Education for Reconciliation: The Effects of an Indigenous Course Requirement on Non-

Indigenous Students' Attitudes on Reconciliation

by

Jeremy Daniel Neufeld Siemens

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of

The University of Manitoba

in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree

MASTER OF EDUCATION

Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning

University of Manitoba

Winnipeg

Abstract

Following the Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada—which identified education as a central tool in the work of reconciliation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Canadians—governments and universities across Canada have embarked on diverse educational initiatives to facilitate this work. One such initiative has been the mandate by the University of Winnipeg that all its undergraduate students take/fulfill an Indigenous Course Requirement (ICR). This mixed-methods study used quantitative surveys and qualitative in-depth interviews to investigate the impact of select ICR courses on non-Indigenous students' attitudes towards issues of reconciliation. Results revealed several positive outcomes of these courses, including: increased recognition of discriminations facing Indigenous peoples, increased support for government equity initiatives, and self-described attitudinal and behavioural changes in participants. At the same time, the study highlights the limits of such courses within the broader work of reconciliation in a settler-colonial context. Implications for policy and practice are discussed.

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents

Chapter One: Overview of Study

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Chapter Three: Methodology

Chapter Four: Results

Chapter Five: Discussion and Implications

List of Tables

CHAPTER ONE

OVERVIEW OF STUDY

Introduction

"Education is what got us into this mess… but education is the key to reconciliation"

- Murray Sinclair (Watters, 2015)

This study is born out of the sentiment above. As Canada reflects on the three-year anniversary of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's Final Report, language of "reconciliation"—an improved relationship between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Canadians —remains central to many discussions within education (Kairos, 2016). Many of these initiatives attempt to manage the complicated role of education in the relationship between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples in Canada. On the one hand, these discussions acknowledge the devastating effects of Indian Residential Schools and the colonial influence on Canada's education system. On the other hand, educators have begun to imagine how contemporary education can be used to inform and transform society in matters of reconciliation (Kairos, 2016).

Using a mixed-methods approach, this study examines one example of educational work of reconciliation. Focusing on the Indigenous Course Requirement (ICR) at the University of Winnipeg, I explore the experiences of non-Indigenous students within a program aimed at education for reconciliation (EfR). I examine how these courses affect non-Indigenous students' attitudes regarding matters related to reconciliation (e.g., recognition of discrimination, support for government response, sense of responsibility, sense of complicity).

Context of Study

Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada Final Report

In 2015, after seven years of research and thousands of interviews, The Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (TRC) presented its findings and recommendations regarding Canada's Indian Residential School (IRS) system. This Final Report was one component of the Government of Canada's settlement package with IRS survivors. The primary mandate of this commission was to inform all Canadians about what happened in these schools (TRC, 2015a), but—as a brief overview of the document will prove—its scope was much larger than history alone.

At the heart of this document was the acknowledgement that the IRS system is "best described as 'cultural genocide'" (TRC, 2015a, p. 1). Drawing on survivor accounts and historical documents, the report outlined how, over the course of over 100 years (1880s-1996), the Canadian government forcibly removed over 150,000 First Nations, Métis, and Inuit children from their homes and placed them in Indian Residential Schools across the country. This was done with the intent of separating these children from their families, destroying their cultures, and assimilating them into the dominant Western culture. To further these efforts of assimilation, the IRS system imposed religious, cultural, and social values on these students without regard for their traditional beliefs. The TRC report also highlights many testimonies of emotional, sexual, and physical abuse that survivors suffered at the hands of school officials (TRC, 2015a).

The last residential school closed in 1996, but the TRC Final Report clearly states that the legacy of the IRS system continues to affect Indigenous peoples living in Canada today. By

numerous accounts and measures, intergenerational trauma marks the well-being of IRS survivors and their descendants. Compared to other Indigenous Canadians, IRS survivors experience poorer health, lower high school graduation rates, and higher rates of substance abuse. These outcomes, and many others like them, "condemn many Aboriginal people to shorter, poorer, and more troubled lives" (TRC, 2015b, p. 3).

The TRC Final Report also acknowledges the interpersonal and systemic discrimination that continues to limit the well-being of Indigenous peoples in Canada. It states that the legacy of the IRS system "is also reflected in the intense racism some people harbour against Aboriginal people and the systemic and other forms of discrimination Aboriginal people regularly experience in Canada" (TRC, 2015b, p. 3). From disproportionate representation in the criminal justice system to underfunding for education on reserves, the report is filled with examples of how Indigenous peoples continue to face discrimination in Canada (TRC, 2015b).

Public Understanding and Attitudes

Further complicating the present-day relationship between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in Canada are the ignorant views that persist within the non-Indigenous community. In 2016, The *Canadian Public Opinion of Aboriginal Peoples* survey (Environics Institute for Survey Research, 2016) highlighted these gaps in knowledge and problematic attitudes regarding reconciliation. This national survey found that only 66% of respondents had heard of or read about residential schools (Environics Institute for Survey Research, 2016). Additionally, the survey found that public perception of injustice does not match the findings of the TRC Final Report. A minority of respondents stated that Aboriginal people were treated worse than other Canadians by major institutions: healthcare (26%), education (42%), and the criminal justice system (38%) (Environics Institute for Survey Research, 2016).

Calls to Action

In light of these disheartening findings—both of injustice and ignorance—it is important to attend to the accounts of resiliency and hope within the TRC Final Report. The TRC's 94 Calls to Action represent part of the desire for a better future. These demands of various levels of government represent avenues for addressing injustice and fostering reconciliation.

Education is one of the key foci within these calls for a better relationship. The TRC Final Report acknowledges the powerful potential of education within the work of reconciliation. The writers of the report argue that "education must remedy the gaps in historical knowledge that perpetuate ignorance and racism" (TRC, 2015c, p. 117). These recommendations surrounding education are wide-ranging, as they touch on everything from elementary curricula to post-secondary courses. Further, they reach across the public sector, calling for requisite education for teachers, lawyers, nurses, and civil servants (TRC, 2015a). Each of these recommendations reflects a common belief that formal teaching and learning practices can play an important role in the work of reconciliation. In response to these Calls to Action, many ministries of education and related institutions have begun to develop related curricula (Kairos, 2016).

As one might expect, the shape and nature of these responses vary across Canada. At some post-secondary institutions, aspects of Indigenous Education, as they relate to the TRC Calls to Action, were already in place before the TRC Final Report. Institutions such as the University of Saskatchewan and University of Manitoba have included components of Indigenous Education in pre-professional programs for years. These programs represent a variety of approaches to the integration of such content. At the University of Manitoba, future doctors are required to take a module that examines the historical and contemporary injustices that affect the well-being of Indigenous peoples in Canada (UM Today, 2015). In the Faculty of Education,

Bachelor of Education students are required to study either Aboriginal Education or the integration of Aboriginal perspectives within a three-credit hour course requirement (University of Manitoba, n.d.). In the University of Saskatchewan's Bachelor of Nursing program, the course content and the structure of the entire program are designed to honour Indigenous perspectives (University of Saskatchewan, n.d.). These programs represent just a few of the efforts that Canadian universities are making that reflect the calls of the TRC. Research into a related course for pre-service teachers in the Northwest Territories found that, despite some hesitation on the part of participants, such courses have the potential to promote increased cultural understanding (Deer, 2013).

In 2016, The University of Winnipeg became one of the first post-secondary institutions in Canada to institute an Indigenous Content Requirement (ICR) as part of all of its undergraduate degrees (University of Winnipeg, n.d.). As part of their broader degree requirements, undergraduate students must take one of 67 select 3-credit-hour courses that meet the ICR criteria. These courses span academic departments, including English, Urban Studies, and History, among others. The pre-approved list of ICR course shares one main criterion: "The course content is derived from or based on an analysis of the cultures, languages, history, ways of knowing or contemporary reality of the Indigenous peoples of North America (what is now called Canada and the USA)" (University of Winnipeg, n.d.). This criterion was the product of discussion and debate between many staff and students (University of Winnipeg, n.d.).

In presenting its rationale for this Indigenous Course Requirement, the University of Winnipeg outlines its place within Treaty One territory and the traditional homeland of the Métis people. The University of Winnipeg states that its academic programming must be "grounded in the territory in which it is located" (University of Winnipeg, n.d.):

This means providing our students with an understanding of the local history, cultures, contemporary issues, languages, and ways of knowing of local Indigenous peoples. This knowledge will help our students to understand the contributions Indigenous people have made to our world, and prepare them to engage in a society where reconciliation with Indigenous peoples is an important reality. (University of Winnipeg, n.d.).

This baseline knowledge of Indigenous peoples and their cultures is central to the work of reconciliation and the broader goals of the University of Winnipeg as they relate to the TRC's Calls to Action. The Indigenous Course Requirement is framed both within the particular characteristics of its Manitoba context and the broader, national work of reconciliation.

Research Problem

As outlined above, both the TRC Final Report and the mandate of the ICR at the University of Winnipeg are based on the assumption that education can play a major role in the work of improving the relationship between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in Canada. They share a belief that a deeper understanding of the historical and contemporary experiences of Indigenous peoples is essential for challenging ongoing ignorance and fostering the attitudes that are required for the work of reconciliation. However, these assumptions are part of the most pointed critique of education for reconciliation (Hart, 2011). Despite the long list of global efforts to improve intergroup relationships, there is little literature that supports the efficacy of such programming (Paulson, 2011). Within the Canadian context, there is minimal evidence that education can foster reconciliation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples (TRC, 2015c). This study attempts to interrogate the assumptions of the TRC Final Report and the University of Winnipeg to better understand the role of education within the work of reconciliation. It is my hope that this work addresses a gap within the larger education for

reconciliation literature while providing particular insights into the context of the ICR at the University of Winnipeg.

<div align="center">**Theoretical Frameworks**</div>

Two theoretical frameworks inform this study: Disruptive knowledge and the tripartite model of attitude.

Disruptive Knowledge

This study took place in a context in which there is a disparity between the presence of ongoing injustice and non-Indigenous Canadians' recognition of this injustice. This disparity led me to draw on the idea of consciousness-raising education (Freire, 1972). From this perspective, the work education is conscientização (consciousness raising), helping all parties "to perceive social, political, and economic contradictions, and to take action against the oppressive actions of society" (p.19). This notion connects to a larger understanding of disruptive knowledge that is central to the work of critical pedagogy (Freire, 1972; Giroux 2011) social justice education (Adams & Bell, 2016), anti-oppressive education (Kumashiro, 2000), and the work surrounding reconciliation in Canada (Coulthard, 2014; Gebhard, 2017; Regan, 2010). Although its forms and outcomes may differ slightly within these areas, disruptive knowledge is as an educational encounter that critiques the status quo, acknowledges ongoing injustice, and draws attention to one's place within systems of injustice. In light of the findings of the TRC Final Report, this approach to education offers a few guiding ideas for this study.

Before participants can respond to the ongoing injustice within society, they must acknowledge its existence. A central tenant of disruptive knowledge is that it illuminates systems of discrimination which are not readily acknowledged by those in power (Kumashiro, 2000). Comparing the findings of the TRC Final Report to the *Canadian Public Opinion on Aboriginal*

Peoples survey, one recognizes that non-Indigenous Canadians are ignorant or unacknowledging of the depth of systemic discrimination against Indigenous peoples in Canada. In response to this perceived gap, scholars have called for disruptive knowledge within the work of education for reconciliation which draws attention to the ongoing expressions of settler-colonialism in Canada (Czyzewski, 2011; Gebhard, 2017; Regan, 2010). Settler colonialism—as a descriptor of the ongoing systems of oppression in Canada—will be discussed at length in Chapter 2. Embracing this framework, this study focuses exclusively on ICR courses that claim to address contemporary injustice and settler-colonialism in Canada (Appendix A). Further, both the survey and in-depth interviews examined attitudes towards the prevalence of systemic discrimination and contemporary injustice facing Indigenous peoples in Canada.

In addition to drawing attention to injustice, disruptive knowledge helps participants understand their place within systems of injustice. This is the second key characteristic of disruptive knowledge that guided my study. The TRC Final Report clearly states that the IRS system continues to impact all people living in Canada, whether they acknowledge it or not: "The perpetrators are wounded and marked by history in ways that are different from the victims, but both groups require healing" (TRC, 2015a, p. 5). This language bears striking similarity to Freire's (1972) description of the impact of oppressive systems when discussing his own form of disruptive knowledge: "Dehumanization, which marks not only those whose humanity has been stolen but also (though in a different way) those who have stolen it, is a distortion of the vocation of becoming more fully human" (Freire, 1972, p. 28). These passages reveal a shared belief between the authors of the TRC Final Report and one of the seminal voices on critical education. A full acknowledgment of injustice in Canada includes an examination of how settler-colonialism has affected and continues to affect everyone living on this land.

Ermine (2007) described how a true acknowledgment of the injustice facing Indigenous peoples reveals this dehumanization within non-Indigenous Canadians:

> Currently, the situation, and very often the plight of Indigenous peoples, should act as a mirror to mainstream Canada…what the mirror can teach is that it is not really about the situation of Indigenous peoples in this country, but it is about the character and honour of a nation to have created such conditions of inequity. It is about the mindset of a human community of people refusing to honour the rights of other human communities. (p. 200)

Reconciliation is not simply a process of Indigenous healing (TRC, 2015a). It is a process of healing that needs to address all parties who are wrapped in systems of injustice. The process of education for reconciliation, then, can be understood as a personal and decolonizing undertaking, as non-Indigenous students recognize their own dehumanizing role in systems of injustice (Regan, 2010). In both the initial survey and in-depth interview questions, I examined how non-Indigenous participants describe their complicity in ongoing discrimination. This complex idea, which included notions of benefit, guilt, and personal bias, was central to the design and analysis of my study.

Although there are certainly clear connections between the framework of disruptive knowledge and the work of reconciliation in Canada, one must also consider the shortcomings that this model presents. An obvious shortcoming is the danger of conflating theories and ideas, as the concept of "disruptive knowledge" draws from various pedagogies and approaches. It is, thus, important to note that this study does not embrace or employ all aspects of the supporting pedagogies, but simply draws on their shared emphasis on consciousness-raising education that results in embodied change.

For a farther-reaching critique of disruptive knowledge, one can turn to the important work of Tuck and Yang (2012). This work surveyed the various expressions of "settler moves to innocence" — the seemingly benevolent actions of settlers, which serve as diversions and distractions from the true work of decolonization. These actions afford settlers a certain sense of comfort and self-reassurance while doing little for Indigenous peoples. Tuck and Yang described the ways in which this type of consciousness-raising education can deflect attention from the work of decolonization:

> We agree that curricula, literature, and pedagogy can be crafted to aid people in learning to see settler colonialism, to articulate critiques of settler epistemology, and set aside settler histories and values in search of ethics that reject domination and exploitation; this is not unimportant work. However, the front-loading of critical consciousness building can waylay decolonization, even though the experience of teaching and learning to be critical of settler colonialism can be so powerful it can feel like it is indeed making change. Until stolen land is relinquished, critical consciousness does not translate into action that disrupts settler colonialism. (p. 19)

There is a real danger in mistaking the disruption of knowledge for the end goal of education for reconciliation. Similarly, there is a real danger in mistaking positive results within this study as evidence of reconciliation. Tuck and Yang rightly point out that consciousness-raising education may obscure one's focus on relational and behavioural outcomes. Kumashiro (2000) reminded us that the goal of disruptive knowledge is not "final knowledge (and satisfaction), but disruption, dissatisfaction, and the desire for more change" (Kumashiro, 2000, p. 34). As outlined in Chapter 5, these ideas are critical in describing the significance of my findings. They serve as a reminder of the much larger goals of reconciliation towards which disruptive knowledge may be useful.

In these ways, the concept of disruptive knowledge offers a few important guiding ideas for this study. First, it outlines the need for education for reconciliation to fully address ongoing injustice and challenge the status quo. Secondly, it recognizes the need for non-Indigenous Canadians, when encountering this disruptive knowledge, to recognize their dehumanizing place within these systems. Lastly, the critiques of this framework serve as an important reminder not to mistake the means for the end within the work of education for reconciliation.

Tripartite Model of Attitude

Attitude measurement is a critical component of this study and its literature is widely reviewed in Chapter 2 to highlight its application and strengths and weaknesses with regard to EfR. Here, I briefly describe the Tripartite Model of Attitudes as a second theoretical framework for my study.

In order to describe and measure attitudes, this study employs the multicomponent or tripartite model of attitudes (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993; Maio & Haddock, 2010). As opposed to lay understanding of attitudes, which often cast the term as a single, stable disposition, this academic understanding is dynamic and contains many component parts (Maio & Haddock, 2004). In such a view, an attitude is an "overall evaluation of an object that is based on cognitive, affective, and behavioural information" (Maio & Haddock, 2010, p. 4). These components are important for conceptualizing attitudes within the larger work of reconciliation.

The *cognitive* aspect of the tripartite model reflects the opinions, beliefs, and thoughts that individuals hold towards particular objects (Maio & Haddock, 2010). The need to address this aspect of attitudes is clearly outlined in both the TRC Final Report and the *Canadian Public Opinion on Aboriginal Peoples* survey (Environics Institute for Survey Research, 2016). The large-scale ignorance regarding the historical and contemporary experiences of Indigenous

peoples in Canada is cited as a target for the work of education for reconciliation. Harmful, racist

beliefs and opinions are described as the contributors to ongoing injustice and the focal point for

transformative educational practices (TRC, 2015a).

The *affective* component of attitude is also explicitly linked to the required work of

reconciliation. Maio and Haddock (2010) describe this component of attitude as the feelings and

emotions that connect an individual to the attitude object. Drawing on the accounts of residential

school survivors, the TRC Final Report outlines how non-Indigenous students "must learn about

the history and legacy of residential schools in ways that change both minds and hearts" (TRC,

2015a, p. 119). This description pushes the work of education for reconciliation beyond a purely

intellectual form of attitude transformation, embracing emotional aspects as well. While there is

danger in such affective work devolving into shallow and voyeuristic forms of emotional

engagement (Czyzewski, 2011; Regan, 2010), there is clearly support within the work of

reconciliation for the feelings and emotions of non-Indigenous people to be cultivated (Regan,

2010; TRC, 2015a).

