler colonial discourses that oppress Indigenous, racialized, and non-binary peoples on stolen land (Finley, 2011; Kovach, 2009; Morgensen, 2015). I name the settler colonial discourse in the ‘Canadian’ context as white because of its particular white, Eurocentric, heteropatriarchal dominating histories. Because of my white settler positionality, I feel that I can name and take space within the anticolonial feminist field that

speaks against white feminism and the heteropatriarchal white settler colonial discourses in ‘Canada.’ In what follows, I explain how I understand a particular anticolonial feminism for this project.

### **White Settler Colonial Discourse Through an Anticolonial Feminist Lens**

Within the settler colonial state of ‘Canada,’ many every day practices (re)produce imperialist and colonial discourses, which is why it is important to name these practices, in order to challenge and deconstruct them. I refer to these discourses as “the way in which meanings and ideas are produced, mediated, and embodied in forms of knowledge, cultural experiences, social practices, and cultural artifacts” (Giroux, 2001, p. 209). These settler colonial discourses in ‘Canada’ (Rowe & Tuck, 2017), which I reframe as ‘white settler colonial’ discourses sustain and produce hierarchies (Giroux, 2001) and benefit those white, male, and heterosexual settlers who dominate in positions of power in the ‘Canadian’ context (Driskill, Finley, Gilley, & Morgensen, 2011). Explained within the conversation of constitutive subjectivities, it is important to note the complicated ways in which our multiple subject positions are always situated contextually and can be implicated both as oppressor and oppressed, and that these are not static and shift/change throughout histories and contexts. White settler colonial discourses oppress those who are not white and whose gender and sexual subjectivities do not conform to patriarchal “rigid colonial dichotomies” (Driskill, Finley, Gilley, & Morgensen, 2011, p. 215). However, these complicated relationships between power and oppression implicate people in different ways depending on their constitutive subjectivities, explained more next. For example, as a white, cisgender queer woman, I will experience privilege and discrimination within the settler state because of my multiple subject positions.

Using anticolonial feminisms allow me to understand “settler colonialism [as] the historical, institutional, and discursive root of heteronormative binary sex/gender systems on stolen land” (Driskill, Finley, Gilley, & Morgensen, 2011, p. 217). This anticolonial feminist framework questions nationalistic ideals of race, genders and sexuality, and how the perpetuation of heteronormative discourses (re)produce white settler colonial discourse.

### **Constitutive Subjectivities**

This anticolonial feminist framework understands subjectivities as constitutive of current and past contexts through Coloma’s (2008) theory of constitutive subjectivities. This theory allows us to understand our subjectivities as multiple, changing, and constitutive of our race/racialization, gender, sexuality, and culture within the settler colonial context. It moves the idea of subject positions from an “either/or” mindset to an understanding of subject positions as “both/and,” where they are seen as “always already refracted within and through each other” (Coloma, 2008, p. 20). Building on Black feminist theorists’ conceptualizations of the intersectionality of identities, I understand Coloma’s (2008) theory of constitutive subjectivities as complicating subject positions by taking note of the ways in which subject positions cannot be compartmentalized. I use the theory of constitutive subjectivities (Coloma, 2008), which takes into account multiple and varying subject positions and complicates understandings of binary notions of oppressed versus oppressor, as we are always implicated in both, and this implicatedness is always constitutive of the context.

This understanding of constitutive subjectivities allows me to uncover the ways in which the curricula tend to enforce a static understanding of identity.

### **Anti-Binary and Anti-Hierarchal Understandings of Subjectivities and Relationships**

Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak's (1988a, 1988b, 1988c) works are important in understanding how western discourses have silenced 'Third World' women. Spivak (1988a) examines the way the subaltern is created as a subject through assumptions of marginalized groups, according to dominant discourses. Western scholars' portrayals of the subaltern create an idea of a homogenous subaltern and are always (re)presented within the discourse where the subaltern do not have a speaking role, which is in itself an act of colonization. In order to subvert these colonial processes, Spivak (1988a) suggested speaking with, instead of listening to and speaking for the contextually marginalized person. If the goal is to 'give voice' to the subaltern, it will often (re)inscribe hierarchal relationships as there are assumptions of who is needing voice and who already has it. This framework and analysis of the curricula understands the importance of highlighting the heterogeneity of marginalized groups (Stein & Andreotti, 2015).

Spivak (2012) also helps to understand that there are choices beyond the either/or and the both/and (Gershon, 2015). Explained by Gershon (2015) of Spivak's (2012) work, the author encourages us to think of the opportunities for "neither/nor" (p. 10), which allows "the multiplicities of possibilities in both powerful and powerless" (p. 14). This way of thinking helps to understand the curricula and our subversions as complicated and multiple. It also aids in reflecting on the many ways of understanding the curricula and histories that aren't accounted for (Stein & Andreotti, 2015). Explained by Stein and Andreotti (2015), "our engagement must be ongoing—we cannot stop a conversation once we believe we have found the "right" theory" (p. 40). To assume that this version of anticolonial feminist theory is the 'right' theory, means to assume that this will help us 'overcome' oppression, which is not my intention. This theory is a way to open up the conversation and look at the ways in which we continually have to question norms and dominant narratives (Stein & Andreotti, 2015).

María Lugones (2010) explains how the "modern, colonial, gender system" (p. 742) hierarchizes categories of race, gender, and sexuality. Through Lugones' (2010) theory, I understand the coloniality of gender as an ongoing process that intersects gender, class, and race as central to the settler colonial system of domination (Lugones, 2010). Focusing on a pedagogy of resistance, Lugones (2010) understands resistance as the tension between the subjectification and subjectivity of the oppressive/resistance relationships. I utilize Lugones understandings of decolonizing gender as a critique of the "racialized, colonial, and capitalist heterosexualist gender oppression" (p. 746) and understand the colonized as invented by the process of colonization (Lugones, 2010). Lastly, Lugones (2010) contributes to the way I understand anticolonial feminisms as a process of resistance to the coloniality of gender by recognizing it and understanding its processes that infiltrate all aspects of subjectivities and lived experiences.

### **Inclusion as (Re)Producing White Settler Colonial Discourse**

Arvin, Tuck, and Morrill (2013) explain how "settler colonialism has been and continues to be a gendered process" (p. 9). Through examining Native feminist theories, the authors explain

that the goal of inclusion within activist projects is hierarchical, and inclusion goals overall are actually central to hierarchal processes within settler colonial states (Arvin, Tuck, & Morrill, 2013). I utilizes these understandings of ‘inclusive’ acts as problematic and situated within current discourses, and focus on the ways in which the curricula superficially aims to ‘include’ contextually marginalized groups and how this (re)produces hierarchical relationships that (re)produce white settler colonial discourse.

‘Turning away’ from white settler colonial curriculum theorists and focusing on the works and theories of decolonial, postcolonial, and anticolonial theorists is an important way in which we can name the racism and hierarchal thinking within curriculum studies (Gaztambide-Fernández & Murad, 2011). Curriculum studies “continues to be constrained by histories of oppression, violence, and displacement” (Gaztambide-Fernández & Murad, 2011, p. 14) and is central to the white settler colonial project of colonization and assimilation (Tuck & Gaztambide-Fernández, 2013). To critique curriculum and curriculum theory and its goals of inclusion and assimilation means to call attention to the ways in which curricula construct “non-white peoples as less than or not-quite civilized... and makes whiteness and white subjectivity both superior and normal” (Tuck & Gaztambide-Fernández, 2013, p. 74). It is these goals of ‘inclusion’ that further perpetuate settler colonialism, as they aim to assimilate and erase the other, “by always-already positioning the accumulated knowledge as other to, less refined, more subjective and less reliable than the whitestream” (Tuck & Gaztambide-Fernández, 2013, p. 82). This framework rejects the curricula’s attempts at inclusion and the multicultural framework, which “flattens difference into neat categories that ignores its fluidity but also seeks to filter out the oppression, violence, and difference inherent within the very definitions of difference” (Huddleston, 2015, p. 24)

### **Multiple Truths, Possibilities, and Openings**

Multiple truths, possibilities, circulations of power and oppression, and fluid constitutive subjectivities can be understood as key to the way in which I understand the anticolonial feminist theoretical framework. To use the anticolonial feminism theory I described above, means to also incorporate poststructural theories through the use of postcolonial and decolonial theorists which incorporate poststructural thought. The poststructural lens in this theoretical framework also allows me to open up the curricula in ways that allow for the showcasing of the multiple truths within it (Lather, 2016). This allows me to understand dominant discourses as reinforcing power structures and discourses in our current white settler colonial state. It also helps me to remain self-reflexive through the research and reminds me that I view and interpret this research through my particular lens using the discourses available to me. This theoretical framework also helps me explain the ways in which the curricula try to limit our understandings of multiple truths and subjectivities, in order to (re)enforce systemic power relations.

### **Discomfort as Necessary for White Settler Educators**

This theoretical framework understands discomfort as necessary to dismantle white settler colonial discourse. It also signals the need to recognize there is much that is irreconcilable within this work (Tuck & Yang, 2012). Drawing on the work of Spivak (2012), I understand double binds as productive, confusing, discomfoting spaces, which are necessary to recognize and dismantle

systemic “oppression and one’s place within it” (Huddleston, 2015, p. 23). Double binds recognize the possibilities within uncertainty (Huddleston & Helmsing, 2015) and become “productive spaces only when scholars are willing to remain awkwardly within them as opposed to exiting quickly” (Huddleston, 2015, p. 17). In order to subvert dominant discourses, those educators reading this that hold power because of their subject positions should remain awkwardly present and continue to be self-reflexive about one’s self, identifications, “life, research, and work” (Huddleston, 2015, p. 23). To stay awkwardly present means to hope for productive spaces to unravel white settler colonial discourse. This grappling with double binds and our place within systems of oppression means an engagement with the double binds, as “Just because you might move awkwardly does not mean you cannot move” (Huddleston, 2015, p. 27).

### **Critical Discourse Methodology**

This project includes a critical discourse analysis of two documents: “The Ontario Curriculum Grades 9 and 10: English” and “The Ontario Curriculum Grades 11 and 12: English” (OMOE, 2007a, 2007b). These two documents are developed and mandated by the ‘Ontario’ Ministry of Education and teachers must use these documents to create and structure their students’ learning goals and assessments each school year. With the exception of the elective courses in the documents, I analyze the documents in their entirety, including the mandatory English courses from the Grade 9 and 10 Academic/Applied and Grade 11 and 12 University/College/Workplace levels. Both curriculum documents also include an identical introductory section before the individual course curriculum expectations, which I include in my analysis.

Overall, each Ontario curriculum document is organized around a curriculum subject (in this case it is English) and is further broken down by grade (one document for grades 9 and 10 and one for grades 11 and 12). The English curricula documents are further organized by academic stream level (academic and applied in grades 9 and 10; workplace, college, college/university, and university in grades 11 and 12); strands (i.e., reading, writing, oral communication, and media literacy); overall expectations; and specific expectations. The specific expectations are organized by themes, depending on the strand. For example, in the writing strand, specific expectations are organized around: 1. developing and organizing content; 2. using knowledge of form and style; 3. applying knowledge of conventions; and 4. reflecting on skills and strategies. These themes are further broken down into categories such as critical literacy, spelling, and metacognition (just to name a few). Through the analysis, it was evident that many of the openings in the curricula were within this critical literacy specific expectation sub-theme. The two English documents were published in September 2007 and replaced the older English curricula documents that were published in 1999. Out of the 18 curriculum subjects mandated by the ‘Ontario’ Ministry of Education, the only subjects which have older documents than the English curricula include Native Languages (1999), Native Studies (1999), Interdisciplinary Studies (2002), Mathematics (2005), Business Studies (2006), and Guidance and Career Education (2006).