The last aspect of attitude, as described in the Tripartite Model, is the most challenging

for the design of this study. The *behavioural* component of attitude describes the aspects that are

linked to previous experiences and encounters with the attitude object (Maio & Haddock, 2010).

Forms of persuasion that rely heavily on cognitive or affective interventions, those which are

most often employed in the classroom, are less likely to change attitudes that are heavily reliant

on behavioural content (Maio & Haddock, 2010). In order to achieve a better attitudinal match,

and, subsequently, increase the possibility of attitudinal change, behavioural interventions must

provide opportunities for participants to engage in embodied learning in which they actively

obtain experiences, as opposed to passively receiving information (Mao & Haddock, 2010). In

the context of education for reconciliation, this work is often pursued through intentional inter-group initiatives (Paulson, 2011), as a means of promoting positive relationships through face-to-face encounters. Unfortunately, such inter-group contact was not a stated component of any of the courses that this study examined. As such, the ICR courses in this study were limited in their ability to address the behavioural aspects of attitude content. However, given the widespread evidence regarding the efficacy of cognitive and affective approaches to persuasion (Maio & Haddock, 2010), this limitation does not exclude these ICR courses as sites for attitudinal change.

This framework suggests that initiatives such as the Indigenous Course Requirement can be understood as a site for potential attitudinal change. The cognitive and affective aspects of attitude seem to fall well within the purview of classroom education, providing students with opportunities to examine their thoughts and emotions. And while the ICR courses may not provide new behavioural *content* to participants, the ICR courses still have the potential to address to changes in behaviour, as changes in the cognitive and affective content of behaviour can lead to behavioural outcomes (Maio & Haddock, 2010).

Purpose of this Study

This study investigated the work of EfR within the context of the University of Winnipeg's Indigenous Course Requirement (IRC). Specifically, the purpose of this study was as follows:

- To investigate the effect of select IRC courses on non-Indigenous students' attitudes towards contemporary issues related to reconciliation in Canada (e.g., current state of injustice, support for government response, level of personal responsibility, sense of complicity in ongoing discrimination)

This purpose reflects both the context and theoretical frameworks of this study. It seeks to be

responsive to the findings of the *Canadian Public Opinion on Aboriginal Peoples* survey

(Environics Institute for Survey Research, 2016) and the TRC Final Report (TRC, 2015a) that

highlight both the ongoing presence of injustice facings Indigenous peoples in Canada and the

ignorance of non-Indigenous peoples regarding this injustice. Drawing on the theoretical

framework of disruptive knowledge, this purpose reflects the belief that an acknowledgement of

such injustice can be an initial step in pursuing reconciliation between Indigenous and non-

Indigenous peoples in Canada.

Research Questions

This study sought to answer the following question:

-   How do select ICR courses at the University of Winnipeg affect non-Indigenous students'

    attitudes towards contemporary issues related to reconciliation in Canada?

Subsidiary questions aided the investigation of this main research question:

o   How do select ICR courses affect non-Indigenous students' attitudes towards

    contemporary injustices facing Indigenous peoples in Canada?

o   How do select ICR courses affect non-Indigenous students' attitudes towards specific

    government responses to matters of reconciliation? (e.g., increased funding for

    Indigenous education, increased funding for clean drinking water on First Nations'

    reserves, inclusion of Indigenous history and culture in school curricula, etc.)

o   How do select ICR courses affect non-Indigenous students' sense of complicity regarding

    ongoing injustice against Indigenous peoples?

o   How do select ICR courses affect non-Indigenous students' sense of personal

    responsibility within the work of reconciliation?

Overview of Methods

This study used a mixed-methods design that followed the explanatory sequence, in which qualitative methods were used to explain the findings of initial quantitative data (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). The study included two phases. Phase 1 included a short survey that non-Indigenous students ($N = 50$) completed before and after their participation in the ICR. The two time points allowed me to examine whether/how students' attitudes changed over the duration of the course. This survey (Appendix B) used questions adapted from the *Canadian Public Opinion on Aboriginal Peoples* survey (Environics Institute for Survey Research, 2016). Each question was selected or created to address an aspect of the research questions identified earlier. Phase 1 data was analyzed using a repeated measures t-test, comparing participant's results from a pre-ICR survey with results from a post-ICR survey. Notable themes and trends from this quantitative Phase 1 were further explored in the qualitative Phase 2. This second phase included in-depth interviews with a representative sample of the participants from Phase 1 ($n = 8$). The interview schedule for Phase 2 was created in response to the results of Phase 1. Thematic analysis was used to interpret the findings of Phase 2.

Participants were non-Indigenous students currently enrolled in one of the following ICR courses at the University of Winnipeg:

HIST-1007 (3) Indigenous History Since 1900: Racism, Resistance, Renewal

CRS-2443 (3) Conflict and Development Issues in Indigenous Communities

FREN-3609 (3) Decolonizing Voices: Francophone Indigenous Literature

IS-2020 (3) Colonization and Aboriginal Peoples

I selected these courses for one major reason: They all examined issues of contemporary injustice facing Indigenous peoples in Canada. As outlined in their course outlines (Appendix

A), these courses claim to address the contemporary expressions of injustice, colonization, or racism. According to those writing on disruptive knowledge (Kumashiro, 2000) and decolonizing education in Canada (Battiste, 2013; Gebhard, 2017; Regan, 2010; St. Denis, 2007), it is essential to recognize oppression, injustice, and racism as contemporary phenomena. Such a focus is essential for fostering the understanding and empathy that the TRC Final Report requires (TRC, 2015a) and promoting an understanding of reconciliation that is rooted in both systemic and personal transformation (Regan, 2010; TRC, 2015c).

Significance of the Study

The significance of this research lies both within the field of education and beyond it. First, this research addresses significant gaps within the field of EfR research in Canada. Despite the vast literature that exists to justify education for reconciliation, there is little literature on its efficacy for improving intergroup relationships. Hart (2011) points out that "a considerable disparity exists between the claims made for school-based education as a means of building peace and the evidence regarding the outcomes of specific activities" (p. 12). Given the devastating role education has played in Canada's colonial history with Indigenous people, it is essential that all efforts within the realm of EfR are closely examined and critiqued. The TRC supports this push for applied research which "provides insights and practical examples of why and how educating Canadians about the diverse concepts, principles, and practices of reconciliation contributes to healing and transformative social change" (TRC, 2015b, p.126). This study examined the work of education for reconciliation in Canada, which may shape the work of educators and administrators focused on improving the relationship between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in Canada.

On a broader scale, this study seeks to further our understanding of particular reconciliatory efforts. Over the past few years, there have been many public claims in support of the work of reconciliation. Prime Minister Justin Trudeau, upon his election in 2015, said "no relationship is more important to me and to Canada than the one with Indigenous peoples" and he stated that his government was committed to the work of reconciliation (Government of Canada, n.d., para. 7). On a local scale, Winnipeg's Mayor Brian Bowman declared 2016 "The Year of Reconciliation", while Manitoba Premier Brian Pallister completed a "journey of reconciliation" bike ride in June, 2017; both of these gestures had the intention of promoting better relationships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Canadians. Despite these public gestures and rhetoric about "reconciliation", critics raise issue with the lack of concrete, demonstrable change on the parts of these governments (Taylor, 2017). In the midst of all of this discussion of reconciliation, projects like the ICR stand as concrete, but relatively unexamined reconciliatory initiatives. This study of the ICR, then, moves the discussion of reconciliation from the abstract to the concrete, as it seeks to provide a deeper understanding of the effects of such projects on non-Indigenous course participants. In doing so, it fulfills the TRC's particular goals of education for reconciliation, while offering specific insights into reconciliatory work for broader Indigenous and non-Indigenous audiences.

Key Terms

Non-Indigenous

The TRC Final Report clearly distinguishes between the unique experiences, requirements, and expectations that face both Indigenous and non-Indigenous groups in the work of reconciliation within Canada (TRC, 2015a). This foundational belief supports my use of the term "non-Indigenous". If the term "Indigenous" describes those people living in Canada who

hold a sense of kinship with First Nations, Metis, and Inuit communities (Vowel, 2016), "non-Indigenous" refers to those who do not share this identity. Thus, "non-Indigenous" encompasses a broad swath of people living in Canada from various backgrounds, including newcomers.

It is important to distinguish this large category of "non-Indigenous" from the narrower category of "settler". The term "settler" is used frequently in related Canadian scholarship (Lowman & Barker, 2015; Regan, 2010; Vowel, 2016) in multiple ways. Vowel (2016) defines it as "the non-Indigenous peoples living in Canada who form the European-descended sociopolitical majority" (p.14). Others describe the dominant mentality of settler-colonialism that has the potential to influence all non-Indigenous people living in such a society (Alfred, 2005; Ermine, 2007). In this study, I am attentive to scholars who employ both definitions, while focusing on the broader category of "non-Indigenous people" as a central focus of my analyses. Given the dualistic (Indigenous, non-Indigenous) framework that guides much of this work (TRC, 2015a), I feel that the broader category of "non-Indigenous" is an imperfect, but useful category in this early work on education for reconciliation. As part of this study, demographic information was collected as means of creating opportunities for more nuanced discussions regarding non-Indigenous experiences.

Reconciliation

Despite its popularity in recent political and social discourse, "reconciliation" is a term that remains difficult to define within the field of education (Cole, 2007). While some definitions describe it as "forgiveness" others regard it as "learning to live together" or "encouraging dialogue" (Paulson, 2011). Even in the Canadian context, agreement on the meaning of the term is difficult to find (TRC, 2015a). In part, this is due to its multi-faceted and complex nature. The TRC report suggests that while reconciliation includes "awareness of the past, acknowledgement

of the harm that has been incited, atonement for the causes, and action to change behaviour" (p. 3), relational concepts must foreground these ideas. This process is primarily about "restoration, reconciliation, forgiveness, about healing ... about truth. And those things are all things of the heart and of relationship, and not of government policy" (p. 20). Official programming or legal action should play a role in reconciliation, but they are not reconciliation in and of themselves. While acknowledging the role of government involvement, reconciliation is primarily about "establishing and maintaining a mutually respectful relationship between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal Peoples in this country" (p. 3).

For non-Indigenous Canadians, this is a decolonizing undertaking. Regan (2010) describes the deeply personal nature of reconciliation in which non-Indigenous Canadians critically analyze their own place within the legacy of settler-colonialism as a means of taking daily steps to move outside of these damaging trappings. Such a critical perspective also rejects the dictionary's definition of "reconciliation" as the "restoration of friendly relations" (Oxford Dictionaries). Given the long history of injustice and exploitation in Canada, "reconciliation" is not a return to a previous idyllic state, but a forging of a new relationship based on the principles above.

In summary, this study identifies a few key aspects of "reconciliation". First, it includes government action, but primarily describes an improvement of the relationship between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples in Canada. Secondly, it does not presume a healthy, mutually respectful relationship ever existed, but nevertheless believes that such a relationship is possible. Thirdly, it recognizes the unique demands of critical decolonization that this work puts on non-Indigenous Canadians.

Education for Reconciliation (EfR)

Education for reconciliation describes the formal structures of teaching and learning (classes, curriculum, etc.) that have been theorized, proposed, planned or implemented in hopes of improving intergroup relations within a particular setting. Found within the TRC Final Report, it is a term that has been applied to the work of reconciliation in Canada. This language of "education for reconciliation" is not unique to Canada and has been employed in many countries, including Ireland (Smith, 2011), Rwanda (Buckley-Zistel, 2009), and South Africa (Johnson, 2011). However, the work of education for reconciliation in Canada must be attentive to the particularities of the relationship that it hopes to improve.

Assumptions of the Study

This study is based on the following assumptions:

- Participants were able to answer all questions honestly.

- The ICR courses chosen for inclusion within the study were taught in a manner that matches the content and focus that is presented in the course description. It is expected that all the studied courses had a primary focus on contemporary Indigenous issues, which include disruptive knowledge.

Delimitations of the study

One of the major delimitations of this study is that it focused only on non-Indigenous students. The TRC document recognizes that the impacts of colonization and the paths to reconciliation are unique for Indigenous and non-Indigenous people. For non-Indigenous students, this work involves, among other things, reforming attitudes and understanding through education:

>[Non-Indigenous students] need to know how notions of European superiority and
>
>Aboriginal inferiority have tainted mainstream society's ideas about, and attitudes
>
>towards, Aboriginal peoples in ways that have been profoundly disrespectful and
>
>damaging. [Non-Indigenous students] need to understand Canada's history as a settler
>
>society and how assimilation policies have affected Aboriginal peoples. This knowledge
>
>and understanding will lay the groundwork for establishing mutually respectful
>
>relationships. (TRC, 2015b, p. 28)

This is not to say that such education may not have benefits for Indigenous students as well.

Instead, it is an acknowledgement of one of the foundational ideas in this study: Non-Indigenous

Canadians are still largely ignorant about the historical and contemporary injustices facing

Indigenous peoples (Environics Institute for Survey Research, 2016) and this ignorance is linked

to discriminatory attitudes and actions (TRC, 2015b). Further, the discussions surrounding the

ICR at the University of Winnipeg were responsive to incidents of racism on campus

(MacIntosh, 2016). It is for these reasons, among others, that I have chosen to focus exclusively

on the experiences of non-Indigenous students. Indigenous students were allowed to complete

the survey and receive renumeration, but their responses were not analyzed.

This study only examined the experiences of students enrolled in ICR courses that focus

on contemporary issues of reconciliation (Appendix A). As outlined earlier, these courses are

aligned with the theoretical framework of disruptive knowledge and the belief that students must

recognize the presence of ongoing oppression (Kumashiro, 2000; Regan, 2010). In this way, this

study does not aim to evaluate the ICR framework as whole, but, rather, examines only one small

aspect of this program.

Limitations of the Study

Reconciliation is a relational concept. Any attempt to examine it outside of a relational context will, therefore, be limited. There are numerous ways in which the task of researching "reconciliation" is a problematic endeavour.

First, the focus on "non-Indigenous" experience is both too limited and too broad. Focusing only on the experiences and reflections of non-Indigenous students in these classes fails to acknowledge the experiences of Indigenous students. This study does not consider the positive and negative experiences that Indigenous students may have in these courses. My findings do not reflect the relational nature of reconciliation, as they only capture one perspective in isolation.

In addition, the category of "non-Indigenous" accounts for students with a wide range of affiliations, experiences, and perspectives, which may fail to accurately address the most contentious relationship at the heart of the effort of reconciliation. Some of the literature surrounding reconciliation identifies the particular demands that settler Canadians face in the work of reconciliation (Lowman & Barker, 2015; Regan, 2010). However, the experiences of settler Canadians cannot be conflated with the experiences of all "non-Indigenous" students (Vowel, 2016). This larger, more ethnically diverse group represents a wide range of students whose experiences of discrimination and privilege could vary greatly, as they represent various socioeconomic levels, many different cultural groups, and political positions. To account for this variation, I collected demographic information on all participants to better understand the nuances that exist within the experiences of different participants that fall under the broad umbrella of "non-Indigenous" students.

This study relied heavily on course descriptions to determine that disruptive knowledge was present within these classes. There was no direct observation of these classes to confirm this assumption, which poses another potential limitation of this study. To address this concern, I contacted instructors before the course and described my theoretical framework. They all agreed that this type of critical education would be part of their teaching. Additionally, as outlined in Chapter 4, participants descriptions of their experiences further support the presence of disruptive knowledge in these courses.

Another major limitation of this study lies in its use of traditional "Western" research methods and analysis. A central tenet of Education for Reconciliation is that educators must come to hold Western and Indigenous knowledge systems with equal respect (TRC, 2015b). There is a large body of literature that outlines the ways in which Western forms of rational and positivistic thought have silenced Indigenous perspectives and perpetuated injustice (Battiste, 2013; Bowers, 2001; Regan, 2010). In this way, my reliance on traditional quantitative and qualitative methodology might further the colonial framework that limits the work of reconciliation. In Chapter 3, I provide a rationale for these methodological decisions and seek to describe how these methods can fit within the work of reconciliation.

Position of the Researcher

As both an educator and a student, I have had experiences that led me to believe in the transformative potential of education for reconciliation. My work as a high school Social Studies teacher has given me hope that formal practices of teaching and learning can positively affect the attitudes of non-Indigenous students. I began this study hopeful that my research findings would support my personal experiences. As this study has proceeded, I have interrogated this belief: Are these experiences truly transformative in a manner that furthers the work of decolonization?

Or, are these experiences "moves to innocence" (Tuck & Yang, 2012) that deflect attention from the realities of settler-colonialism? Throughout this process, I have maintained a belief in the potential of such education, but I now recognize the danger of falling into either side of the dualism suggested above. I understand that such education can not be easily categorized as wholly transformational or completely short-sighted.

I also acknowledge the ways my identity as the descendant of European immigrants has shaped my approach to this work. I cannot fully understand the injustice of settler-colonialism, as someone who has not been oppressed. Like some of my participants, it has only been through formal education that my attention has been drawn to these systems of injustice. At the same time, I acknowledge that my position within settler-colonialism negatively shapes the way that I view the world. Throughout this process, I have had to confront my own sense of complicity in the ongoing injustice facing Indigenous people. This research has forced me to ask some very difficult questions: Is this research, rooted in Western ways of thinking and focused on the experiences of non-Indigenous people, truly beneficial for Indigenous students? Does this research capitalize on the ubiquitous, but empty discourse surrounding reconciliation? As a means of attending to these questions, this study includes the perspectives of scholars who are critical of ICRs and the discourse of reconciliation more broadly. These sections do not answer the questions above—as I'm not sure conclusive answers are possible—but they do force readers to consider these questions for themselves. These traits, and many more, have shaped all aspects of this study in more ways than I can imagine.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This study is rooted in the idea that formal teaching and learning practices can improve intergroup relationships. Examining the work of groups ranging from UNESCO to Reconciliation Australia and Canada's own Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC), it is clear that the idea "that education contributes towards reconciliation is one of the foundational assumptions that informs international work around education" (Paulson, 2011, p. 5). This literature review is meant to interrogate that assumption. To begin, this chapter will briefly examine the various pedagogies that embrace this belief and that are connected to work of education for reconciliation. Establishing key categories surrounding this work will provide a framework for interpreting and analyzing particular expressions of related education. Furthermore, outlining the broad work of education for reconciliation will establish the importance of a context-based approach to this work. In order to understand both the possibilities and limitations of education for reconciliation, one must first consider the context (historical and contemporary) in which such work proceeds.

Within a Canadian context, this examination must include brief considerations of settler-colonialism and reconciliation. Education, as a public initiative, reflects the values and ideas of the larger body politic (Freire, 1972). Such education in Canada is bound by the control of settler-colonialism and shares the potential of reconciliation. A brief examination of these concepts will provide an overview of the broader challenges that education for reconciliation faces within Canada.

The next section of this literature review will examine the particular conceptualizations and implementations of education for reconciliation within a setting of settler-colonialism. Examining the broad scope of related work that has been done in Canada, this section will outline key criticisms and recommendations regarding education for reconciliation. In doing so, it will establish the potential of disruptive knowledge to play a transformative role in the practice of teaching and learning. Moving from this theoretical consideration to more practical matters, this section will include an examination of post-secondary research regarding EfR. In particular, it will examine the impact of reconciliation-related course on non-Indigenous students' attitudes.

Lastly, this literature review will consider relevant research regarding intergroup attitudes and injustice. This section will outline the barriers that exist within such work while describing the approaches that have proven effective in promoting attitudinal change. Taken together, these various sections are meant to highlight and critique some of the work and thinking around EfR and situate my study within the larger body of knowledge in this area of research. At the same time, this literature review will outline the unique contributions that this study will make to said literature.

Pedagogies of EfR

Peace Education

In a global context, "education for reconciliation" is often tied to a framework of peace education. Peace education is described as both a philosophy and a process that instils values of non-violence, love, and compassion while fostering the skills and knowledge to address conflict in non-violent ways (Harris & Morrison, 2012). Morrison (2011) describes how values of cooperation, dialogue, and problem-solving serve as part of a foundation that focuses on "working peacefully from within, transforming ourselves and working to transform our outer

world" (p. 821). Bar-Tal (2002), in identifying the "elusive" nature of peace education,

describes the importance of situating these broad concepts into particular contexts and the unique

relationships within them. This particularity of peace education is an idea that is echoed across

the literature (Bar-Tal, 2002; Bar-Tal & Rosen, 2009; Hart, 2011; Morrison, 2011; Paulson,

2011). There is a widely-held belief that such education must be rooted in the local "motivations,

goals, beliefs, attitudes… regarding the conflict, the nature of the relationship between parties,

and the nature of the parties themselves" (Bar-Tal & Rosen, 2009, p. 558). When discussing

issues of reconciliation within education, matters of context must be considered; there is no one-

size-fits-all model that can serve all groups in all places.

      This localized approach to education for reconciliation has been employed around the

world. Scholars have cited the positive impacts of education in some of the world's most

pronounced conflict zones such as Israel/Palestine (Biton & Salomon, 2006, Feuerverger, 2001;

Salomon, 2004) and Northern Ireland (Mcglynn, Niens, Cairns, & Hewstone, 2004; Niens &

Cairns, 2005). These programs have improved participants' attitudes towards out-groups, altered

their conceptualization of peace, and promoted attitudes of reconciliation. Understandably, the

structure and scope of these initiatives vary immensely from conflict to conflict and study to

study. For these settings, physical violence is an ongoing or relatively recent phenomenon. In

these contexts, the nature of the conflict is very different and schools can function simply as a

site for intergroup contact (Mcglynn, Niens, Cairns, & Hewstone, 2004). For example, Mcglynn,

Niens, Cairns, & Hewstone (2004) described how the mere integration of Protestant and Catholic

students in Northern Ireland promoted positive attitudinal change and offered hope of

reconciliation.

Such findings point to the global potential of peace education, but they address conflicts that are often drastically different than that of Canada. As will be explored in greater detail later, the Canadian context does not closely parallel those traditionally studied within peace education. Education for reconciliation within the Canadian context is not offered in response to matters of armed conflict and interventions such as integrated schools are already an assumed aspect of education in Canada. This represents a distinction between many peace education studies and the work at hand. Whereas most efforts of peace education proceed in settings where both parties acknowledge conflict, the work of education for reconciliation in a Canadian context involves an initial step of helping non-Indigenous peoples recognize the on-going nature of the conflict (Regan, 2010). As has already been shown, non-Indigenous acknowledgement of such conflict is not widespread (Environics Institute for Survey Research, 2016).

Social Justice Education

Social justice education offers the critical component of intergroup relations that the Canadian context demands. This umbrella term covers many sub-fields of education that seek to illuminate and challenge oppression, inequity, and injustice. Social justice education "aims to help participants develop awareness, knowledge, and processes to examine justice/injustice in their personal lives, communities, institutions, and broader society" (Adams & Bell, 2016, p. 4). Unlike peace education which, for the most part, begins with the assumption that conflict exists, social justice education draws attention to the unacknowledged expressions of conflict within society which are consequences of structural inequalities. This is a broad category that can apply to many sub-areas of education, including anti-oppressive education (Kumashiro, 2000), critical pedagogy (Freire, 1972), and anti-racist education (Dei, 1996; Dei, 2014; St. Denis, 2007).

Like peace education, there is a sense that the work of social justice education must reject a one-size fits all model and attend to the particular aspects of the localized oppression (Adams & Bell, 2016; Kumashiro, 2000). Kumashiro (2000), in explaining anti-oppressive education, affirmed that "the situatedness and complexity of oppression make problematic any attempts to articulate a strategy that works (for all teachers, with all students, in all situations)" (p.41). Despite the overlap between the work of social justice education and the efforts of peace education, their starting points are notably different. Whereas practitioners can employ peace education in post-conflict situations to address historical injustice (Bar-Tal, 2002), social justice education, while acknowledging the legacy of history, draws particular attention to the ongoing nature of conflict and enduring oppression (Adams & Bell, 2016). This type of education has the potential to draw attention to contextual aspects of oppression and inequity that are not widely acknowledged.

This attempt to make systems of injustice and privilege visible faces one obvious obstacle: student resistance. Student resistance within social justice education has been identified in both international research (Sonn, 2008; Williams & Melchiori, 2013) and in the Canadian context (Schick, 2000; Schick & St. Denis, 2003). Schick's (2000) examinations of student experiences in required anti-racist courses at a Western Canadian university offer unique insights for my study. While Schick (2000) acknowledges ways that these courses can trigger resistance that further entrenches harmful stereotypes and racist believes, she suggests that there remains potential for foundational change at the discursive and ideological levels. Based on her research, student resistance is not simply a product of individual opposition, but a reflection of how dominant ideologies of meritocracy and oppression are "embedded in the social fabric" of many social institutions (Schick & St. Denis, 2003). This obstacle is echoed in broader analyses of

such education (Maddison & Stastny, 2016) and identifies the limited potential of minor

educational efforts in the midst of major societal forces. In my estimation, the qualitative phase

of my study is responsive to this potential obstacle. If student resistance plays a role in students'

responses to the ICR courses, my in-depth interviews provide a tool for identifying and exploring

the nature of this resistance and its place in the work of education for reconciliation.

Considerations of Pedagogy

This brief overview has highlighted a few key points regarding the place of peace

education and social justice education within the work of reconciliation. First, they both

highlight the potential of formal approaches of education to promote positive relationships

between conflicting groups. There is widespread belief around the world and across pedagogies

that the classroom can foster reconciliation. Secondly, peace education and social justice

education converge on the idea that such educational approaches must be attentive to the local

contexts in which they occur. Thirdly, this brief examination has highlighted the challenges that

each pedagogy faces in this work within a Canadian context. A foundational aspect of peace

education is the recognition of conflict between the groups involved. Such an undertaking may

be easy in settings that are moving on from armed conflict, but the presence of conflict is not so

obvious to many people living in Canada. Social justice education reminds us that getting those

in positions of privilege and power to acknowledge, or even recognize, the ongoing expressions

of conflict is not a simple undertaking. I believe that in both its theoretical framework of

disruptive education and its qualitative data collection, my study is attentive to these challenges.

This overview has introduced some aspects of education of reconciliation, but it remains

a field of study with major gaps in its literature. The TRC Final Report reminds us that "there

remains much to learn about the circumstances and conditions in which reconciliation either fails

or flourishes" within the work of education (TRC, 2015c, p. 125). Building off the foundation of these pedagogies, the following section will examine the particular demands of the Canadian context.

Canadian Context of Education for Reconciliation

As the brief overview of EfR pedagogies established, the work of education for reconciliation must give careful consideration to the contextual milieu in which it is situated. In order to understand the work of the ICR, the broader work of EfR in Canada, and the role of disruptive knowledge in these pursuits, scholars must recognize the unique challenges and potentials of our social and political setting. The following sections situate this work within the scholarly discourse of two essential concepts: Settler-colonialism and reconciliation. It is only with an understanding of each of these contextual markers that one can meaningfully discuss the work of education for reconciliation in Canada.

Settler-Colonialism

For many scholars, any discussion of the socio-political nature of Canada begins with a recognition that our country is a settler-colonial state (Alfred, 2005; Lowman & Barker, 2015; Regan, 2010). Settler-colonialism, as a concept for describing the relationship between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples, is essential for understanding the work of reconciliation more specifically. This section will outline the key characteristics of settler-colonialism as a means of describing the nature of the relationship to which reconciliation seeks to respond. In doing so, I will outline the deep-seated ideological and institutional barriers to the work of reconciliation in Canada.

Settler-colonialism is not synonymous with the broader, traditional concept of colonialism. While they are both rooted in the attainment of pre-occupied lands, the extraction of

wealth and the control of Indigenous populations, settler-colonialism is described as a distinct

force with goals that are unique from those of traditional colonialism (Lowman & Barker, 2015,

Tucker & Yang, 2012; Veracini, 2010; Veracini, 2016). Whereas traditional models of

colonialism use domination and exploitation in foreign colonies to appease leaders and support

the ruling governments, settler-colonialism exerts control and domination over lands and people

without any intention of leaving (Veracini, 2010). Wolfe (1999), in describing this central aspect

of settler-colonialism, highlighted that, in such a context, "the colonizers come to stay – invasion

is a structure, not an event" (p. 2). As opposed to an external model of oppression in which post-

colonial possibilities involve the colonizers returning to their home countries, the settler-colonial

model offers a framework of internal oppression in which the colonizers exert control over

Indigenous peoples and the land within their newly formed borders (Lowman & Barker, 2015).

These formations have far-reaching implications for both the lands that they occupy and

the Indigenous people that they control; settler-colonialism seeks sovereignty over both in

perpetuity:

> Settler-colonialism is different from other forms of colonialism in that settlers come with
>
> the intention of making a new home on the land, a homemaking that insists on settler
>
> sovereignty over all things in their new domain… This is both because the settlers make
>
> Indigenous land their new home and source of capital, and also because the disruption of
>
> Indigenous relationships to land represents a profound epistemic, ontological,
>
> cosmological violence. This violence is not temporally contained in the arrival of the
>
> settler but is reasserted each day of occupation. (Tuck & Yang, 2012, p. 5)

Building on Wolfe's (1999) seminal idea of settler-colonialism as a structure, Tuck and Yang

(2012) described sovereignty as the guiding force within this structure. Settler sovereignty is the

self-justified expressions of ultimate power and control that these permanent colonial structures impose over Indigenous peoples and their lands (Veracini, 2016). Colonial occupation is presented as an inevitable, justified, and progressive process within a Western model of development (Lowman & Barker, 2015).   Notions of violence are minimized, as the work of settlement is rationalized and normalized (Lowman & Barker, 2015). Not only does this framework obscure the oppression of Indigenous people and their lands, it begins the work of a much deeper form of oppression.

In order to maintain its claims of sovereignty, settler society attempts to extinguish all claims of Indigenous sovereignty.   This "profound epistemic, ontological, cosmological violence" (Tuck & Yang, 2012), is an extension of the initial erasure of Indigenous peoples from their lands. The displacement of Indigenous peoples is not merely a physical removal from the lands; it is far-reaching transformation that reimagines reality and rewrites history to fit the settler narrative of sovereignty. Lowman and Barker (2015) describe the three steps of the settler pursuit of total sovereignty: elimination, indigenization, transcendence. It begins by ignoring, silencing, and eliminating Indigenous claims of sovereignty through acts of assimilation. Next, it provides new narratives of the land and its people that justify the settler occupation and attempt to permanently erase Indigenous narratives of land from history. This step may even include a re-telling of history that lays settler claim to indigeneity on the land (Vowel, 2016). Finally, the "colonizer" and "colonized" labels are dropped as the settler reframes colonialism as a distant point within the arc of the settler's sovereign history on the land. Examining Canada's history, examples of this progression are not difficult to find. Whether it is the obvious systems of assimilation and attempted erasure of cultures (TRC, 2015a), public myths of settler peacebuilding (Regan, 2010), or the former Prime Minister, Stephen Harper's claims that

"Canada has no history of colonialism" (Henderson & Wakeham, 2009), there are many

indications that Lowman and Barker's (2015) framework of settler-colonialism applies to the

Canadian context.

This brief overview of settler-colonialism provides a few necessary insights for the

purposes of this study. First, it establishes the persistent, but often unrecognized oppression that

settler sovereignty exerts on Indigenous peoples. Unlike other societies where discussions of

reconciliation follow distinct periods of conflict, Canadian reconciliation proceeds within a non-

transitional setting in which conflict is not only ongoing but often unacknowledged (Coulthard,

2014; de Costa, 2017). Secondly, this section outlines the unique power imbalance within which

the work of reconciliation must proceed. Because systems of oppression are still in place, the

individuals and groups seeking a better relationship encounter each other within those systems

that continue to affect all parties involved.

Reconciliation

How can reconciliation in Canada proceed in light of the country's identity as a settler

colonial state? This is a question that lies at the heart of this study and is central to the work of

education for reconciliation more broadly. Before I outline possibilities in this area, it is essential

to acknowledge the Indigenous and non-Indigenous voices within our country that have

problematized the notion of reconciliation.

Coulthard (2014) offers a succinct overview of the challenge that such programs face in

our current setting:

> … in settler-colonial contexts— where there is no period marking a clear or formal
>
> transition from an authoritarian past to a democratic present— state-sanctioned
>
> approaches to reconciliation must ideologically manufacture such a transition by

allocating the abuses of settler colonization to the dustbins of history, and/or purposely

disentangle processes of reconciliation from questions of settler-coloniality as such. (p.

108)

This version of reconciliation is one that perpetuates the injustice of settler-colonialism, as

described in the previous section. Within our current socio-political setting, reconciliation—as a

government initiative—can be seen to be incapable of challenging colonialism in any meaningful

way (Alfred, 2005). Even in its attempts to forge a better relationship, it is still drawing on the

tools and knowledge that are characteristic of this colonial system (de Costa, 2016). As such, it

either relegates oppression to the past or ignores the forces of settler-colonialism altogether.

This half-hearted version of reconciliation has been described to offer little to Indigenous

peoples in Canada (Alfred, 2005). First, it obscures the central matter of settler-colonialism —

land (Alfred, 2005; Lowman & Barker, 2015; Tuck & Yang, 2012). Despite public commitments

across many sectors, "there is no escaping that the real and deeper problems of colonialism are a

direct result of the theft of [Indigenous] lands, which cannot be addressed in any way other than

through the return of those lands to [Indigenous people]" (Alfred, 2015, p. 183). In refusing to

address the foundational matters of Indigenous sovereignty and claims to the land, contemporary

efforts of reconciliation continue to participate in the legacy of settler-colonialism (Tuck &

Yang, 2012). Tuck and Yang (2012) describe how many of the public efforts of "decolonization"

are part of a "settler moves to innocence" mindset– movements that provide non-Indigenous

people with the illusions of a better relationship, without requiring them to relinquish land or

political control. This work of reconciliation can become less about the needs of Indigenous

peoples and more about the psychological needs of non-Indigenous Canadians.

This leads to a second major critique of reconciliation: It merely serves to absolve non-Indigenous Canadians of feelings of guilt, allowing them to maintain settler colonial control (Alfred, 2005; Tuck & Yang, 2012). Reconciliation allows non-Indigenous people an opportunity to congratulate themselves on their role in improving relationships, but it does not demand any substantial self-reflection in the process (Tuck & Yang, 2012). This surface-level reconciliation does not force them to fully acknowledge their complicity in matters of ongoing oppression, nor does it require them to surrender the benefits they have inherited within this structure (Alfred, 2015; Regan, 2010; Tuck & Yang, 2012). In the context of Indian Residential Schools, Regan (2010) acknowledges that efforts of reconciliation can appropriate "survivor's pain in voyeuristic ways that enable non-Indigenous people to feel good about feeling bad but engender no critical awareness of themselves as colonial beneficiaries who bear a responsibility to address the inequities and injustices from which they have profited" (p.47). In such a setting, reconciliation seeks a shallow form of emotional engagement that allows non-Indigenous peoples to maintain the status quo (Strakosch, 2016).

As a response to the critiques above, reconciliation must be reimagined. This includes a shift in the temporality of colonialism as it relates to reconciliation. Instead of recognizing current injustice as a product of past colonial control, ongoing oppression must be viewed as contemporary expressions of settler-colonialism (Coulthard, 2014). This shift in the temporality of injustice has the potential to enable non-Indigenous peoples to recognize their place within existing systems of injustice (Coulthard, 2014; Macoun, 2016; Regan, 2010; Strakoch, 2016). The entire undertaking of reconciliation is thus situated within a framework of settler-colonialism (Alfred, 2005; Strakosch, 2016). This reassessment of one's current place within

such a system also presents new possibilities for the shape and goals of the work of reconciliation.