To enact a critical discourse analysis, means to examine language in order to uncover how what is said or not said reproduces oppressive structures (Schwandt, 2001). A critical discourse analysis methodology allows me to put my theoretical framework to work by looking at “the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context” (Van Dijk, 2001, p. 352). It also allows me to see the

multiple truths or multiple voices in the curricula that allowed for both (re)productions and subversions of the dominant white settler colonial discourse.

Using the anticolonial feminist theoretical framework explained above allowed me to uncover the colonizing aspects of the English curricula and how these can be subverted, focusing on white settler colonial normative sexualities, genders, race, culture, and capitalism. I analyzed how subject positions and relationships based on race, gender, sexuality, culture, and capitalism were introduced and contextualized within the documents. This critical discourse analysis “highlights how everyday language use is purposeful, embedded within social practice, signals identities and ideologies, and has active consequences” (Schieble, 2012, p. 211).

With my theoretical framework as a lens in this critical discourse analysis, I searched the documents for the following:

- what kind of language is used to introduce/describe sexuality, gender, race, culture, and capitalism?
- what texts are used as examples?; and
- what language is included/omitted to explain systemic forms of oppression?

I initially wanted to analyze the way ‘colonial’ or ‘colonialism’ is described in the documents; however, it is completely absent, so I analyzed the language used to describe capitalist practices instead. The omission of these words shows the glaring absence of critical analysis of structural forms of oppression in the current settler colonial context (Norton, 2011).

### **How the Documents (Re)produce & Subvert White Settler Colonial Discourse**

In the original draft of this paper, I simply critiqued the documents for the ways in which they reproduced white settler colonial discourse. After some reflection and feedback from mentors, I realized that this was the ‘easy way’ to do this project, and was not true to the theoretical framework. I went through the documents again with more ‘open’ eyes to look at not just the failures of the documents, but the many, various ways in which the documents speak about race, culture, gender, sexuality, and capitalism. The findings and analysis in this section then, show the various ways in which the documents (re)produce white settler colonial discourse, but also the moments within the curricula which create possibilities for subversions of the dominant white settler colonial discourse.

The documents have the same introductory section, which include many moments where there can be an opening of the curricula to anticolonial conversations. Some examples include: “Whatever the specific ways in which the requirements outlined in the expectations are implemented in the classroom, they must, wherever possible, be inclusive and reflect diversity of the student population and the population of the province” (OMOE 2007a, 2007b, p. 14); “Effective teaching approaches involve students in the use of higher-level thinking skills ... and to think about fairness, equity, social justice, and citizenship in a global society” (OMOE 2007a, 2007b, p. 28, 27); and,

The English curriculum takes into account that students in Ontario come from a wide variety of backgrounds and that every student has a unique set of perspectives, strengths, and needs... expose students to materials that reflect the diversity of Canadian and world cultures, including those of Aboriginal peoples. (OMOE 2007a, 2007b, p. 5)

These examples show how the curricula include the encouragement of critical thinking and there is an opening up of conversations around equity, social justice, and Indigeneity.

Both curricula also include a section in the introduction to explain the goals of “antidiscrimination education” in the English curriculum (OMOE 2007a, 2007b, p. 33-34). In this section, both curricula explain how the principles of antidiscrimination,

encourages staff and students alike to value and show respect for diversity in the school and the wider society. It requires schools to adopt measures to provide a safe environment for learning, free from harassment, violence, and expressions of hate. (OMOE 2007a, 2007b, p. 33)

Although the language does not discuss structural oppression, the conversation can start at the individual and gives the opportunity to continue this conversation ‘outwards’ to discuss the discourses behind harassment, violence, and hate.

This “antidiscrimination education” section of the curricula encourages the use of diverse learning tools that represent students and explains that a

broad range of students’ interests, backgrounds, cultures, and experiences are an important aspect of an inclusive English program... use materials that reflect the diversity of Canadian and world cultures, including those of contemporary First Nations, Métis, and Inuit peoples, and make them available to students. (OMOE 2007a, 2007b, p. 33)

Again, this opens up a conversation; however, there is no way to know how these goals are implemented into the classroom by just looking at the curricula. This section explains that teachers bring critical literacy into their classrooms to have students question issues of power and justice in contemporary society, and then quickly brings the conversation back to the individual by explaining that students are given the “opportunity to explore the social and emotional impact of bullying, violence, and discrimination in the form of racism, sexism, or homophobia on individuals and families” (OMOE 2007a, 2007b, p. 34). Theorizing this through the anticolonial feminist framework, means to look at the ways that these aims of the curricula, although the intention may or may not be good, often (re)produce white settler colonial discourse. The language used to create critical literacy focuses on ‘inclusion’ into the ‘multicultural’ society of Canada without a conversation about colonialism, Indigeneity, or who is being included into what. This “liberal multicultural discourse” ignores Indigenous sovereignty and side steps the conversation of what teachers are asking students to be included into, and on whose terms (Arvin, Tuck, & Morrill, 2013, p.10).

With this in mind, I analyze the curriculum and grouped the findings and analysis into four sections: normative identities and families, gender binaries and stereotypes, racism coded as culture, and settler colonialism coded as capitalism. I deconstructed how the documents introduce or describe sexuality, gender, race, culture, and capitalism, but of course these conversations and subject positions overlap one another among the themes. Throughout the entirety of the documents, race/racism and sexuality/homophobia are only included in a list of differences and are excluded anywhere else in the documents. For example, when speaking about critical literacy and identifying biases, teachers ask students: “What in the speaker’s background or experience [e.g., ethnocultural heritage, economic status, gender, sexual orientation, race, age, religion] might affect his or her position on the subject?” (OMOE, 2007a, p. 71). Therefore, my analysis of race and



sexuality are limited. The explicit omission or “spaces of silence” (Norton, 2011, p. 437), paired with the problematic way in which language is used in normative and damaging ways, shows how the curricula often perpetuate white settler colonial discourse that prizes white, heteropatriarchal subject positions.