This reimagined view of reconciliation is not fixated on solving a singular problem or arriving at a fixed end point. Strakosch (2016) describes this view of reconciliation as focused on a "middle space" of understanding, where Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples do not seek to overcome their differences. Reconciliation is "not so much the site of resolution, but the site where settler-colonial conflict itself is understood, represented and contested" (p. 23). Such a vision does not transcend the influence of settler-colonialism but attempts to navigate these influences in a way that works towards a better, albeit tensioned, relationship (Strakosch, 2016).

Education for Reconciliation in Canada

Critiques of Common Approaches

This context of settler-colonialism and reconciliation is essential for understanding current discussions of education for reconciliation within Canada. Within the work of education for reconciliation, one finds many of the same issues that were discussed above. Related forms of education have been criticized for their inability to adequately address matters of ongoing injustice and the presence of settler-colonialism (Czyzewski, 2011; Gebhard, 2017; St. Denis, 2007). The reasons for these critiques are varied, but, as will be shown, all point to the need for disruptive knowledge.

One common criticism is that a shallow introduction of Indigenous cultures fails to challenge settler-colonialism. Although the integration of Indigenous cultures, worldviews, and histories is a direct response to both the TRC Final Report and the calls of many Indigenous and non-Indigenous scholars (Aikenhead & Michell, 2011; Battiste, 2013; Kanu, 2011; TRC, 2015a), its implementation is not without critique. On the one hand, the integration of these perspectives

has been shown to lead to outcomes such as reduced cultural alienation and improved academic

performance for Indigenous students (Kanu, 2011) and intercultural understanding for non-

Indigenous students (TRC, 2015a). However, St. Denis (2011) argues that such a focus on

culture and traditions is too often taught within a framework of multiculturalism – in which

Indigenous practices are studied as one culture among many, divorced from political issues of

race, racism, and its associated injustices. In such a setting, the "prevailing and prevalent policy

and practice of multiculturalism enables a refusal to address ongoing colonialism, and even to

acknowledge colonialism at all" (St. Denis, 2011, p. 315) These scholars argue that discussions

of culture must also extend into the political discussion of race, where matters of power and

privilege can be directly addressed (Dei, 2014; Kanu, 2011; Schick, 2000; St. Denis, 2007).

In addition to avoiding matters of injustice completely, related education initiatives have

been critiqued for the ways in which they temporally locate injustice. Like the incorporation of

Indigenous culture, this critique acknowledges the importance of addressing historical injustice

but argues that such a focus does not go far enough. While there is a growing and necessary

curricular focus on the history of residential schools and the impacts of colonialism (Czyzewski,

2011; Kairos, 2016), such a historical focus fails to account for contemporary injustice

(Czyzewski, 2011; Gebhard, 2017; Regan, 2010). Gebhard (2017) found evidence of such

damaging discourses within her examination of Canadian educators' understanding of residential

schools. Within these discourses, there was a noted distinction between the oppressive and

damaging systems of the past and descriptions of benevolent forms of contemporary education.

There is a concern that an isolated emphasis on past harms may perpetuate the harmful idea that

oppression and racism are merely past realities within Canada (Czyzewski, 2011). These studies

reflect the larger concerns of settler colonial scholars that the work of "reconciliation", despite its

discussion of injustice, can continue to perpetuate notions of settler innocence (Lowman &

Barker, 2015; Tuck & Yang, 2012). It is this call for a focus on contemporary matters of injustice

and colonialism that has shaped the focus of this study. As a response to these issues, all courses

examined for the purposes of this study have a focus on contemporary expressions of colonialism

in Canada.

Whereas the previous two critiques of Canada's approach to education for reconciliation

focus on its inability to adequately account for injustice, the third identifies problematic ways

that non-Indigenous students encounter matters of contemporary injustice. Even if education for

reconciliation can move beyond the shallow renderings of multiculturalism and historical

observation, it may still only provide non-Indigenous students with an emotional encounter that

is ultimately void of personal meaning (Czyzewski, 2011; Regan, 2010). Czyzewski (2011)

describes this "passive empathy" as an approach to contemporary injustice that maintains a

distance between the non-Indigenous student and systems of oppression. This "passive empathy"

is "insufficient at educating the reader to engender social change; this type of reading enables

simplistic and consumptive modes of identification with the 'other'" (p. 5). Acknowledging

contemporary injustice in a manner that merely describes the plight of Indigenous peoples can

maintain a sense of distance between students and the true work of reconciliation (Gebhard,

2017). Within this type of learning, "settlers may be sympathetic listeners, [but] their empathy

could be short-lived, serving only to confirm their own humanitarianism and failing to generate a

sense of moral responsibility for the IRS legacy that would lead to material change." (Regan,

2010, p. 46).

Taken together, these critiques reflect larger themes that were established within the

earlier discussion of settler-colonialism and reconciliation. Reconciliation within Canada has not

been part of a dramatic shift in political order or social relations. Unlike countries such as post-Apartheid South Africa, Canada's work of reconciliation proceeds within a non-transitional society in which there is no clear distinction between eras of violence/oppression and the current era (Coutlhard, 2014; de Costa, 2017). Many of the political structures responsible for the damaged relationship between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples in Canada continue to organize our country. As such, settler-colonialism continues to shape all aspects of society, including education (Battiste, 2013; Coulthard, 2014).

Disruptive Knowledge as Response

There is, thus, a call for a disruptive form of education that challenges, rather than avoids, contemporary expressions of settler-colonialism. Drawing on the work of Kumashiro (2000), both Gebhard (2017) and Czyzewski (2011) outline the need for "disruptive knowledge" within the Canadian context of education for reconciliation. This anti-oppressive approach responds to shortcomings of a purely multicultural or historical view of EfR. It argues that, in order to address injustice, students do not simply need more knowledge, they need disruptive knowledge (Kumashiro, 2000). Gebhard (2017), in describing the nature of this work, states that "[d]isruptive discourses about residential schools include those that foreground the examination of racism and white privilege as the legitimizing systems of a colonial project that continues today, albeit in different forms" (p. 25). This type of education fully addresses matters of current injustice within the framework of settler-colonialism. The work of reconciliation is no longer only an atonement for the past, but also a reckoning with the present. As one explores the various components of this vision of EfR, one understands the ways that it responds to Canadian context and the previous critiques of popular EfR approaches.

First, disruptive approaches to EfR are categorized as truth-telling and myth-challenging projects. As Coulthard (2014) and others (Alfred, 2005; Regan, 2010) have acknowledged, state-sanctioned efforts of reconciliation often attempt to affirm notions of democracy and peaceful relations. In order to maintain a positive image, these governmental approaches present a warped vision of Canada's identity as it related to matters of colonialism and reconciliation. These accounts perpetuate violence in both the stories that they choose to tell and the stories that they choose to omit (Regan, 2010; Tupper, 2014). Tupper (2014) acknowledges that "[g]aps and exclusions in curriculum and pedagogy are all aspects of "unknowing" that contribute to constructed "truths" about what it means to be Canadian, as well as what it means to be an Aboriginal person in Canada" (p. 470). If the work of settler-colonialism includes a retelling of history that reinforces settlers' claim to sovereignty (Lowman & Barker, 2015; Tuck & Yang, 2014), disruptive education resists such a revisionist history. In Tupper's (2014) estimation, such education should contain a critical component that addresses the gaps within the national narrative and forces educators and students to have difficult conversation about the reality of the relationship between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people.

In a similar vein, Regan (2010) acknowledges the importance of truth-telling education that can challenge the "peace-making" myth within Canadian discourse. This mythical version of Canada's history promotes and maintains an understanding of Canada as a benevolent nation of well-meaning politicians and citizens. In both historical and contemporary narratives, matters of government policy, treaty relationships, and Indigenous (non) recognition are framed in a manner that provides justification and/or placation for non-Indigenous people in contemporary society. Regan's proposed response of "truth-telling" is a complex and personal journey that extends far beyond encounters with a single, fixed truth. As settlers come to unlearn the "truths"

within which they are steeped, they begin to recognize the longstanding beliefs that foster

injustice, both within society at large and within themselves. Such truth-telling is rooted in the

belief that "the attitudes and actions of the majority of the population must shift. It is not just the

mind and pocketbook of settler society that must be reached, but its heart, soul and conscience as

well" (p. 109). In addition to challenging the gaps of misguided "truths" of contemporary

education, this disruptive approach to truth-telling similarly addresses these issues within

individual hearers and participants.

        Understood together, these insights into education for reconciliation lay the groundwork

for the study at hand. First, they outline the limitations of purely cultural or historical

perspectives to engender embodied change. There is strong agreement that, in keeping with the

scholarship on disruptive education, societal transformation requires the individual to recognize

his/her place within systems of ongoing oppression. The framework of disruptive knowledge is

congruent with the work of settler colonial scholars and education scholars in Canada, who both

describe the need for education that challenges the status quo. In light of this, my study seeks to

examine the experiences of non-Indigenous students in courses that – according to their

descriptions – offer the potential for such disruptive knowledge. This examination considers the

multi-faceted nature of personal responsibility that is central to matters of reconciliation (Regan,

2010; TRC, 2015a).

Indigenous Course Requirements in Canada

        It is against this backdrop that Canadian universities are considering the implementation

of Indigenous Couse Requirements. Many scholars have stressed the importance situating such

required content within larger, institutional movements towards "indigenization" (MacDonald,

2016; MccCallum, Nagam, Hanley, Caudano, & Gavrus, 2017; Pidgeon, 2016). They suggest

that the implementation of a course requirement should accompany wide-ranging changes that support the well-being of Indigenous professors and students (Pidgeon, 2016), build and highlight expert knowledge on Indigenous issues and content (Gaudry, 2016), and embrace the integration of Indigenous knowledge systems more broadly (MacDonald, 2016; McCallum et al., 2017; Smith & Summerville, 2017). There is a widely held belief that, as products of a settler-colonial society, Canadian universities must undergo significant self-examination and change in order to meaningfully contribute to the work of reconciliation (MacDonald, 2016; MccCallum, Nagam, Hanley, Caudano, & Gavrus, 2017; Pidgeon, 2016).

Descriptions of the ICR at the University of Winnipeg reflect some of these recommendations. McCallum et al. (2017) described the ways in which the history department at the University of Winnipeg underwent a process of critical self-evaluation in light of the new ICR. This process, which was both institutional and personal, forced faculty to examine the content and epistemologies at the foundation of their courses. Lepp-Friesen (2018) examined this implementation from a different perspective, studying the experiences of students and faculty in these courses. In this study, a majority of students (65%) reported an overall positive experience, citing increased understanding and awareness of Indigenous issues, a deepened sense of respect for Indigenous culture, and a commitment to the work of reconciliation. Among those who reported negative responses (28%), various reasons were given: antagonistic attitudes towards the course's compulsory nature, a rejection of the need for reconciliation, and the suggestion that these courses were silencing alternative perspectives. These reflections highlighted both the reason for optimism and the points of regarding student experiences with the UW's ICR. My study builds on these initial reflections, as it interrogates the work of education for reconciliation against the particular theoretical implications of disruptive knowledge.

In addition to considering *if* or *how* these requirements should be implemented, it is

essential to consider *why* such requirements should be implemented. Many of the considerations

above situate these requirements within the larger reconciliatory work of the university. This

work has unique implications for Indigenous people, non-Indigenous people, and the two groups

in relationship. The most widely described approach, one that Pidgeon suggests supported the

work of the University of Winnipeg, "is based on social justice, acknowledging the systemic and

societal racism and the general lack of awareness and understanding non-Aboriginal Canadians

have about Aboriginal peoples history and contemporary issues across the country" (Pidgeon,

2016, p. 85). In this view, non-Indigenous ignorance necessitates such a requirement. Such a

perspective stands in stark contrast to the work of Gaudry (2016), who argues directly against

this understanding:

> One long-standing myth is that Indigenous dispossession and marginalization is [sic] the
>
> result of settler ignorance, and the corrective for this is more education. Why this solution
>
> is generally correct, the identification of the problem is not. Dispossession and
>
> marginalization are the result of *colonialism*, not ignorance, an active process that
>
> replicates the privilege and power of some at the expense of others… The problem, then,
>
> isn't one of ignorance, but an all-to-easy justification of the social order. (Gaudry, 2016)

Gaudry's stark contrast of "colonialism" and "ignorance" reveals an important tension at the

heart of this study. As discussed earlier, the work of disruptive knowledge is not about acquiring

more knowledge, but, rather, about learning to adopt an orientation that recognizes the unending,

unfinished, and partial nature of our learning (Kumashiro, 2000). Gaudy's reflections offer a

reminder that any ICR must be understood as one step in a larger, ongoing project of

illuminating and challenging expressions of settler-colonialism. Just as others warned about the

dangers of mistaking critical consciousness for decolonization (Alfred, 2005; Tuck & Yang, 2012), Gaudry offers similar cautions in the context of the ICR. In this way, it is essential not only to understand if and how students' attitudes have changed; one must also consider how participants describe the implications of this change for ongoing personal and societal transformation.

Education for Reconciliation in Post-Secondary Courses in Australia

Given the relatively recent nature of such requirements, there is limited field-based research within a Canadian context. To better understand the potential of these courses, it is important to look beyond our borders. This must be done with some caution, recognizing the contextually-rooted nature of such education. The following section, then, is not meant to provide a detailed roadmap for post-secondary EfR work in Canada. Its purpose is to establish the broad possibilities and challenges of EfR within a similar socio-political context. To this end, Australia serves as an excellent point of comparison. The two countries share many similarities in both their historical and contemporary realities: Both countries are settler colonies and wealthy commonwealth nations that have a history of colonization against Indigenous peoples; both countries went through a Truth and Reconciliation Commission, which recommended implementation of education initiatives (Short, 2003); and both countries continue to report high levels of systemic and interpersonal discrimination against Indigenous peoples (Australian Human Rights Commission, 2016; TRC, 2015a).

This international parallel is one that leaders within Canada's reconciliation movement have already drawn. For example, in describing the Canadian context of "reconciliation", Regan (2010) draws on Ravi de Costa's description of ongoing ideological oppression in Australia. Her parallel suggests that, like in Canada, Australia has experienced no "rupture in the ideological

conditions that make settler or national identity possible. That is, a widespread acceptance

amongst both victims and perpetrators make the fundamental ideas underpinning social and

political arrangements untenable" (p. 46). Unlike other countries in which oppressive

governments have been overthrown, these contexts maintain many of the colonial systems that

have been the site of oppression for centuries. These structures allow for the reproduction of

colonial ideals, beliefs, and values that stand in direct opposition to the possibility of an

improved relationship. It is this shared set of complex and challenging dynamics that establish

the value of the Australian experience for understanding EfR in Canada.

The following section will outline Australian literature on the outcomes of EfR initiatives

for adult, non-Indigenous learners, as it pertains to the cognitive and affective aspects of their

attitudes. This body of literature is not large enough to reach any definitive conclusions

regarding the outcomes of such programs, but it does identify a few important themes. In light of

my own mixed methods approach, the following section reviews relevant literature from both

quantitative and qualitative areas of research.

Quantitative Work

Beginning with related quantitative research, there is some evidence for the positive

effects of formal education on non-Indigenous, adult learners' attitudes towards reconciliation.

Two notable studies (Hill & Augoustinos, 2001; Pedersen & Barlow, 2008), examined such

outcomes. As the proceeding discussion will outline, the authors revealed noteworthy changes

across various related attitudinal measures.

Hill and Augoustinos (2001) examined the responses of non-Indigenous adult learners

before and after a three-day anti-prejudice workshop, The Cross-Cultural Awareness

Programme. This government-initiated program is required for employees of the Court

Administration Authority (CAA) of Australia. As a response to the Royal Commission into

Aboriginal Deaths in Custody, the aim of this program is to increase understanding of Aboriginal

culture and history, while improving attitudes and reducing stereotyping towards Aboriginal

people. As part of their study, Hill and Augoustinos (2001) studied the experiences of 62

members of the CAA during their participation in this program.

This study included pre-course and post-course measures of participant knowledge,

prejudice, and stereotyping over three time points. The researchers used the constructs of

Modern Racism and Old-fashioned Racism to measure prejudice and created their own scales to

assess knowledge and stereotyping. Participants were given the questionnaire before the course

(Time 1), immediately after the course (Time 2), and three months after the course (Time 3).

Between Time 1 and Time 2, students underwent three days of classroom-based learning.

This course covered many different topics: History and culture of Aboriginal people in Australia;

the concept of institutional racism; research on attitudes, racism, and stereotyping; contemporary

expressions of racism in Australia; and approaches to confronting racism in the workplace. The

62 participants took the course in smaller groups, each of which was led by an Aboriginal

member of the CAA. This was an intentional choice on the part of the researchers, who hoped

that working with someone who was both a member of in-group (CAA member) and a member

of the target outgroup (Aboriginal) might aid in prejudice reduction and positively change

stereotypes.

Comparing the data across time points, a few key trends emerged. First, there was

significant change across all measures between Time 1 and Time 2. Students showed a reduction

in prejudice, positive change in stereotypes, and increased knowledge. Most of these changes

were not maintained over the three-month period between Time 2 and Time 3. The group of

participants who completed questionnaire at all time points ($n = 32$), showed no significant

change in prejudice or stereotyping between Time 1 and Time 3, but their level of knowledge at

Time 3 was significantly higher than it was at Time 1.

This positive finding aside, Hill and Augoustinos's (2001) study has a number of

shortcomings. First, as they concede in their own discussion, their sample size became so small

over the three time periods that it affected the statistical power of their analysis. A second

shortcoming of their study, which the authors also acknowledge, lies in the nature of the program

itself. Here, there were a number of problems. For one, the authors acknowledged the Cross-

Cultural Awareness Programme addressed Old-fashioned racism—blatant discrimination against

minority groups (e.g. beliefs of racial superiority)—as opposed to Modern Racism (e.g., denial of

ongoing discrimination). Additionally, this program tends to focus on interpersonal expressions

of prejudice, as opposed to prejudice that exists within broader institutions (e.g., education, law,

workplace). Taken together, these characteristics fail to capture systemic notions of injustice and

oppression that are part of life in Australia. In other words, the program only exposed

participants to a small glimpse into the reality of prejudice. Combined with the short duration of

the program, one can understand how such a course may fail to sustain attitudinal change as one

leaves the course and returns to work in space where more complex and far-reaching expressions

of prejudice are the norm. In both its content and its duration, the course was too limited to

permanently rehabilitate patterns of thought that are entrenched into larger social organization.