### Normative Identities and Families

In both documents, there are opportunities to subvert the normative assumptions, largely through the ‘critical literacy’ sub-theme in the specific expectations sections of each of the four strands of the curriculum (as explained in the methodology, these four strands of the English curricula include: Oral Communication, Reading, Writing, and Media Studies). The critical literacy requirement in each strand ranges from asking students to name the voices that are not represented (OMOE, 2007a, p. 46, 78; OMOE, 2007b, p. 129), to asking students who the text is (not) written for (OMOE, 2007b, p. 133). Although this is a good start, the language used to create critical thinking is often problematic, in that its aim is inclusionary. As explained before, inclusionary methods ignore systemic oppression and assume marginalized people want to be ‘included’ into the dominant ideological system (Arvin, Tuck, & Morrill, 2013). There is no questioning of who is fitting into what and on whose terms. This creates an idea that oppression is based on individual acts. For example, the document guides students to think about exclusions in an author’s list and questions the “list maker,” which assumes the exclusions are based on the identity of the list maker, rather than larger systems of oppression (OMOE, 2007b, p. 97). Nowhere in the curricula is there a conversation about systemic forms of oppression or the history of systems of marginalization, (re)producing a liberal, individualistic rights discourse that ignores the larger systems of oppression.

The critical literacy sub-theme within the specific expectations often explain that individual acts can be remedied by an individual person, without a conversation about larger systems of oppression. For example, a Grade 11 and 12 expectation asks students to “examine their writing to check for bias and to determine whether their language and ideas are inclusive and non-discriminatory” (OMOE, 2007b, p. 52, 69, 86, 137). In another expectation, students are asked to “examine their writing to determine if they have used stereotypes, and remove them” (OMOE, 2007b, p. 137). These expectations are based on the assumption that one can just remove the exclusionary, discriminatory, or stereotypical language and the problem will be resolved. Although these expectations create a good starting point for teachers, without a conversation about why these exclusions, discrimination, and stereotypes entered the writing in the first place, the problem may stay within the individual’s writing and larger systems of oppression remain unquestioned.

The documents both begin with an introduction, which explain that,  
If [students] see themselves and others in the texts they study, they will be more engaged in learning and they will also come to appreciate the nature and value of a diverse, multicultural society. (OMOE, 2007a, 2007b, p. 4)

This passage is not the only instance where the documents aim to be inclusive; however, in many instances the documents negate their promises through the language they use in the specific expectations of the courses. For example, in the introductory section of both documents, the word ‘parents’ is used, but a footnote is added to explain that this is used as an inclusionary term “to

refer to parent(s) and guardian(s)” (OMOE, 2007a, 2007b, p. 6). It is evident this is a superficial attempt, as the document continuously use identifiers which assume biological parenthood, normative heteronormative living situations, and a binary gender system. Throughout the documents, the students are referred to as “daughters and sons” as well as “their children” of the “parents” (OMOE, 2007a, 2007b, p. 6). This helps to reinforce heteronormative subject positions by negating other types of families through the assumptions and language used, which (re)produces a normative white settler colonial understanding of families.

The attempt at inclusion and lack of conversation around systemic oppression helps to (re)produce hierarchies in identities. As explained by Arvin, Tuck, & Morrill (2013), inclusionary practices are not effective often because they do not critique the underlying systems of oppression and are hierarchical. In addition to this, inclusion into white settler colonial discourse, means inclusion into colonization, war, and other oppressive actions (Arvin, Tuck, & Morrill, 2013). Structural change is needed, not inclusion into a broken system that benefits those that conform to white settler colonial discourse. Therefore, even though the attempts of inclusion are superficial, if inclusion was in fact met, it would not be desirable for those who do not adhere to a white settler colonial discourse.

Although there are many problematic ways in which oppression and inclusion are discussed in the curricula, there are opportunities for discussion or openings of the curricula. In many instances, the curricula create a space within the critical literacy sub-theme throughout the four strands to have students question oppression. Pushing beyond inclusionary goals, the curricula create opportunities for students to question stereotypes in the media and texts (OMOE, 2007a, p. 85). For example, the Grade 10 Applied course asks students to “explain how the ability to identify various kinds of stereotypes in ads – of families, teenagers, Aboriginal people, religious groups – helped them to create their own ads without stereotypes” (OMOE, 2007a, p. 97). Again, in this instance it would be beneficial for students and teachers to question why there are certain stereotypes and the structural forms of oppression behind stereotypes, which could create many possibilities to subvert the white settler colonial discourse.

Within the critical literacy sub-theme of the specific expectations there are opportunities for students to compare different subject positions and how their own experiences influence their thinking about different topics. For example, students are asked to explain different “gender/sexual orientation/ability/age/economic circumstances” and how they are “similar to or different from those in other texts they are familiar with” (OMOE, 2007a, p. 60). They are also asked to question where their ideas are coming from (OMOE, 2007a, p. 64, 92) and to think about how the media and advertisers create texts for different audiences (OMOE, 2007b, p. 88). Lastly, there are opportunities for students to question “racist, sexist, or homophobic language and its effects on readers” (OMOE, 2007b, p. 51). Although there are many instances that the curricula (re)produce normative identities and family structures, there are also possibilities that open up the curricula in ways that subvert normative assumptions and language through critical literacy skills. It is important to continue to ask how teachers are reproducing normative identities and family structures through curricula and texts in order to create opportunities for subverting white settler colonial discourses.

### **Gender Binaries and Stereotypes**

I found many problematic instances of the way in which gender is described in the documents. The most glaring issue was the reproduction of a binary gender system with not a single reference to trans, gender-nonconforming, or gender queer students or teachers. When students are referred to as an individual, it is never with gender-neutral language but always “him or her,” “his or her,” or “he or she” (always with the masculine pronoun first). There is never a questioning of this binary gender system that white settler colonial discourse is built on (Driskill, Finley, Gilley, & Morgensen, 2011; Lugones, 2010). The documents try and extend thinking to question gender stereotypes and explain that “students are made aware of the historical, cultural, and political contexts for both the traditional and non-traditional gender and social roles represented in the materials they are studying,” but then explains that teachers’ learning materials should “involve protagonists of both sexes” (OMOE, 2007a, 2007b, p. 33). This statement reinforces a normative binary gender system, by excluding multiple other genders, which has been created by “rigid colonial dichotomies” (Driskill, Finley, Gilley, & Morgensen, 2011).

Although the intended goal of some student activities is to uncover gender stereotypes, the documents perpetuate them with the language used. For example, one document asks, “How does the politician use figurative language to persuade his audience to see his point of view?” (OMOE, 2007b, p. 43). Assuming the politician is male and always using masculine pronouns first, shown earlier, shows how the sexist, patriarchal white settler colonial discourse is embedded within the curricula to (re)produce males as higher in a binary gender hierarchy.

The documents also (re)produce gendered stereotypes and a binary gender system when selecting literature for the students. The documents explain,

Resources should be chosen... [for] their appeal for both girls and boys... many boys are interested in informational materials... as opposed to works of fiction, which are often more appealing to girls. (OMOE, 2007a, 2007b, p. 33)

This not only perpetuates a binary gender system by reinforcing ‘boys’ versus ‘girls,’ but it also perpetuates gender stereotypes by (re)enforcing normative interests. There are many additional instances where the documents perpetuate gendered stereotypes, including comparing or predicting “male and female responses” (OMOE, 2007a, p. 66, 95; 2007b, p. 51, 115), one of which is blatantly sexist and asks students to “predict how young, single males might respond to a car ad for a family van” (OMOE, 2007a, p. 66). This constant (re)enforcement and (re)production of a binary gender system and gender stereotypes is rooted in white settler colonial hierarchical understandings of gender throughout history (Lugones, 2010).

Genders and sexualities have and continue to be policed and suppressed by white settler colonial discourse. The heteronormative understanding of a binary, masculine/feminine sex/gender system is at the root of white settler colonial discourse (Driskill, Finley, Gilley, & Morgensen, 2011). This understanding of gender also creates an idea of identity that is static and stable, and one in which someone can ‘attain.’ Understanding our multiple and shifting understandings of our selves as constitutive subjectivities, allows for in between spaces of multiplicity and fluidity. Through the constant enforcement of a binary gendered system of male/female and masculine/feminine, the curricula ignore the multiple ways in which students understand them selves and ways in which they may not conform to white settler colonial gender stereotypes. In addition to this, the curricula separate gender without ever mentioning the multiple ways in which subjectivities intersect and interact with how one sees one’s self and how one is seen by others. Without an understanding of how race, gender, sexuality, class, ability, etc. are

interconnected, the curricula simplify gender and reproduces sexist, stereotypical, white settler colonial understandings of gender.

Although there are many ways in which the curricula (re)produce simplistic ideas of gender, which are often sexist and stereotypical, there are some instances in which the curricula could create possibilities to question these white settler colonial discourses. Often through the critical literacy sub-theme within specific expectations of each strand, students are asked to question assumptions about gender and gender stereotypes (OMOE, 2007b, p. 64, 115). Although sometimes problematic in that it assumes a binary gender system which the white settler colonial discourse is based on, as explained earlier, the curricula asks students to question if the “text make[s] an assumption about the gender of its readers,” before asking if it is “directed primarily to male or female readers” (OMOE, 2007b, p. 115). This creates an opportunity for students to question assumptions and stereotypes, but still relies on a binary understanding of gender. Overall, there are still individualistic goals and assumptions embedded within the curricula, which do not question systemic oppression of gender and sexuality. For example, the Grade 11 College course asks students, “What sort of power does the female protagonist have in this soap opera?” (OMOE, 2007b, p. 72). This could open up the possibilities of speaking about the patriarchal system, but instead, it focuses on the power of the individual female in this instance. Without a conversation about systemic oppression which implicates white, racialized, and Indigenous women and trans folks in different ways, students could be left with the allusion that power is only individual. Teachers can use these tools to speak with their secondary students about the ways in which their curricula or texts are speaking about gender through binary and stereotypical terms.

### **Racism Coded as Culture**

Initially, I wanted to analyze how the document introduced or described race and racism, but these topics are only spoken about within lists of ‘difference’ or ‘oppressions,’ again showing how discourses produce these “spaces of silence” (Norton, 2011, p. 437). This also creates a specific image of ‘the Other,’ which is not the dominant, where ‘the Other’ is created through assumptions and seen as homogenous (Spivak, 1988a). For example, in the list of differences often addressed, gender, race, and religion are included as simplified differences. Without an explanation on the ways in which oppressions are very different for Christians and Muslims, or Trans women of color and cisgender white women, for example, this attempt to group ‘oppressions’ invisibilizes the complex and interconnected ways in which people are marginalized due to their constitutive subjectivities (Coloma, 2008).

The curriculum for Grades 9 and 10 refer to “culturally appropriate” or “culturally acceptable” body language several times without reference to whose culture this is in comparison to or what culturally appropriate or acceptable means (OMOE, 2007a, p. 42, 44, 56). This comparison and hierarchy of the ‘home culture’ to ‘the Other’ is implicitly and explicitly embedded throughout the document. Students are asked to compare their cultures with a different culture (OMOE, 2007a, p. 45), without a critical analysis of what it means to do so or what the student’s culture is *different from* (Kumashiro, 2002). This also creates a hierarchy, which is embedded within white settler colonial discourse, where those that conform to the normative subject positions are seen as ‘normal,’ while those that do not are seen as in need of inclusion.

There are additional instances in the curriculum document that could become problematic in reference to culture. For example, students are asked to “use changes in voice to read different

characters' lines in a scene from a multicultural play" (OMOE, 2007a, p. 86) and are asked "what strategies would you use when addressing newcomers to Canada or those who may be hard of hearing?" (OMOE, 2007b, p. 44). These two instances that could include 'role play' could become very discriminatory in nature and could reproduce harmful stereotypes of marginalized groups, not to mention the fact that newcomers and those hard of hearing are grouped as though they are one in the same. This example shows the interconnected issues of ableism, racism, and the hierarchy of the English language, based on white settler colonial standards. Through the anticolonial feminist framework, we can turn to Spivak (1988a), who would explain this as part of the white settler colonial discourse that reproduces the idea that the subaltern or marginalized groups do not have a speaking role, but a space where people speak on behalf of them. In these colonial processes of marginalization, Spivak (1988a) encourages people to speak *with* those who are contextually marginalized, instead of speaking *for* them, as this (re)inscribes hierarchal relationships.