The duration (three-credit hour) and content (explicit focus on systemic matters of injustice) of

my examined courses allowed me to address this shortcoming.

Another potential shortcoming is linked to the study's measurement of knowledge. Taken

at face value, the disparity in outcomes between knowledge and prejudice may call into question

foundational assumptions of programs such as the Cross-Cultural Awareness Programme or the

ICR. These programs are rooted in the idea that knowledge can influence attitudes. However, the

measurement of these constructs is not straightforward. The authors of this study acknowledge

that the sustained increase in knowledge outcomes may simply have been a flaw in their

measure, as students simply recognized the correct answer after answering the same fact-based

questions at three time points.

The second notable quantitative study (Pedersen & Barlow, 2008) is slightly more

aligned with the focus of my work. Their study examined 123 first-year university students in an

elective unit on cultural psychology. Using the lens of psychology, this course examined aspects

of Indigenous culture and the ongoing prejudice facing Indigenous peoples in Australia. The

instructors tried to avoid inducing guilt in their lectures and encouraged dialogue regarding

Indigenous issues.

Data was collected at two time points, before and after the unit. Students were given a

questionnaire that measured their prejudice against Indigenous Australians, their false beliefs

regarding Indigenous Australians, and their sense of guilt regarding the present mistreatment of

Indigenous Australians. Attitudinal thermometers were used to quantify guilt and prejudice,

while a series of fact-based questions was used to measure false beliefs. Additionally, the

questionnaire included an open-ended qualitative question that asked students their thoughts on

the idea that Indigenous Australians receive special treatment from the government.

After taking the course, participants recorded significant changes across all intended

measures. As the researchers expected, participants recorded lower levels of prejudice and fewer

false beliefs regarding Indigenous Australians after taking the course. The researchers controlled

for the effect of guilt and found no significant change in students' reported guilt scores between

Time 1 and Time 2. Another noteworthy finding of the study came in the qualitative data. The

researchers found that students were much more positive in their descriptions of the "special

treatment" that Indigenous Australians receive in their post-course questionnaires.

This study offers obvious support for the design of my study, but it is not without its

shortcomings. First, like Hill and Augoustino's study (2001) the sample size posed issues for

statistical analysis. While the study began with 123 participants, only a fraction completed the

questionnaire at both time points. This drastic reduction in sample size underpowered the

researchers' study to an extent its effect sizes were difficult to detect. Secondly, the study

examined an elective course unit. Students who choose to take such a unit on Indigenous issues

exhibit some level of openness to this topic. Students with opposing viewpoints may have self-

selected themselves out of this unit (Pedersen & Barlow 2008). My study addresses this second

issue with its focus on a compulsory course.

Qualitative Work

In similar work from a qualitative perspective, course-based content has been shown to

positively affect non-Indigenous students' perspectives regarding matters of reconciliation

(Chiodo, Sonn, & Morda, 2014; Ranzign, Mcconnochie, Nolan, & Wharton, 2008; Sonn, 2008).

Each of these studies examines the work of EfR at the post-secondary level in Australia.

Examined separately, they each contribute important insights into programs such as the ICR.

Ranzign et al. (2008) found that such programming aligned well with the work of EfR.

Their work examined the experiences of 220 undergraduate students in a compulsory first-year

psychology course that addressed matters of reconciliation. The course provided a background

on Indigenous history, colonization, and contemporary Indigenous society. It then linked this

background knowledge to the field of psychology, as it explored issues of cultural competence,

intergenerational trauma, and grief within the Australian context. Finally, the course covered the topics of attitudes, beliefs, and racism. Following the course, students were given a questionnaire with three open-ended questions. These questions asked about their experiences in the course and about how the course affected their views of Indigenous Australians.

Ranzign et al.'s (2008) findings offer a few important ideas for my own study. First, students identified that the course elicited a sense of personal responsibility for the work of reconciliation, a key tenant of my theoretical framework (Regan, 2010). Secondly, they experienced little student resistance, despite the fact that the course was mandatory. One of the drawbacks of Ranzign et al.'s (2008) work, for matters of comparison, is that it seemed to have more of an institutional focus on students' general experience in the course. The study's emphasis was not primarily on matters of reconciliation but on the positive/negative experiences of students in these classes. As universities consider the implementation of these courses their overall quality (instructor, materials, structure, etc.) need to be considered, but such a broad focus limits Ranzign et al.'s (2008) ability to speak to matters of reconciliation in particular.

Writing from an autoethnographic perspective, Sonn's (2008) work provided a sharp contrast to that of Ranzign et al. (2008), as it critically examined issues of race, whiteness, and reconciliation in his own post-secondary setting. Sonn drew on his experiences teaching second and third-year psychology electives to explore the work of education for/in addressing Australia's racial injustice. Notably, for purposes of this study, he affirmed the potential of disruptive knowledge to illuminate systems of power and privilege and students' places within these systems. He suggested that as education draws on texts that lift up Indigenous voices and draw attention to whiteness, "we are able to challenge students to make visible their own group membership, privilege, and networks of power, and begin the process of repositioning

themselves in relation to racialized others" (p. 164). Sonn's work offers some strong theoretical

support for the project at hand, but its deeply contextual and personal nature does not establish

trends that are generalizable. This type of deeply contextual data leaves few concrete points of

comparison from which my study could proceed.

Finding a middle ground between the two fore-going studies, Chiodo, Sonn, & Morda's

(2014) work drew on aspects of critical pedagogy while following a methodology that is quite

similar to that of Razign et al (2008). The study focused on a six-week unit that drew on aspects

of multicultural education and social justice education. The aim of the course was to educate

students about Indigenous cultures while situating these discussions within historical and

contemporary contexts of power imbalance. Data collection involved open-ended questionnaires

that served as an evaluation of the course. While they were hesitant to claim any major shifts in

student attitudes, they did outline a few key findings. The students' responses revealed an

openness to consideration of whiteness and racial privilege, a deeper sense of cultural

competence, and new found knowledge of Indigenous issues in Australia. The sample size

(n=113) allows for consideration of trends within the work of disruptive knowledge that Sonn's

(2008) auto-ethnographic study did not. The common student responses provided a slightly

generalizable result to the potential of such critical pedagogy. At the same time, the data

collection was largely focused on evaluating the course as a whole, not directly on measuring

students' attitudes.

Considered together, it is clear these studies identify promising possibilities within this

work but leaves room for a more pointed examination of matters of reconciliation.

Problems and Challenges

Location of prejudice. One of the major challenges within such work is locating

prejudice and related attitudes. The individual expression of prejudice is both a basic premise

and an acknowledged roadblock in much of this literature (Hill & Augoustinos, 2001; Paradise,

2005; Pedersen & Barlow, 2008; Pedersen, Walker, & Wise, 2005). Underpinning this type of

study is "the widespread belief that prejudice is a personal pathology that requires 'attitudinal

and moral rehabilitation'" (Hill & Augoustinos, 2001, p. 260). This individual component of

prejudice is significant, but focusing on it may ignore forms of interpersonal and systemic

expressions of prejudice (Paradies, 2005). There is, thus, some agreement that such courses must

be part of much larger anti-racism initiatives that address interpersonal and systemic expressions

of prejudice, without simply focusing on individual attitudes (Hill & Augoustinos, 2001;

Paradies, 2005; Pedersen, Walker, & Wise, 2005; Pedersen & Barlow, 2008). In other words, an

understanding of individual attitudes does not provide a full picture of prejudice within society.

Given the complex nature of inter-group relations, such studies cannot presume to fully address

such issues. This shared finding within the Australian literature guided my own study. As will be

outlined in the chapters that follow, it is focused on both personal and systemic

conceptualizations of prejudice.

Long-term outcomes. In order to account for the lack of sustained attitudinal changes

amongst participants, Hill & Augoustinos (2001) recognized the difficulty of completing anti-

racist work within a systemically racist society. Without system-wide initiatives, there is little

hope for the sustained impact of "one-off" courses. A piecemeal approach to such education "is

unlikely to be effective if there are no serious challenges to the social realities that shape and

govern intergroup and structural relations" (p. 260). Conversely, Pedersen, Walker, & Wise

(2005) argued that education can foster the anti-racist attitudes that are required for large-scale

change. They argued that such attitudes are "important to address as precursors for attempts to

introduce major structural or legislative change" (p. 28). These seemingly opposed views of

education's role represent a sentiment that is shared across this small body of literature —

education has a proven capacity for fostering attitudes for reconciliation but, for it to be truly

effective within an unjust society, such education cannot exist as an isolated initiative (Hill &

Augoustinos 2001; Paradise, 2005; Pedersen & Barlow, 2008; Pedersen, Walker, & Wise, 2005).

For the University of Winnipeg, the ICR is an expression of their attempt to respond to TRC

Calls to Action on an institution-wide level (University of Winnipeg, n.d.). However, in light of

the broader context of settler-colonialism, the long-term impact of such initiatives may be

limited.

      Conflation of terms and pedagogies. It is difficult to draw any meaningful conclusions

regarding effective pedagogies from the Australian body of literature. This is not due to a lack of

identifiable pedagogical language such as "anti-racist education" or "multicultural education".

Rather, it is due to the contradictory and conflated uses of these terms. In some of these studies

(Hill & Augoustinos, 2001; Pedersen & Barlow, 2008) "anti-racist" seems to be a broad

descriptor aimed at "eliminating (or at the very least modifying) racist beliefs and/or behaviours"

(Pedersen, Walker, & Wise, 2005, p. 21). This usage seems to draw on larger notions of "anti-

racism strategies" within the field of social psychology (Pedersen, Walker, & Wise, 2005). In

other studies (Chiodo, Sonn, & Morda, 2014; Sonn, 2008), the term is explicitly linked to the

work of critical pedagogy (Freire, 1972). In this latter framework, "anti-racist education" more

closely parallels the common use of the term within Canadian literature (Dei, 1996; Dei, 2014;

St. Denis, 2007). This version of anti-racist education aims to "decentre privileged ways of being

and knowing, and instead consider the ways in which power and issues of identity and belonging

influence the ways in which race relations are negotiated in culturally diverse communities"

(Chiodo, Sonn, & Morda, 2014, p. 183). These usages may share some similarities but can

denote significantly different approaches to teaching and learning. Without a larger body of

literature or more consistent use of terminology, it is impossible to make meaningful claims

about the efficacy or outcomes of various pedagogical approaches to EfR within this literature.

Negative student response. While acknowledging largely positive student responses to

these courses, some scholars identified the presence of negative student responses (Chiodo,

Sonn, & Morda, 2014; Pedersen, Walker, & Wise, 2005; Ranzijin et al., 2008, Sonn, 2008).

Some students raised issue with the courses' particular focus on Indigenous issues and culture,

objecting to the absence of other minority cultures and perspectives (Chiodo, Sonn, & Morda,

2014). Others opposed the compulsory nature of such coursework (Ranzijin et al,.2008). Another

common, negative experience was participant guilt (Pedersen, Walker, & Wise, 2005; Sonn,

2008). Feelings of guilt have been linked to lower levels of prejudice (Pedersen, Beven, Walker,

& Griffin, 2004), but guilt-inducing strategies are seen to be an ineffective means of promoting

student engagement in these issues (Pedersen, Walker, & Wise, 2005).

Limited outcomes. In contrast to the studies above, Maddison and Stastny (2016)

provided a large-scale analysis of education for reconciliation efforts in Australia. With over 10

years of studies to draw from, they argued that "there is little evidence to suggest that education

is a deeply transformative site with regard to non-Indigenous attitudes to Aboriginal and Torres

Strait Islander people and/or reconciliation" (p. 233). The broad scope of this paper called into

question many commonly-held assumptions regarding the nature and potential of education for

reconciliation. Notably, even those programs that contained critical aspects—description of

historical/contemporary injustice, acknowledgement of white privilege, recognition of personal implication within systems of oppression—failed to produce meaningful changes in participant behaviour. In Maddison and Stastny's (2016) estimation, overcoming centuries of colonial injustice is a nearly impossible task for education to undertake. In the end, "it seems that the logic of settler-colonialism…fosters a kind of 'deafness' to learning about Australia's history, Indigenous people and cultures, and an unwillingness to engage" (p. 245). In their estimation, the work of education within a colonial system holds little power to transform the attitudes and behaviours of those who refuse to engage.

Madison and Stastny's bold claims should provide some pause for EfR researchers, but they do not render this project futile. As the preceding studies have shown, there is evidence that suggests that there is transformative potential within education for reconciliation in Australia. Additionally, one must not overstate the similarities between the Australian and Canadian contexts. In light of the notable differences that remain (e.g., cultural differences of Indigenous groups, land claims/treaty process, political structures) this body of research offers direction, hope, and caution for my study, but it does little to render it superfluous or futile. The unique challenges of the Canadian context and the relative dearth of related literature necessitate such a study, even in light of the broader body of literature that exists for the Australian context.

Attitudes and Inequity

The preceding discussion has considered large themes of settler-colonialism, reconciliation, and disruptive knowledge as well as particular topic areas of research regarding the work of EfR in Canada and Australia. This section attempts to explore a middle ground as it returns to the topic of attitudes. In particular, this section will examine the functions of attitudes, attitudes regarding disruptive knowledge, and Canadian attitudes regarding issues of

reconciliation. Whereas other sections provided a foundation for the purpose and design of the study, this section of the literature will be critical for analyzing and interpreting the results of the study.

In Chapter 1, I reviewed the basic view of attitudes that guides this study. Most scholars agree that affective, behavioural, and cognitive influences shape our evaluations of the world around us, forming attitudes towards various objects (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993; Maio & Haddock, 2010; Petty, 2012). In this way, our feelings, past experiences, and beliefs all have influence over the evaluations we make on a day-to-day basis. In order to understand workings of attitudes in contexts of inequality, one needs to go beyond the mere content of attitudes in order to consider their purpose.

There are many theories to explain the functions of attitudes, but the enduring understandings share a few broad characteristics. Some of these theorists categorize these functions into sub-categories (Herek, 2000) or consider additional functions (Maio, Esses, Arnold, & Olson, 2004), but they all point to some expression of the following functions. First, attitudes guide our evaluation of the world around us for our immediate benefit. We form attitudes in order to avoid those things which are displeasing and to engage those things which are beneficial or pleasing (Maio & Haddock, 2010; Petty, 2012). Secondly, attitudes serve a social-adjustment function that aligns us with desirable others (Maio, Esses, Arnold, & Olson, 2004; Herek, 2000). Whereas the first function drew us to favourable objects, the social-adjustment function is organized around embracing/avoiding others who express certain attitudes. The last attitudinal function works to protect the ego against internal conflict (Maio & Haddock, 2010; Petty, 2012). Certain attitudes protect one's self-identity and worldview and when these attitudes are challenged, crisis may occur. This *externalization* function is of

particular importance when considering difficult truths about social inequity and one's role within it. The following studies examine how these various functions of attitude work for and against change.

One notable finding revolves around the impact of national identity on one's ability to acknowledge past injustices. Doosje, Branscombe, Spears, and Manstead (2006) examined Dutch students' responses to reminders of their country's colonization and exploitation of Indonesia. This study found that the strength of participant's national identity predicted their level of acknowledgement of their country's wrongdoings and their support of apologies—participants with a strong sense of national identity were less likely to acknowledge their country's wrongdoing. This study and others like it (Branscombe, Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje, 1999; Mackie, Devos, & Smith, 2000) reveal the barriers that group identity can present when individuals are faced with troubling information. Scholars such as Regan (2010) have pointed out that there are strong national myths against which the work of EfR must proceed (e.g. Canada as peacemaker). Within the work of disruptive knowledge, there is a clear danger that the externalization function of attitude function might prevent participants from truly questioning their country.

These barriers exist not only in participants' receptivity regarding past injustice, but also regarding ongoing inequities. In order to explain this phenomenon, Leach, Snider, and Iyer (2002) developed the Model of Relative Advantage. This model examines the unique affect-based attitudes that are produced through one's recognition of their place of privilege in inequitable societies. They posit two forms of engagement: Other-focused and self-focused. These orientations represent the aspect of the inequity (their advantage vs. others disadvantage) that is most salient to the participant. Leach, Snider, and Iyer suggested that participant response

is dependent on their orientation (self-focused vs. other-focused), their perception of the advantage (legitimate vs. illegitimate) and their sense of control (high vs. low). Each combination of these variables can produce a different affective outcome. Of these outcomes, only three hold the potential for meaningful action (guilt, sympathy, moral outrage) while the rest maintain the imbalance and prevent change from taking place (indignation, pride, disdain, pity, fear, worry, gloating).

Building off this theoretical framework, Iyer, Leach, & Crosby (2003) studied self-focused and group-focused approaches to intergroup attitudes among White college students in the U.S. They measured the relationship between guilt and support for government action in the form of restitution or affirmative action for African Americans. Here, "guilt" was operationalized as being a characteristic of participants who had a self-focused approach to relative advantage, a high sense of control over their advantage, and who felt that the advantage was illegitimate. In this context, a high sense of guilt was predictive of the participants' support for government action in the form of restitution and affirmative action.

These preceding studies provide a few key insights into how and why participants' attitudes do and do not change in the face of disruptive knowledge. Within such a context, there is a clear sense that the externalization function of attitudes can present a serious barrier to such work. Disruptive knowledge challenges and critiques many of the certainties that this attitudinal function seeks to protect. Considering the work of Doosje, Branscombe, Spears, and Manstead (2006), Leach, Snider, and Iyer (2002), and Iyer, Leach, & Crosby (2003), it is clear that there are reasons both for optimism and caution in this type of work. The intersections of these frameworks and my own findings will be discussed in Chapter 5.