The documents also make assumptions with regards to culture, including assuming all students are Canadian and have a Canadian identity (OMOE, 2007a, p. 53). This invisibilizes the multiple subjectivities in what is now called 'Canada,' such as many different Indigenous nations across the province, permanent residents, non-status immigrants, and those with multiple citizenships. Related to this assumption of Canadian identity is a move to historicize and put Indigenous peoples in the past. This inclusion of Indigeneity as historical allows the reproduction of white settler colonial discourse, which imagines a "settler future" and "Indian past" (Tuck & Yang, 2012, p. 13). It is important for educators today to see colonization as an ongoing process which intersects race, gender, sexuality, and class, among other subject positions.

There are also ways in which the curricula do create space for conversations about race, racism, Indigeneity, and settler colonialism. Students are asked to name the social and ethnocultural groups that are excluded in media and other texts (OMOE, 2007a, p. 81; OMOE, 2007b, p. 47, 65, 72, 81). This naming of inclusion/exclusion does not question the underlying issue of systemic oppression and individualizing inclusion/exclusion as individual acts. The documents also ask students to question stereotypes within media and other texts (OMOE, 2007a, p. 43, 96; OMOE, 2007b, p. 61). For example, in the Grade 11 University course, the curriculum asks, "Are the portrayals of Aboriginal people in commercials mostly realistic or stereotypical?" (OMOE, 2007b, p. 56). This question could open a dialogue into the assumptions students have about Indigenous peoples and could create space for conversations about contemporary issues.

The curricula also create possibilities to question white settler colonial discourse by speaking about difference with regards to culture. Teachers are to ask students about the importance of understanding cultural differences and its effects on opinions and experiences (OMOE, 2007a, p. 57, 58, 74; OMOE, 2007b, p. 81, 124); common portrayals of marginalized groups (OMOE, 2007b, p. 89); different Aboriginal issues (OMOE, 2007a, p. 63, 71; OMOE, 2007b, p. 84, 107, 142); cultural events, such as Black History Month (OMOE, 2007a, p. 68, 91); and the contributions of Aboriginal people to 'Canadian' society (OMOE, 2007a, p. 76, 81; OMOE, 2007b, p. 68, 119, 132). Speaking about cultural differences could create possibilities for deconstructing white settler colonial discourse; however, if done within a liberal multicultural framework of inclusion, which often compares 'the Other' to the dominant white settler colonial subject, hierarchal relationships will be (re)inscribed. For example, the Grade 11 University course asks students, "Does your knowledge of *Aboriginal experience* help you understand the narrative?" (OMOE, 2007b, p. 47, emphasis added). Deconstructing this question allows us to think about how the curricula often assumes Indigenous peoples are one group, and discounts the multiple nations within what is now called 'Canada.' The curriculum is asking students to understand the Aboriginal 'experience' as if

it is a singular narrative. It is also important to note that the way in which the documents speak about culture is always separate from gender, sexuality, race, etc. Thinking about this, it is important for educators to reflect on the ways in which the documents they are using also share a ‘single’ version of very diverse subject positions.

### **Settler Colonialism Coded as Capitalism**

It is evident that the curricula are preparing students for employment in the capitalist economy. In several instances, the documents speak about the importance of language for postsecondary education and/or employers (OMOE, 2007a, 2007b, p. 17, 36, 44). For example, the Grade 11 University course asks students to “create a long-term strategy for raising their current oral communication knowledge and skills to the level needed for their choice of occupations or postsecondary programs” (OMOE, 2007b, p. 44). Looking back at the analysis of culture in the documents, it is evident that a specific version of English, or white settler colonial English, is what is seen as the ‘correct’ or successful version of English in this capitalist framework. As explained by Mendoza (2016), colonialism is what made capitalism possible, and to promote a capitalist society uncritically, means to ensure the freedom of some at the expense and subordination of others. It is also important to think about the ways in which capitalism and colonialism are constitutive of the ways in which race, gender, sexuality, ability, and culture are interconnected with one another. It is evident that capitalism is one of the ways in which marginalization continues to perpetuate hierarchies of oppression for those that do not conform to white settler colonial discourse through language, ability, race, and so on.

In addition to these instances where English is seen as a gateway to becoming a ‘successful’ member of the capitalist society, the documents are teaching students differently according to their academic level. There are many instances in which the Applied or College level courses are geared towards the workplace and working or lower class, compared to the university-streamed students, which are geared towards academia and the upper class. For example, Grades 10, 11, and 12 encourage the use of Shakespeare at the Academic and University levels, while it is not mentioned in the Applied, College, and Workplace levels in any grade. Although the merit of including Shakespeare at all should be in question, this inclusion of Shakespeare in only the upper level courses is a glaring example of how class hierarchies are embedded within curricula.

Through an anticolonial feminist framework, we can see the way in which class hierarchies are embedded in the curricula. This cannot be separated from the ways that race, gender, sexuality, and culture are constitutive of these processes of marginalization. Reproducing marginalized class levels will (re)produce the oppression of these already marginalized groups. As explained by Lugones (2010), Mendoza (2016), and Mohanty (2003), these processes of marginalization among race, gender, sexuality, and class are inseparable and mutually constitutive within systemic power relations.

There are opportunities for an opening up of the idea of settler colonialism and capitalism when the Grade 12 College course asks students to “use standard Canadian English to participate in a panel discussion on gender or racial stereotyping in music videos” (OMOE, 2007b, p. 112). This has the possibility to create a conversation around stereotypes, but it is embedded within capitalist terms of ‘standard Canadian English,’ without ever deconstructing other types of English or why ‘standard Canadian English’ is the one to be attained. Another opening up of the conversation is shown when the Grade 12 course asks, “How might college websites encourage a

diverse range of students, including students with disabilities and Aboriginal students, to apply to the college?” (OMOE, 2007b, p. 123). Although this opens up the conversation to diversity, it does not deconstruct the ways in which including students who are Indigenous or have disabilities is a way in which capitalism benefits through superficial inclusive advertising.

### Implications and Next Steps

Understanding how curricula introduce and describe sexuality, gender, race, culture, and capitalism is important, as the documents aim to be inclusive in their introductory goals, but throughout the documents' expectations they (re)produce normative family structures; a binary gender system; sexist views of women; gender stereotypes; individualistic ideas about the problems and solutions of power and oppression; hierarchies of 'the norm' and 'the other;' stereotypes of racialized groups through role play; an "Indian past and settler future" (Tuck & Yang, 2012, p. 13); capitalist ideology without critique; and class structures based on streaming.

Although I categorized the findings into four main themes, it is evident that these themes overlap and are all interconnected in the complex ways in which white settler colonial discourse is reproduced throughout the settler society and education system. Shown through the findings, the separation of subject positions reinforces superficial, binary, and static understandings of subject positions. These static understandings puts the focus on individuals, rather than understanding the systemic forms of oppression that affect people in multiple ways.

In addition to these findings, there were some openings, possibilities, and multiple truths that the curricula provide for subversions of the white settler colonial discourse. Throughout the documents, students are encouraged to use their critical thinking skills to speak about equity, social justice, citizenship, and racist, sexist, and homophobic language. The curricula do encourage discussions about Aboriginal issues and contributions, and cultural events. Although sometimes framed in problematic ways, there are opportunities within the curricula to subvert white settler colonial discourse. It is here that I urge teachers to linger and remain in the uncomfortable and awkward, yet productive spaces of uncertainty (Huddleston, 2015).

As many teacher training programs are comprised of a majority of white students who are learning to teach a white settler colonial curriculum, teachers are being trained to teach in ways that reproduce whiteness (Bonilla-Silva, 2005; Sleeter, 2001) or white settler colonial discourse. It is important for teachers who hold privilege to stay within these uncomfortable spaces (Huddleston, 2015) and recognize the ways in which the curricula and resources they are using reproduce white settler colonial discourse. When teachers recognize the ways they are reproducing this discourse, they can start to work at changing these teaching methods, or recognize the ways in which there is much that is irreconcilable between the curricula goals and their own political commitments to social justice and anticolonial initiatives (Tuck & Yang, 2012). However, through analyzing or asking questions of the documents they utilize, teachers can discover the ways their own teachings reproduce normative identities and families, gender binaries and stereotypes, racism, and settler colonial capitalist ideals, and begin to find ways to move beyond these white settler colonial discourses.

This is a space where teachers and students can work together to dissect the documents/texts they use in classrooms to uncover the dominant discourses embedded within them. Looking at the results of these findings, teachers can utilize this analysis as a guide to question their own curricula and resources. On their own or with students, educators can ask questions of the documents they

use and carefully read the ways the documents use language to reproduce systems of power and oppression. Teachers could start by mirroring the theoretical framework and analysis in this article and ask the texts they are working with:

- what kind of language is used to introduce/describe sexuality, gender, race, culture, and capitalism?;
- what texts/media are used as examples?;
- what language is included/omitted to explain systemic forms of oppression?; and
- how is colonialism and land/property described in the text?

The questions the teacher and/or students ask of the texts depends on the context in and land on which one teaches, and could also be co-developed between students and teacher.

Overall, the implications of these findings show how the mask of equity and liberal multiculturalism in ‘Ontario’ can hide the (re)production of dangerous white settler colonial discourses and narratives. It is important for teachers to examine the curricula or resources they work with to analyze the ways they reproduce white settler colonial discourse. Within the Ontario English curricula, there still is no interrogation of structural forms of power or oppression or Indigenous genocide. This in addition to the explicit (re)enforcing of binaries, hierarchies, and gendered stereotypes enables the white settler colonial discourse to remain the dominant discourse which invisibilizes Indigenous nations current and past struggles with the settler colonial state.

Of course, there are limitations to the research that I have completed here. Conducting a critical discourse analysis uncovered the ways in which the curricula are (re)producing and creating spaces for the subversion of white settler colonial discourses, but it does not necessarily help make the issues disappear. A look into the ways that we can subvert these dominant discourses within the classroom is necessary to understand the ways in which people resist, refuse, and persist within current contexts. By deconstructing the way in which curricula are constructed and enacted, teachers and students can uncover and critique the oppressive systems that are being reproduced through the documents in their own contexts.

Staying in these uncomfortable spaces, further research using this framework can continue to look for the multiplicities in curricula and classrooms and to uncover systemic power and oppression as well as the relationships within them. Through an anticolonial feminist framework, we can critique current systems, but also take into account the ways in which we are complicit and implicated in these power/oppression structures. It is the aim of this paper to open up the conversation and look at the ways in which we continually have to question norms and dominant narratives, and remain in these uncomfortable spaces for growth and deep learning to happen (Stein & Andreotti, 2015).

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> I say ‘Ontario’ and ‘Canada’ in quotes to signify the creation of and precarity of the settler colonial state and its borders. When I refer to the curricula documents, I do not use the quotes as this is the title of the documents.

<sup>2</sup> I use the term queer to signify “... neither a foundational logic nor a consistent set of characteristics” (Jagose, 1996, p. 96), but a way to oppose normalizing, disciplining forces of my sexuality (Seidman, 1993). I choose to ‘reclaim’ the word queer to represent the non-heteronormative nature of my sexuality, and also its fluidity and suspension of a sexuality classification such as lesbian or bisexual (Blackburn, Clark, & Nemeth, 2015).