Attitudes Toward Reconciliation in Canada

Within a Canadian context, there is little academic research on the attitudes of non-Indigenous Canadians towards matters of reconciliation that has been conducted since the release of the TRC Final Report. The closest relevant document is the Public Opinion on Aboriginal Peoples survey Environics Institute for Survey Research, 2016). This survey was the product of various Indigenous and non-Indigenous groups who have a shared emphasis on matters of reconciliation. The study included a nationally representative survey of 2,001 Canadians over the age of 18. This study served as a follow-up to an initial survey that was released in 2008. Looking at the changes in the results over those eight years, a number of key trends emerge.

One notable trend lies in the attitudes of non-Indigenous Canadians regarding contemporary injustice facing Indigenous Canadians. When given an open-ended question regarding the biggest challenge facing Indigenous Canadians, nine out of ten respondents were able to provide an answer, but there was little agreement across participants. In 2008, the most common response focused on treaty rights and land claims (18% of respondents), whereas in 2016 the most common response focused on inequality and discrimination (18%). In 2008, only 6% of respondents identified inequality and discrimination as the biggest issue facing Indigenous Canadians. Similarly, in 2006 74% of respondents felt that Aboriginal people "Often" or "Sometimes" face discrimination. In 2016, that number had risen to 87%. While these stats seem to suggest an acknowledgement of the ongoing injustice facing Indigenous peoples, the study also offers evidence to the contrary. As mentioned earlier, there is a sharp divide between respondents' attitudes towards institutional discrimination and the findings of systemic injustice within the TRC's Final Report. Discussing institutions such as education, health care, criminal

justice, and the workplace, a minority of respondents felt that Indigenous people were treated

worse than other Canadians.

Another notable set of findings came in relation to respondents' understanding of their

role within the work of reconciliation. In 2008, 67% of respondents "Yes, feel strongly" or "Yes,

do not feel strongly" when asked in individual Canadians have a role in the work of

reconciliation. In 2016, that number had risen to 84%. Relatedly, 33% of respondents agreed,

either "Strongly" or "Somewhat" that Mainstream Canadian society benefits from ongoing

discrimination against Indigenous peoples.

Lastly, this study revealed the varying levels of support that non-Indigenous Canadians

have for various government initiatives related to Indigenous peoples. Strong support was high

for equal funding for education (75%) and issues of drinking water and adequate housing (75%).

However, it was relatively low for issues related to the control of land. 24% of respondents

strongly support settling all outstanding land claims, regardless of cost. 31% of respondents

strongly support providing Aboriginal communities with full control over natural resources on

traditional territories.

My study built off these initial findings, to produce richer and deeper data. A quick look

at the survey construction of the Environics Institute for Survey Research study reveals sub-

optimal survey construction (e.g. limited response options, vague response options, etc.). I

adjusted these questions to better align with the standards in attitudinal research. Not only does

my study produce more nuanced quantitative data, it also provides some insights into the

motivations and explanations behind these numbers. The qualitative component of my study

adds context-specific insights into non-Indigenous attitudes regarding reconciliation. My study

moves from the broad, nationally-representative picture of the Environics study to the local

setting of the ICR at the University of Winnipeg. While non-Indigenous attitudes remain the

focus of both studies, my study examines those attitudes within larger questions of the work of

education for reconciliation. In these ways, my study builds on and extends the work of the

Environics Institute for Survey Research (2016) study.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Methodology

This study adopted a mixed-methods approach comprised of quantitative and qualitative methods. The rationale for this methodology begins with my research question. There is widespread agreement among scholars that the selection of a mixed-methods approach must be rooted in one's purpose and research questions (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011; Greene, 2007; Ivankova, Creswell, & Stick, 2006; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2015). Describing mixed methods research, Greene (2007) argued that "methodology is ever the servant of purpose [and questions], never the master" (p. 97). With this frame of reference, it is important to return to the main research question:

- How do select ICR courses affect non-Indigenous students' attitudes on contemporary
    issues related to reconciliation in Canada?

This main question reflects a key characteristic of mixed-methods research — it is a broad inquiry that can be addressed through both quantitative and qualitative means (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2010).

Mixed methods research builds on the strengths of quantitative and qualitative measures while minimizing the effects of each approach's weaknesses (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011; Tashakkori, Teddlie, & Johnson, 2015). Quantitative methods are standard in attitudinal research change and well-suited to measure over time (Maio & Haddock, 2010). Qualitative methods allow me to examine these trends in a manner that is deeper, more contextual, and more nuanced (Glesne, 2016). On their own, neither of these methods would provide a full answer to the main research question as it is currently framed. As an under-researched topic, it is valuable to gain

insights into broad trends across a larger population. At the same time, the context-specific

nature of disruptive knowledge and the complex nature of reconciliation require the rich

descriptions that qualitative methods provide. These quantitative and qualitative methods can

provide a robust answer to my research question (Ivankova, Creswell, & Stick, 2006).

<div align="center">**Mixed Methods: The Debates**</div>

Mixed methods research is often seen to occupy a tensioned philosophical position within

academia given the oppositional framing of quantitative and qualitative epistemologies

(Bergman, 2008). Philosophical considerations are necessary for all researchers, but the diverse

and sometimes opposing views within mixed-methods research make this task a complex

undertaking (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). For my study, this task is particularly challenging

given the ways in which justice-oriented scholars have problematized the positivistic roots of

quantitative research (Bowers, 2001; Giroux, 2011). As mentioned in Chapter 1, the

philosophical assumptions of quantitative research have been linked to colonialism and the

silencing of Indigenous ways of knowing. Some argue that researchers must adopt critical

methodologies that reject the colonial trappings of positivistic research (Dei, 2005).

Acknowledging these concerns, this study nevertheless proceeds on the belief that these

varying epistemologies are not inherently oppositional. In discussing the "straw man" arguments

surrounding the divide between qualitative and quantitative approaches, Bergman (2008)

challenged many of the often-cited conflicts between these two approaches. He proposed a

framework in which scholars could draw on empirical measurements without assuming all of the

harmful ideologies that can accompany them. Keeping with this line of thinking, I do draw on

traditional quantitative methods, but I approach these methods from a post-positivistic stance. I

use this term to identify a less-strict approach to quantitative research in which the world is "at

least approximately knowable" (Glesne, 2016, p.8). This stance does not present my findings as completely objective and universal laws of human behaviour, but it nevertheless values the importance of sound methodological practices rooted in validity and reliability (Greene, 2007). On the other hand, Phase 2 of my study is more closely aligned with an interpretivist lens in which meaning is constructed and contextually bound. I recognize the various levels of interpretation that are part of the research process — the participants' descriptions of their experience, my analysis and interpretation of their descriptions, and the reader's interpretation of my analysis (Greene, 2007). These two philosophical perspectives are meant to inform my study in complementary ways; it is not my goal to resolve or overcome the philosophical tensions within mixed-methods research.

      This dialectic approach recognizes the partiality of each perspective and the rich, albeit tensioned, insights they can offer when considered in dialogue. Green (2007) argues for this mixed philosophical approach as a "respectful conversations among different ways of seeing and knowing" (p. 79). Within a Canadian context, scholars have pushed for a similar dialectic approach between Eurocentric and Indigenous epistemologies (Battiste, 2013; TRC, 2015b). These authors acknowledge the damage of positivist thinking within settler-colonial Canada but offer a non-exclusionary vision of academia in which various forms of knowing can be used to address matters of reconciliation. As an independent, non-Indigenous researcher, my work will not accomplish this larger goal of "trans-systemic" knowledge exchange (Battiste, 2013), but it does acknowledge the importance of moving beyond the narrow confines of compartmentalized epistemologies.

Research Site

The site for this study was the University of Winnipeg. In recent years, Winnipeg's struggle for racial equity has made national headlines. From major coverage of its ongoing problems of racism (Macdonald, 2015) to declaring its own "Year of Reconciliation" (City of Winnipeg, 2016), the city has assumed a prominent place in Canada's discussion of Indigenous and non-Indigenous relations. In addition, the University of Winnipeg has recently become one of only two universities across Canada to require all undergraduate students to fulfill an Indigenous Course Requirement (ICR). In its description of its Indigenous Course Requirement, the university draws on language of "reconciliation" and points to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) of Canada to provide its own rationale for the course (University of Winnipeg, n.d.). These city-wide and institutional characteristics clearly identify the University of Winnipeg as a site suited for research on education for reconciliation.

Participants

Participants were non-Indigenous students ($N = 50$) currently enrolled in an Indigenous Course Requirement courses at the University of Winnipeg. All students were invited to participate in the survey and receive renumeration, but the data from Indigenous participants were not analyzed. Participants were enrolled in one of the following courses:

CRS-2443 (3) Conflict and Development Issues in Indigenous Communities

FREN-3609 (3) Decolonizing Voices: Francophone Indigenous Literature (3 hrs Lecture)

HIST-1007 (3) Indigenous History Since 1900: Racism, Resistance, Renewal

IS-2020 (3) Colonization and Aboriginal Peoples

These courses were selected for one major reason: They all examined issues of contemporary injustice facing Indigenous peoples in Canada. As outlined in Appendix A, these courses claim

to address the contemporary expressions of injustice, colonization, or racism. Within work on

disruptive knowledge (Kumashiro, 2000) and the work of Canadian scholars writing about

decolonizing education (Battiste, 2013; Regan, 2010; St. Denis, 2007), it is essential to recognize

oppression, injustice, and racism as contemporary phenomena.

Data Collection Methods

Using a mixed-methods approach, this study followed the explanatory sequence in which

the quantitative phase (Phase 1) preceded the qualitative phase (Phase 2). In Phase 1, participants

($N = 50$) were given a brief survey before and after their participation in the ICR. These surveys

were used to measure change in their attitudes over the span of the course. Phase 2 of the study

qualitatively expanded the results of Phase 1. After analyzing the results of Phase 1, an

interview schedule was developed in order to explore notable findings. The interview schedule

sought richer descriptions of the nature, meaning, and importance of participants' attitude

change. For Phase 2, I recruited participants ($n = 8$) from the participant pool of Phase 1 for in-

depth interviews. The data collected in Phase 2 were then analyzed for themes using emic and

etic coding, whereby themes were both applied to the text and recognized as emerging from the

data.

Phase 1: Quantitative Phase

Quantitative Data Collection

As a means of measuring students' attitudes towards issues related to reconciliation, a 19-

question survey (Appendix B) was administered in-person at two time points. Timepoint 1

occurred near the beginning of participants' ICR courses in January, 2018. Timepoint 2 occurred

near the end of the ICR courses in April, 2018. These surveys were used to measure change in

participants' attitudes. The survey questions were adapted from *Canadian Public Opinion on*

Aboriginal Peoples (Environics Institute for Survey Research, 2016). The survey included 18

multiple-choice questions that employed a Likert scale. The survey also included one open-

ended question. This survey was administered in-class with the permission of the course

instructors.

Rationale for survey. Surveys are one of the most widely used tools in the measurement

of attitudes (Maio & Haddock, 2010; Sapsford, 2007). Rooted in the value of comparison, they

allow researchers to easily study change over time between two identical samples. For these

reasons, it is an adequate choice for my initial examination of non-Indigenous participant's

attitudes towards reconciliation.

Not only does the use of a survey meet the broad goals of the project, the particular

survey from which questions were adapted is a strong match for the research problem. The

rationale behind the *Canadian Public Opinion of Aboriginal Peoples* survey, closely parallels the

aims of my study:

> The objectives of this research are to better understand non-Aboriginal Canadians in
>
> terms of…Perceptions and attitudes about Aboriginal peoples generally, and about
>
> specific issues (e.g., residential schools, reconciliation, economic disparities).
>
> (Environics Institute for Survey Research, 2016)

While the focus of their study is slightly broader than matters of reconciliation, it does align well

with this current project. As one examines this original study more closely, additional rationale is

provided for the use of these questions.

Another strength of this survey, from which I adapted my questions, is its established

place within the larger work of reconciliation. Seven non-profit organizations, representing

Indigenous and non-Indigenous groups across Canada, worked together to create the *Canadian*

Public Opinion on Aboriginal Peoples survey (Environics Institute for Survey Research, 2016). The input of these groups lends content validity to this instrument (Litwin, 1995). The document reflects the input of National Centre for Truth and Reconciliation and grassroots organizations such as Reconciliation Canada, among others. This wide range of Indigenous and non-Indigenous input provides some assurance that the questions reflect the issues at the heart of this study.

A third important connection exists between the survey questions and my research questions. All survey questions relate directly to my research questions, which are also closely linked to my theoretical framework. This survey addresses participants' recognition of contemporary injustice against Indigenous peoples (items 1-5), their sense of complicity in ongoing discrimination (items 6-9), their sense of responsibility to the work of reconciliation (items 10-11), and their support for government responses to matters of reconciliation (items 13-18). The clear theoretical links between these questions and my purposes support my use of these questions.

Limitations of survey. Unlike other tools of psychometrics, there is no literature that outlines the development and analysis of this scale. In the Environics report, the survey items were listed individually and are not presented as part of a larger construct. From a traditional positivistic perspective, this raises some concern over the reliability and validity of the scale. In order to address this limitation, I ran analyses to identify the statistical relationship between theoretically-related items. This allowed me to combine single items into larger constructs. Additionally, the survey data are not meant to stand alone as the only source of meaning in this study. The interview data expands and supports the findings of the survey. For these reasons, and

the rationale listed above, the benefits of using this survey far outweigh any perceived positivistic shortcomings.

Quantitative Data Analysis

In order to statistically analyze the survey data, numerical values were assigned to all close-ended responses (e.g., Strongly agree = 5, Strongly disagree = 1). These values were used in both the preliminary analyses and main analyses. Preliminary analyses were conducted to understand the relationship between survey items. Such analyses identified relationships between items, which allowed some measures to be analyzed together. If items were theoretically linked and highly correlated, I combined the items and analyzed the larger construct (e.g., Support for government initiatives). My preliminary analysis also included the codification of open-ended responses. Here, key terms and ideas were used to categorize responses into representative groups.

The main analyses used repeated measures t-test. This statistical test was used to measure the difference in participants' attitudes between Time 1 to Time 2. Both the preliminary analysis and main analyses were run using SPSS software which calculated all relevant values.

<div align="center">

Phase 2: Qualitative Phase

</div>

Participants for Phase 2 were drawn from the participant pool of Phase 1. The goal of Phase 2 was to expand and explain the results of Phase 1, adding complexity and nuance to the numerical data. It is clear that the "individuals best suited to do so [were] the ones who contributed to the quantitative data set" (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). Thus, participants from Phase 1 were invited to partake in the in-depth interview. Following the recommendations of Creswell and Plano Clark (2011), the sample size for this phase was much smaller ($n = 8$) than the first phase ($N = 50$). A smaller sample promoted the feasibility of rich, in-depth interviews

while providing enough qualitative data to meaningfully answer the research questions (Glesne,

2016). Participants were selected to reflect the demographic proportions of Phase 1 (age, sex,

education, ethnicity, etc.).

Qualitative Data Collection

Based on the results of Phase 1, an interview schedule (Appendix C) was created to better

understand the meanings, experiences, and explanations associated with participants' answers to

the survey questions (Creswell & Clark, 2011). These interviews were 25-50 minutes in length.

They were semi-structured in nature, including follow-up questions and probes in order to foster

a conversational exchange that was guided by the participants' words and ideas (Glesne, 2016).

Interviews were digitally recorded and memo-notes were taken during the interview to identify

non-verbal cues and aid in the coding processes.

Given the complex and interpersonal nature of reconciliation (Regan, 2010; TRC, 2015a),

there is a need for rich descriptions and personal accounts of students' experiences. The survey

tool may provide a meaningful overview of trends and themes but it limits participant expression

and does not provide an explanation for these trends and themes (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011).

The in-depth interview provided a fuller and deeper understanding of the survey data. As

Johnson & Rowlands (2012) described, the in-depth interview delves into the lived experiences

and context of an event:

> It begins with common sense perceptions, explanations, and understandings of some
>
> lived cultural experience…and aims to explore the contextual boundaries of that
>
> experience or perception, to uncover what is usually hidden from ordinary view or
>
> reflection or to penetrate to more reflective understandings about the nature of that
>
> experience. (p. 103)

Such a research tool fits well within the context of the research problem. As outlined earlier, consideration of context is essential within the work of education for reconciliation and disruptive knowledge (Hart, 2011; Kumashiro, 2000; Paulson, 2011). In these ways, in-depth interviews allowed for personal, contextual, and rich descriptions of participants' attitudes.

Qualitative Data Analysis

Once transcriptions were created, various forms of coding were applied. This coding process involved identifying and linking themes that occur within the data (Glesne, 2016). I followed Maxwell's (2013) categorizing strategy, which included coding along organizational, substantive, and theoretical lines. Rooted in identifying similarities and differences, each of these coding processes involves a different aspect of sorting and analyzing the data.

For the organizational step, I divided information into separate categories in relation to topics that they addressed. Here, the focus is not on the substance of what the participant said, but only on the nature of what they were talking about (Maxwell, 2013). This step organized data around topics covered in my research questions. The next two steps (substantive and theoretical categorization) penetrated into the nature of what was said. Matters of meaning were closely considered as descriptive categories are applied to the data. For the substantive stage, categories represent the participants' explanations and descriptions of meaning (Maxwell, 2013). Within this work, I identified the trends that occurred within and across cases, while staying close to the words and meanings within the data itself. This work is slightly distinct from the final theoretical mode of categorization, where categories were drawn from theories that are external to the data (Maxwell, 2013). In this final step, I drew on the larger body of literature to apply external codes to the body of data. Here, I re-read my data through the lenses of relevant theories to identify notable trends.

Lastly, a copy of the analysis was shared with the interview participants. This stage of member-checking provided the opportunity for participants to confirm/deny/challenge/critique my interpretations. It was also meant to create space for additional analytic perspectives. In combination with the conversational nature of the interview, member-checking was meant to empower the participants as active contributors to the research process (Glesne, 2016). Some participants responded to these initial analyses and affirmed my interpretation of their words. Others did not respond to this opportunity.

Establishing Validity in Mixed-Methods Research

Drawing on quantitative and qualitative methods, mixed-methods research relies on multiple approaches to establishing validity. For many researchers, regardless of their orientation, the notion of validity is closely tied to the idea of trustworthiness— the extent to which the results of the study can be trusted (Glesne, 2016; Golafshani, 2003, Zohrabi, 2013). As the proceeding discussion of validity will show, establishing this trustworthiness involves distinct steps for each phase of my study.

For the quantitative component of my study, careful consideration was given to the data collection tools. In order for my results to be valid, there needs to be some assurance that my questions actually measured attitudes related to measures of reconciliation. Given that my research questions came out of the work of nationally-recognized, reconciliation-oriented groups (e.g., National Centre of Truth and Reconciliation), my questions are understood to offer content validity—The questions are based on the work of experts in the field (Litwin, 1995; Zohrabi, 2013).

In order to further ensure the validity of results within Phase 1, a number of additional steps were taken in the construction and delivery of the survey. First, I considered the potential

problem of response bias. This general term refers to characteristics of a survey (length, question order, response options, response option order, etc.) that can cause responses to deviate from the respondent's true answer (Lavrakas, 2008). I took a few steps to address this potential bias: I limited the survey length and adjusted response options (negative/positive wording, order, etc.) across survey items.

One of the greatest obstacles to research involving self-reported attitudes is the Social Desirability Bias—the tendency of participants to provide answers that reflect what is socially acceptable, as opposed to the answers that reflect their true attitudes (Krumpal, 2013). This is not an obstacle that can be completely overcome, but it can be addressed. As opposed to completing the survey directly with a researcher, all participants anonymously completed the survey, reducing the influence of the researcher. When completing the survey, participants were not asked to record their identity (e.g. write their name) on the documents that included their survey responses. Additionally, participants were assured that their identities would not be attached to published results and they were reminded that there were no correct answers. Lastly, anticipated results of the study were not discussed with participants. These steps were meant to limit the impact of the Social Desirability Bias.

The issue of Social Desirability Bias is also worth considering for data collection in the qualitative phase of my study. Whereas I can provide Phase 1 participants with self-complete surveys to promote truthful responses, this is not an option when it comes to the in-depth interview. The face-to-face nature of the interview creates added social pressures that might influence participant responses (Zohrabi, 2013). To limit these threats to validity, it was essential to construct questions in a manner in which no "correct" answer is evident. The questions were created in manner that invited participants to share their experience without assuming or

implying a desired result (e.g. attitude change). Even though I had quantitative data that

suggested that these participants had experienced certain positive attitudinal changes, I

constructed the questions in a manner that created space for them to describe any experience

(e.g. positive change, no change, negative change).

Examining the power distribution between researcher and participant is also critical for

the analysis of data in a qualitative approach. Member-checking is one way of reducing the

divide between these research parties, while also increasing the validity of the study's findings.

Member-checking allowed participants to examine my analysis of their words/ideas while giving

them the opportunity to validate or challenge my interpretations (Glesne, 2016). In the pursuit of

trustworthiness, I felt that this was an important step to increase the likelihood that my final

conclusions accurately reflected the participants' own meanings.

Ethical Considerations

It was my expectation that all participants provided informed consent of their own free

will to join this study. This consent was given at each stage of the research process. Recruitment

of participants took place in-class at the University of Winnipeg. Following the reading of the

recruitment script, a consent form (Appendix D) was provided to all interested students. This

form included a full description of the purpose and nature of the study, as well as an overview of

the expectations and demands of participants. Contact information for both the researcher and the

Education Nursing Research Ethics Board (ENREB) was provided to all participants. They were

also encouraged to contact the researcher or ENREB with any questions regarding the study.

Given the potentially troubling nature of ICR course content (e.g., colonization, abuse, poverty),

the research package also included a list of counselling services for all participants.

Steps were taken to protect the identity of all participants. All data was stored in encrypted files that are password protected. Additionally, codes were generated to link participants' personal information to sections of data. The file that contained the key for these codes were stored separately from the data files to ensure that all data files were completely anonymous. Further, any identifying information within the qualitative data was removed. Small remuneration was offered for students' participation. Each participant in Phase 1 was also entered in a draw for a $200 gift card to the University of Winnipeg bookstore. Participants in Phase 2 where each given a $10 gift card to a local coffee shop.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Phase 1 Results

Participant Demographics

As part of the survey, participants in Phase 1 provided demographic information that was requested in the survey. In total, 61 non-Indigenous participants completed this survey at Timepoint 1. However, 11 of these participants did not complete the Timepoint 2 survey. Given that the repeated measures t-test requires data from both timepoints, I excluded these participants from my analyses and the demographics below.

The final sample of 50 students completed one of four select ICR courses across four disciplines: History ($n = 17$), International Development Studies ($n = 23$), French ($n = 5$), and Indigenous Studies ($n = 5$). Participation was somewhat proportional to the final enrolment of each course: History ($n = 43$), International Development Studies ($n = 43$), French ($n = 10$), and Indigenous studies ($n = 21$). The mean age of participants was 23.7 years ($SD = 8.6$), with a range of 18-56 years. Categorical demographic information is outlined in Table 1. Compared with institutional data, there is one noteworthy difference. The percentage of participants who identified as women (79.3%) is much higher than the institutional average of 63% (Lepp-Friesen, 2018).

Survey Data

Descriptive statistics. The frequencies of responses for each survey item at Timepoint 1 and Timepoint 2 are listed in Appendix E. I also combined conceptually-related items into multi-item measures, where appropriate. When combining items, I followed a few important steps. Following Furr's (2011) guidelines for scale construction, I looked for theoretical connections between items in order to identify possible constructs (e.g., support for government initiatives)

and ensured that the questions for each construct used identical response options (e.g., strongly agree, agree, etc.). For example, survey item #1 (How often do you think Indigenous peoples are the subject of discrimination in Canadian society today?) was not included with other measures of contemporary discrimination, because its response options (Always, often, etc.) were very distinct from the other items that also assess this construct (Treated much better, treated somewhat better, etc.), creating issues for comparison. Finally, I ran a series of analyses to determine the statistical relationship between these items. For constructs of three or more items, I calculated Cronbach's alpha. This test measures the internal consistency between items (Field, 2013). For measures composed of two items, I calculated their correlation to identify the strength of their relationship. As outlined in Table 2, Cronbach's alpha for these constructs was above the standard cut-off ($\alpha \geq .70$) representing adequate internal consistency (Field, 2013). Similarly, as shown in Table 3, most correlations indicated large effect sizes ($r \geq .50$; Cohen, 1988). The Timepoint 2 correlation between items 8 and 9 did not reach this cut-off, so those items were not combined in further analyses.

Inferential statistics. These descriptive results suggest changes in attitudes between Timepoint 1 and Timepoint 2. In order to assess the statistical significance of the differences between mean scores for each survey measure at Timepoint 1 and Timepoint 2, I conducted a series of dependent measures t-tests. Table 4 presents the results of these analyses for the multi-item measures, and Table 5 presents the results of a repeated-measures t-test on remaining individual items. The assumptions of the repeated-measures t-test were met across most constructs. For some measures (sense of responsibility, support for government initiatives), the differences in means were not normally distributed. This was determined using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests. For these measures, I conducted non-parametric analyses

(Wilcoxon Signed-Ranks Test). In both cases, the results were very similar to those produced by

the repeated measures t-tests (e.g., support for government initiatives: $p = .001$; sense of

responsibility: $p = .070$); I thus report the repeated-measures t-test below for simplicity.

Across all multi-item measures, the difference in means was statistically significant ($p \leq$

$.01$) and/or represented a noteworthy effect size ($d \leq .20$). Effect sizes where $d \geq 0.20$ indicate a

strength of change that is practically significant (Cohen, 1988). For the four multi-item measures,

both conditions were met for three of the measures. Using Cohen's (1988) benchmarks in effect

size, 1/4 of the effect sizes can be classified as small ($d \leq .20$), while the other 3/4 can be

classified as medium ($d \leq .50$).

In the context of the University of Winnipeg's ICR, these results are notable. The ICR

and the courses within it were not designed with an explicit focus on attitudinal change. As

outlined in earlier chapters, there is reason to believe that such courses might produce such

attitudinal change, but this requirement is part of a much larger reconciliation-focused effort.

Looking at these results from a practical perspective, even data from measures with small

differences in means (e.g., sense of responsibility) are noteworthy. At Timepoint 1, 70% ($n = 35$)

of respondents were fully supportive of the idea that individual Canadians had a role in the work

of reconciliation. At Timepoint 2, 84% ($n = 42$) reported this level of support. This means that

7/15 participants (47%) who were not fully supportive at Timepoint 1, moved to this highest

level of support over the duration of this course. This is one way of understanding the real-world

impacts of the data outlined in Table 2. Additionally, when one considers average effect sizes in

related attitudinal ($d = .30$) and education research ($d = .40$), most of these improvements could

be considered above-average (Beelmann & Heinemann, 2014; Hattie, 2012).

This type of statistical significance was not found across data from the single-item

measures. The repeated measures *t*-tests on these items did not produce *p*-values ($p \leq .01$) or

effect sizes $d \leq .20$) of note.

Open-ended question. As part of the survey, participants completed one open-ended

question: "If you answered "strongly agree" or "somewhat agree" to #11, please briefly describe

how you, as an individual, can bring about reconciliation in Canada". I coded these responses

thematically to identify trends across timepoints. Where applicable, I assigned multiple codes to

a single response. The frequencies of top responses are included in Table 6.

The frequency of codes was mostly consistent across Timepoint 1 and Timepoint 2. The

notable exceptions were the increases in participants who listed "Activism/address systemic

injustice" and "Recognize and address my own biases". The following are illustrative examples

of such changes across timepoints:

> P43 at Timepoint 1: "Getting to know and supporting Indigenous people we know or else
> we will feel disattached [sic] to their sufferings"
>   Code: "Forming relationships across groups"
>
> P43 at Timepoint 2: "Being conscious of the prejudicial system and advocating against it.
> Raising awareness of intergenerational trauma as a major cause of ongoing poverty of
> Indigenous peoples"
>   Code: ""Activism/address systemic injustice""
>
> P41 at Timepoint 1: "I have worked with an inner-city non-for profit with 90%
> Indigenous children and worked towards healing, empowerment, and restoring identity at
> camp, evening programs and house visits at grassroots level"
>   Code: "In my work/vocation", "Promoting Indigenous culture"
>
> P41 at Timepoint 2: "On a small scale, I can choose to re-frame my stereotypes to
> reinforce positive attributes of Indigenous ppl [sic]. Also, continue to lead inner-city
> canoe trips and if ever in power, allow Indigenous cultural practices"
>   Codes: "Recognize and address my own biases", "Promote Indigenous culture",
>   "In my work/vocation"

Phase 2

Participant Demographics

The results of Phase 1 guided the recruitment process for Phase 2 ($n = 8$). I selected Phase 2 participants who demonstrated attitude change across some of the measures outlined in the section above. As outlined in Table 1, the demographics of these Phase 2 participants were quite similar to those of Phase 1 participants. All Phase 2 participants took part in in-depth interviews in April and May of 2018. These interviews were 25-50 minutes in duration and followed a semi-structured format (Appendix C).

In order to protect the identity of the study participants, participant numbers (P1, P2, etc.) are used in place of names. Identifying information regarding the specific course sections has also been removed. That said, it is helpful to consider the specific demographic information of each participant. Much has been written on the experience of "Settler" Canadians when it comes to matters of reconciliation and disruptive education (Gebhard, 2017; Regan, 2010). Conversely, relatively little has been written regarding the outcomes of such education across other key characteristics (age, gender, etc.). The following descriptions are meant to provide additional contextual information for the data presented within this section.

P1 was an 18-year-old, Arab female, who was not born in Canada and has no family history in this country. She was in her first year of university and participated in the History course. P2 was a 22-year-old, Black male, who was not born in Canada and has no family history in this country. He was a student in the International Development Studies (IDS) course and was in his first year of post-secondary study. P3 was a 20-year-old, White female. She was born in Canada, as were her parents and grandparents. She participated in the History course and had 1-2 years of post-secondary study experience. P4 was a 38-year-old, White female. She was born in

Canada, as were her parents and grandparents. She participated in the IDS course and had 3-4

years of post-secondary experience. P5 was a 23-year-old, White female. She was born in

Canada, as were her parents and grandparents. She participated in the French course and had 1-2

years of post-secondary experience. P6 was a 20-year-old, White male. He was born in Canada,

as were his parents and some of his grandparents. He participated in the History course and had

3-4 years of post-secondary experience. P7 was a 20-year-old, White female. She was born in

Canada, as were her parents and grandparents. She participated in the IDS course and had 3-4

years of post-secondary experience. P8 was a 56-year-old, White female. She was born in

Canada, as were her parents and grandparents. She participated in the Indigenous Studies course

and had 3-4 years of post-secondary experience.

Interview Data

   Establishing disruptive knowledge. This study assumed that the courses studied

included "disruptive knowledge". As outlined in Chapter 2, this type of education challenges

long-held beliefs, while presenting difficult information that highlights injustice. Such education

is meant to force students to recognize the depths of inequality and re-evaluate their relationship

to this wrongdoing. Before examining prominent themes across these interviews, it is important

to establish this fundamental assumption. The following sections confirm the presence of

disruptive knowledge within the courses studied.

   Addressing injustice. Across all interviews, participants articulated a deepened

recognition of the mistreatment of Indigenous people in Canada. Participants included the use of

broad theoretical terms such as "colonialism", "(inter)generational trauma" and "oppression" to

describe this reality in broad terms:

   It was really interesting to look at colonization from an Indigenous perspective. (P7)

> Lots of times [current issues of well-being] [are] still generational trauma, which I didn't really understand before. (P5)

> It just really exposed a clear understanding of the oppression and marginalization of [Indigenous peoples] that is ongoing and continuing. (P8)

This understanding of mistreatment also included specific historical events such as treaty formation, Residential Schools, the Oka conflict, and the (non)response to tuberculosis in Indigenous patients:

> Like, yes, Indigenous people were given these reserves to live on and expected to be self-sufficient and things like that, but the land wasn't able to grow anything, so how are they supposed to be self-sufficient? (P4)

> I learned that based off residential schools people coming out of the situations have a hard time getting jobs. They [pause] have a lack of cultural identity after residential schools. (P3)

> They were basically forced out of their land and this was because some community wanted to extend a golf course, so the lives of people were less than the golf course to the Canadian government. (P2)

> Within the health care system, I learned in class that until the 1940s there wasn't much. They didn't really treat the Indigenous [people], they kinda just of ignored them. When they got tuberculosis, they segregated them from the hospital and didn't give them proper treatment. On reserves, they had to fly them out there to the hospitals and they still wouldn't get proper treatment. (P1)

Contemporary examples included the lack of clean drinking water on reserves and the verdict in

Gerald Stanley's court case[1]. For some, these issues represented new, unsettling information

regarding the mistreatment of Indigenous peoples in Canada. P6 described his reaction to

learning about boil-water advisories in First Nations communities: "I didn't realize how there are

so many reserves still dealing with drinking water as an issue. It seems pretty ridiculous". P2

offered a similar description of his own experience:

> Because I feel the general public, in general, also has this belief that Indigenous people
>
> have support from the government, but they just don't use it or they misuse it. Whereas
>
> they are not being supported as they should be compared to the rest of Canada. The rest
>
> of Canada has access to clean water, while Indigenous communities don't. This was
>
> something that I wasn't aware of. And, you know, [is] shocking in Canada.

For others, this information represented a deeper understanding of topics with which they were

already somewhat familiar. For P3, this included learning about the recency of Residential

Schools: "I knew [about] residential schools and the basis that it was basically assimilation. I

didn't know too much about how parents were unable to come visit the kids and I didn't know

that happened until '98 [sic]. I thought it finished probably in the 60s". P4 described how this

course deepened her understanding of treaty land: "I had an understanding that there were

treaties signed and Indigenous people were given a certain amount of land and things like that

but not all of the extenuating circumstances to that land that they were given". In these ways,

---

[1] Gerald Stanley, a non-Indigenous male, was charged with second-degree murder in the 2016 shooting death of Colten Boushie, an Indigenous male. Stanley was acquitted on all charges related to Boushie's death. This trial was described as a "flashpoint in the relationship between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples in Saskatchewan" (Friesen, 2018). Citing exclusionary jury selection and inconsistencies in Stanley's testimony, among other issues, many described this outcome as another example of the systemic injustice facing Indigenous people (Friesen, 2018).

participants described how these courses illuminated negative aspects of topics with which they were already somewhat familiar.

       Addressing ignorance. Within this acknowledgement of new learning across participants, there were distinct differences in the way participants framed their learning and described their previous ignorance. Two younger participants (P3 and P7) described how they found aspects of this course particularly shocking, recognizing their limited understanding of contemporary matters:

> I guess even just knowledge of what was going on in the news, because I didn't know a
>
> lot. (P7)
>
> I didn't know *a lot* [before taking the ICR course]. (P3)

The two older participants framed their new learning in relation to their previous understanding. P4 stated, "I've always considered myself an educated person and an informed person and I'm just *that* much more informed" (P4). Similarly, P8 stated, "I have learned obviously new things as well but had many of my previous knowledges confirmed" (P8).