## References



- Ashcraft, C. (2012). But how do we talk about it?: Critical literacy practices for addressing sexuality with youth. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 42(5), 597-628.
- Arvin, M., Tuck, E., & Morrill, A. (2013). Decolonizing feminism: Challenging connections between settler colonialism and heteropatriarchy. *Feminist Formations*, 25(1), 8-34.
- Blackburn, M. (2012). *Interrupting hate: Homophobia in schools and what literacy can do about it*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Blackburn, M. V., Clark, C. T., & Nemeth, E. A. (2015). Examining queer elements and ideologies in LGBT-themed literature: What queer literature can offer young adult readers. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 47(1), 11-48.
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2015). The structure of racism in color-blind, 'post-racial' America. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 59(11), 1358-1376.
- Coloma, R.S. (2008). Border crossing subjectivities and research: Through the prism of feminists of color. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 11(1), 11-27.
- Driskill, Q., Finley, C., Gilley, B. J., & Morgensen, S. L. (2011). The revolution is for everyone: Imagining an emancipatory future through queer indigenous critical theories. In Q. Driskill, C. Finley, B. Gilley and S. Morgensen (Eds.), *Queer indigenous studies: Critical interventions in theory, politics and literature* (pp. 211-222). Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.
- Finley, C. (2011). Decolonizing the queer native body (and recovering the native bull-dyke): Bringing "sexy back" and out of native studies' closet. In Q. Driskill, C. Finley, B. Gilley & S. Morgensen (Eds.), *Queer indigenous studies: Critical interventions in theory, politics and literature* (pp. 31-42). Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.
- Gaztambide-Fernández, R., & Murad, Z. (2011). Out of line: Perspectives on the 'browning' of curriculum and pedagogy. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy*, 8(1), 14-16.
- Gershon, W. (2015). Double binds, ab-uses, and a hopeless hope: Epistemological possibilities and sensual questions for Spivak's introductory framing of *An Aesthetic Education in the Era of Globalization*. *Critical Literacy: Theories and Practices*, 9(1), 4-16.
- Giroux, H. A. (2001). *Theory and resistance in education: Towards a pedagogy for the opposition*. Westport, Connecticut: Bergin & Garvey.
- Herzog, B. (2013). Anticolonialism, decolonialism, neocolonialism. In *The Encyclopedia of Global Human Migration, Vol. 2* (pp. 523-527). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Huddleston, G. (2015). An awkward stance: On Gayatri Spivak and double binds. *Critical Literacy: Theories and Practices*, 9(1), 17-28.
- Huddleston, G., & Helmsing, M. (2015). Introduction: An imperfect struggle with Gayatri Spivak. *Critical Literacy: Theories and Practices*, 9(1), 1-3.
- Jagose, A. (1996). *Queer theory: An introduction*. New York University Press.
- Kovach, M. (2009). *Indigenous methodologies: Characteristics, conversations, and contexts*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Kumashiro, K. K. (2002). *Troubling education: Queer activism and antioppressive education*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Lather, P. (2016). Top ten + list: (Re)thinking ontology in (post)qualitative research. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 16(2), 125-131.
- Lugones, M. (2010). Toward a decolonial feminism. *Hypatia*, 25(4), 742-759.

- Mendoza, B. (2016). Coloniality of gender and power: From postcoloniality to decoloniality. In L. Disch & M. Hawkesworth (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of feminist theory* (pp. 100-121). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mohanty, C. T. (2003). 'Under Western eyes' revisited: Feminist solidarity through anticapitalist struggles. In *Feminism without borders: Decolonizing theory, practicing solidarity* (pp. 221-251). Durham: Duke University Press.
- Morgensen, S. L. (2015). A politics not yet known: Imagining relationality within solidarity. *American Quarterly*, 67(2), 309-315.
- Norton, N. (2011). Cutting like a razor: Female children address sexism and sexuality through poetry. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 41(4), 433-455.
- Ontario Ministry of Education. (2007a). *The Ontario curriculum grades 9 and 10: English*. Retrieved from <http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/curriculum/secondary/english910currb.pdf>
- Ontario Ministry of Education. (2007b). *The Ontario curriculum grades 11 and 12: English*. Retrieved from <http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/curriculum/secondary/english1112currb.pdf>
- Patel, L. L. (2014). Countering coloniality in educational research: From ownership to answerability. *Educational Studies*, 50(4), 357-377.
- Rowe, A. C., & Tuck, E. (2017). Settler colonialism and cultural studies: Ongoing settlement, cultural production, and resistance. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 17(1), 3-13.
- Schieble, M. (2012). A critical discourse analysis of teachers' views on LGBT literature. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 33(2), 207-222.
- Schrader, A. M., & Wells, K. (2004). Queer perspectives on social responsibility in Canadian schools and libraries. *School Libraries in Canada*, 24(4), 8-37.
- Schwandt, T. A. (2001). *Dictionary of qualitative inquiry* (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Seidman, G. (1993). 'No freedom without the women': Mobilization and gender in South Africa, 1970-1991. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 18, 291-320.
- 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.
- Spivak, G. (2012). *An aesthetic education in the era of globalization*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Spivak, G. C. (1988a). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossber (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture* (pp. 271-313). London: Macmillan.
- Spivak, G. C. (1988b). *In other worlds: Essays in cultural politics*. New York: Routledge.
- Spivak, G. C. (1988c). Feminism and critical theory. In *In other worlds: Essays in cultural politics* (pp. 77-92). New York: Routledge.
- Stein, S., & Andreotti, V. D. O. (2015). Complicity, ethics and education: Political and existential readings of Spivak's work. *Critical Literacy: Theories and Practices*, 9(1), 29-43.
- Tuck, E. & Gaztambide-Fernández, R. A. (2013). Curriculum, replacement, and settler futurity. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 29, 72-89.
- Tuck, E. & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 1(1), 1-40.
- Van Dijk, T. (2001). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 352-371). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Weedon, C. (1987). *Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory*. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Wolfe, P. (2006). Settler colonialism and the elimination of the native. *Journal of Genocide Research*, 8(4), 387-409.