       When describing their prior ignorance, participants also identified different causes for their previous unknowing. For some participants, this ignorance was a result of inadequate education during elementary and secondary school. P3 stated, "[mistreatment of Indigenous peoples] just came one after the other and things like that, which we never really found out [in K-12 education]. Like, in elementary you learned about Louis Riel and that was it. You never learned anything else". P4, who described herself as informed before taking the course, suggested that new information forced her to re-evaluate her consumption of media: "And now, more information [on Indigenous issues] is presented and I'm like 'Maybe I don't know all the facts. Maybe I need to not just get all my information from one source and seek out other

sources'". Despite differences in the nature and source of this ignorance, all subjects emphasized

a new/deepened understanding of the mistreatment of Indigenous peoples:

> There wasn't a specific part of the course that made me feel guilty, just the whole course,
>
> in general, made me feel guilty because I didn't know and I used to be like, 'Why are they
>
> like, drunks and all that?'. Now, I know why, so maybe I can make a change in some
>
> way. (P1)
>
> Well, previously I guess I didn't have much knowledge and, I guess, I had the general
>
> belief that the government was providing funding for Indigenous communities and it
>
> seemed like they were misusing these funds, however, it's the opposite. (P2)
>
> Yeah, [before the course] I thought [mistreatment of Indigenous peoples] was more of the
>
> past thing but there's still—the reserves are still really, really not good quality. (P5)
>
> I guess, through this course and looking at some of the prior acts that the government has
>
> had in place, I realized the detriments of a toxic government legislature. Whereas before I
>
> didn't even think about it that much. (P7)
>
> I kind of knew that we had obviously treated them poorly but I didn't realize how much
>
> that we tried to just eliminate their culture and eliminate what they were doing. (P6)
>
> ***Summary.*** These descriptions suggest the presence of disruptive knowledge within these

courses. All participants described learning about ongoing injustice in Canada within their ICR

courses. With this fundamental assumption established, the following sections will provide a

more detailed picture of how participants described their experiences with this disruptive

knowledge in three areas: a.) its nature (What were the unique cognitive and affective

characteristics of this disruptive knowledge?); b.) its formation (What aspects of

teaching/learning within the ICR course produced this disruptive knowledge?), and c.) its

outcomes (How do participants describe the embodied personal and societal potential of this

disruptive knowledge for the work of reconciliation?). Following this, I will examine the themes

that emerged outside of this theoretical framework (resilience, value of Indigenous culture, etc.).

Nature of disruptive knowledge.

Cognitive characteristics. As outlined in Chapter 2, the tripartite model of attitudes

serves as one of the theoretical frameworks of this study. This model proposes that attitudes

include a cognitive component, which includes the thoughts and beliefs that one holds regarding

the attitudinal object (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993; Maio & Haddock, 2010). Recognizing the

impossibility of fully separating one's thoughts from one's emotions, the following section will

consider the sections of data that are predominantly focused on participant's self-described

thoughts and beliefs regarding matters of reconciliation.

Implicating the Canadian government. Across all interviews, participants linked the

Canadian government to the mistreatment of Indigenous peoples. In some cases, participants

described this relationship in terms of a lack of care or engagement. P2, for example, described

this type of understanding:

> One of the main things that does make me angry is the government's negligence in all
>
> this. Basically [pause] their failure to take responsibility for what they're supposed to be
>
> doing. Indigenous peoples are still citizens of Canada and the government is supposed to
>
> be responsible for all citizens regardless of if you're in the city or on a reserve but the
>
> government sort of has a different way of treating people who live on reserves than
>
> people who live in a city. (P2)

For P3, the government's failures were linked to an inability to listen to the concerns of

Indigenous peoples. She argued that the government, "should be more aware of how [Indigenous

people] feel about the land and climate change" and that the government needs to "bring [Indigenous] people to the [decision making] table". In other cases, participants described this mistreatment in terms of oppression, where the government's actions were seen as an imposition on the well-being of Indigenous peoples. For example, P6 said that "[The government] focused more on trying to eliminate their culture rather than—that was kind of the plan from the get-go, right? The government worked to eliminate [Indigenous peoples] rather than trying to fit them into the society they were trying to build". This direct description of oppression was present in other participants' reflections:

> I saw the effects of colonization…tearing families apart or trying to destroy the culture… [L]earn[ing] actual facts …or laws that oppressed Indigenous peoples in the past helped me understand the present a lot more. (P7)

> It just really exposed a clear understanding of the oppression and marginalization of peoples that is ongoing and continuing. (P8)

Whether describing a lack of attention or a direct imposition, all participants linked aspects of the government's work to the mistreatment of Indigenous peoples.

In order to understand how the ICR shaped participants' attitudes regarding the role of the government in work of reconciliation, I asked participants to describe their opinions on this topic this topic *before* taking their ICR course. For some, the ICR knowledge was truly disruptive in the sense that it revealed the complicity of the government in ways that they hadn't previously understood. For P5, the ICR course illuminated issues that needed government attention, "I probably used to think that there was nothing to fix, so [the government] probably just didn't need to do anything". For P3, this disruptive knowledge directly implicated the government within the ongoing mistreatment of Indigenous peoples: "I probably thought at the

beginning that we didn't affect them as much as I thought we did in terms of justice and health care and impairing their spirituality and their culture. I didn't know it was that embedded in our government". P7 also described these initial understanding of government as one with only minor consequences for Indigenous people: "I guess I used to not think that the government was important, but now I realize how the government can constrict a lot of grassroots initiatives". P2 similarly described a newfound, negative understanding of the government. For him, this new information undermined his ideas of the positive work of the Canadian government:

> Well, previously I guess I didn't have much knowledge and, I guess, I had the general belief that the government was providing funding for Indigenous communities and it seemed like they were misusing these funds. However, it's the opposite. The government does not provide enough and when they do provide funding it goes into basically the survival of communities not the improvement of life sustainability. So, that was something that I learned through the course of the program.

For P6, the issue of Shoal Lake captured the troubling relationships between the government and Indigenous peoples:

> [The government] took the water from Shoal Lake and basically flooded their reserve and it was like—that's like such the classic example of just not caring about another community at all and just doing what the city of Winnipeg felt was right for the city of Winnipeg…I didn't know about that at all

For these participants, the course presented a negative picture of the government that shifted the neutral or positive opinions that they had previously held. However, this type of shift was not found across all interviews.

Other participants had a negative view of the government before taking this course. For these students, new information on the (in)actions of government confirmed and deepened their previous understandings as opposed to challenging them:

I kind of have always felt that government initiatives towards reconciliation is just kind of a mess. I think that my attitude has shifted just a bit in—I support the fact that the government wants to do something, but I think they go about it in the wrong way. (P4)

Well, again, it reinforced everything. It confirmed and reaffirmed and reinforced… you feel angry when you know these things are still going on and people are either just oblivious to it or the government just keeps cutting programs or not committing or not following through with their commitments. (P8)

Even when participants recognized the government's efforts on these fronts, their descriptions included negative aspects:

I still kind of do think [the government] are pretty shabby people, but I think at least at the moment they're kind of trying, to say the least. (P3)

I don't think the government is doing much. Like, they say they want to do a lot, but they're not. They are like, 'Oh, we want to make reconciliation between the Indigenous [sic] and non-Indigenous', but they're not. They are putting pipelines through Indigenous lands. They are not doing much. (P1)

Reimagining Canada. Some interview participants linked these increasingly negative attitudes towards the government with new images of Canada. As has already been stated, some participants described an experience of shock when learning about the (in)actions of the Canadian government in regards to the well-being of Indigenous peoples. P4 spoke in broad terms about this realization: "Most of it we learned, it looks pretty bad for Canada". P3 described

how the image of Canada she encountered in the course was at odds with contemporary

narratives of our country: "I think in 2018 we are saying everyone is allowed in Canada and they

can be whoever they want to be, in terms of immigrants or anything like that, but that's not really

the case based on our history". P8 described how her time in Indigenous Studies courses,

including this course, drastically altered her sense of patriotism:

> But Canada is supposed to be this great country. [This negative image of Canada is] not a
>
> nice thing to have to face, especially for someone who has grown up very patriotic in
>
> thinking, 'I live in the best country in the world!'. And now I don't even think our country
>
> is legitimate. That's what I've learned. That's hard knowledge. (P8)

This experience of reimagining Canada wasn't only evident in the experiences of participants

with a long family history in Canada, but also in the reflection of P2, who similarly described his

experience as an immigrant: "[The lack of clean drinking water on some First Nations] was

something that I wasn't aware of. And, you know, shocking in Canada. Even when I was in

Nigeria, I still had access to clean water even though we have to pay for it, but there was still that

access". Each of these descriptions captures different aspects of an idea that was found across

half of the participants' responses: The image of Canada presented in their courses did not match

the image of Canada that they held before encountering this type of knowledge.

Questioning societal/personal stereotypes. For all participants, this increased

understanding of historical and ongoing injustice was also linked to a re-evaluation of

stereotypes regarding Indigenous people in Canada. Participants acknowledged many persistent

stereotypes towards Indigenous people surrounding inadequate parenting, substance abuse,

reliance on government services, and crime. When considered against newfound information

regarding the mistreatment of Indigenous peoples, participants described how they reinterpreted

these beliefs. In terms of preferential treatment, P8 described a transformation surrounding her understanding of reserve land:

> And I know that I'm not alone because it's my generation largely—we thought reservations were the Indigenous peoples' special land: 'That's their land. They've always had that. That's their land.' Not knowing that they were pushed into those lands and they're not their lands, they're not their traditional hunting and whatever their particular culture was, of course, tied closely to the land. (P8)

P6 described a similar shift in his views regarding the issue of parenting within Indigenous communities:

> Well, there's just like a—there's generational gaps now, right? Because of the residential schools. You have parents raising kids that were taken away and abused or just not treated well and then they have children and then it just creates generations of people that, I don't know, aren't necessarily ready to handle life the way that we or *Canada* has set it up.

P1 described broader stereotypes regarding Indigenous agency in the face of mistreatment: "I used to think 'Why can't they just defend themselves?' but now I know why. It's because the Europeans literally put laws, so they can't". The victimization of Indigenous peoples was a central aspect of many of these reinterpretations. In this framework, the content of the stereotype (crime, substance abuse, parenting) was not directly challenged. Instead, issues of agency or culpability were the focal points. Participants continued to describe deficits in the well-being of Indigenous communities, but came to ascribe these situations to causes beyond Indigenous peoples' control:

Often people see Indigenous people…and they just discriminate and stereotype…

'They're people who are drug dealers and prostitutes', but that's not really who they are

and it's not necessarily always their fault; it's kinda, long-term effects that have led them

to situations. (P3)

[I learned] that it wasn't their fault. When you hear [stereotypes] or racism or stuff like

that it's always their fault that they are like this, whereas we kind of place them in the

situation where they don't really have a choice. Like if they don't have the money to take

care of their kids like with the foster care system, they are just taken away rather than

trying to help them kind of get back on their feet. (P5)

These participants did not reject or challenge claims regarding the prevalence of these issues

(crime, substance abuse, child care, etc.) within Indigenous communities. Instead, they reframed

these problems in ways that shifted the blame from Indigenous peoples themselves to systems

and policies that created or exacerbated these issues.

Identifying the location of bias. Across all interviews, there seemed to be some agreement

that such stereotypes exist, but participants described their proximity to this discrimination in

different ways. In some cases, these descriptions were impersonal and far-reaching ("most

people", "society", etc.). Such descriptions occurred in most interviews but were sometimes

accompanied by more personal descriptions of bias. One expression of this personal description

included participants who linked their upbringing to the potential for their own bias ($n = 5$):

I'm not going to say I grew up in a racist family, but like an older traditional, whatever,

Mennonite family. So, it's like you don't really get exposed to these ideas…There's just, I

guess, something inherently discriminatory about how I maybe was before and I think

that maybe changed. (P6)

> I grew up in a family that was pretty like, very discriminatory versus [sic] Indigenous
>
> people…I think [my experience in this course] was very much a mind shift. (P5)
>
> Like, my mom is very racist towards Indigenous, so I always try to defend them now.
>
> (P1)
>
> There's been a few comments made in my own family since I finished this course and
>
> instead of just being like 'Oh', I've been like 'No! But did you know this? Did you know
>
> that?'. (P4)
>
> You didn't have many people [in the class] say, 'Oh, you know in the Colten Boushie
>
> case or Tina Fontaine? Oh, they were just asking for it. They deserved to die' — that kind
>
> of thing. Whereas, maybe my family members have said that to people. (P7)

In such cases, the participants seemed to distance themselves from the views of their families,

describing a different set of views that they discovered within the course.

Another type of personal bias was found in the responses of P1, P2, and P7. Here, an

acknowledgement of bias was more direct. P2 and P7 described how their newfound

understanding of historical and contemporary injustice shaped their view of the current situation

of some Indigenous people:

> I guess [this course] sort of helped me remove the bias I might have initially had when
>
> encountering or communicating with Indigenous people in the sense that I can understand
>
> maybe why some people might behave in a certain way and also why some people might
>
> have a different outlook to life than myself: 1.) Because they have different cultural
>
> beliefs and 2.) Because of the struggles they may have faced, which was something I
>
> wasn't considering before. (P2)

Having [a larger perspective] can translate into the little interactions either with an

Indigenous person on the street and saying—Not seeing this person as someone who is

messed up or has life falling apart. but saying that, 'this is an effect of intergenerational

trauma that has been placed on you and it's not your fault'. (P7)

Regardless of their proximity to discrimination, participants described such bias or

discrimination as a distant or prior reality. Most discussions of bias were framed in ways that

suggested that participants never held such biases or that they had overcome such biases through

their learning in this course. Participants did not directly acknowledge any ongoing biases

against Indigenous people.

Affective characteristics. These encounters with disruptive knowledge were not limited

to the things that participants learned but extended into the things that they *felt*. These

descriptions of the affective characteristics of students' experiences constitute another aspect of

the tripartite model of attitudes (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993; Maio & Haddock, 2010). Moving from

thoughts and beliefs to emotions and feelings, this section will describe the affective

characteristics of students' encounters with disruptive knowledge in their ICR courses.

Participants described a wide range of emotional experiences within their ICR course. P4

encapsulated this broader trend when describing how she experienced "the gamut of feelings".

Participants listed feeling hopelessness, anger, passion, hope, sadness, guilt, empowerment, and

empathy in response to course content. The following sections outline two themes regarding

participants' emotional reactions.

Sadness. All participants described experiences of sadness in relation to learning about

the historical and contemporary mistreatment of Indigenous people in Canada. Despite an

attempt to focus the interview on the contemporary experiences of Indigenous peoples, some

participants described their experiences of sadness in relation to particular historical events. P1 described her sadness upon learning of the restrictive nature of the Indian Act:

It made me sad again, because…if I would have known that they've been through all of this I would have done something to make a change, but I never knew. I thought the Indian Act was just who is Indian and who isn't Indian but it's a lot more than that. They made rules.

P8, meanwhile, linked this feeling of sadness to both historical and contemporary experiences:

Well, sad is everything [sic]. The residential schools and 60's scoop are particularly painful. Understanding that people were completely wiped out. Understanding that women went from being highly esteemed and sacred to, like, the change in women's roles…That's painful. That's sad. Knowing that kids are hungry, knowing that kids are still being taken from their families. (P8)

The remaining participants all described some form of emotional distress when faced with the historical or contemporary mistreatment of Indigenous peoples. As outlined above, participants described the nature and source of this feeling in different ways. In some cases, participants linked sadness to an experience of empathy, where participants imagined themselves as the victims of mistreatment:

I'm no better anyone else that is Indigenous so why should I be looked at or treated better? It doesn't make sense to me. It makes me sad for the people who would be perhaps treated differently or worse than I would be, even though they could be…really hard-working and all these things and just because of the way they look that they would be regarded as less. (P5)

[The events at Oka] sort of made me feel very sad because I can't imagine myself being

that situation and not being able to trust the government to choose my life over expanding

some golf course. (P2)

In other cases, this sadness was a more distant reaction to the observation of injustice:

I guess simply just the injustice and simply—Almost being horrified that a person can

look at another person and think that they are scum of the earth just because they are

different race or different than them. (P7)

Well, [the mistreatment of Indigenous peoples is] obviously sad and you just want to

figure out…Obviously you need to know the history about why these things are

happening, but I'm more interested in what we could do to help change (P6)

Regardless, all participants described a negative emotional reaction to learning about the

mistreatment of Indigenous peoples.

In three cases, participants described these negative experiences as deeply impactful and

almost overwhelming experiences. P7 linked these feelings of sadness to a sense of hopelessness

that affected her physically: "At one point [I experienced] a deep sense of hopelessness and

injustice and desperation and sadness, and just like becoming overwhelmed and just crying on

my couch at home". P4 described how learning about the lived experiences of racism from guest

speakers, her classmates, and her instructor was emotionally "draining" and "heartbreaking". She

described how it would take her a few days to process her emotional reaction, relying on her co-

workers and her husband to sort through her experiences in the course. P8 described the need for

spiritual cleansing through smudging after particularly difficult classes:

And then the more you find out the more you realize the layers and layers and layers and

layers. So, it can be very—there's times you just want to smudge after. Especially when

we're talking about residential schools and atrocities, you know it's very painful…People

have to be emotionally prepared. (P8)

These reflections demonstrate the deeply affective potential of such information. Participants

with such experiences (P4, P7, P8) all described these events in ways that suggested a negative,

debilitating potential for such emotional distress.

Guilt. Whereas all participants' responses reflected some experience of sadness,

descriptions of guilt were much more varied. Some of the participants interviewed (P1, P3, P8)

directly acknowledged feelings of guilt, while the rest (P2, P4, P5, P6, P7) did not. When

examining the descriptions of each group, one notices a few similarities in terms of how all

participants position themselves in relation to the mistreatment of Indigenous peoples.

Within the group who acknowledged feelings of guilt, descriptions took numerous forms.

For P1, this guilt was connected to her previous ignorance and the stereotypes that she held:

"There wasn't a specific part of the course that made me feel guilty, just the whole course in

general made me feel guilty because I didn't know and I used to be like, 'Why are they like,

drunks and all that?'". P3 linked this sense of guilt to her group affiliation:

Probably Residential Schools made me feel guilty because I'm from the Catholic religion.

And I don't necessarily have the same viewpoints as those who probably did in

Residential Schools but it still makes me feel guilty because that used to be my group; I

used to be Catholic. That's how I see it. I felt guilty because I was Catholic.

Speaking in broader terms, P8 linked her experiences of guilt to the feeling that she has

benefitted from injustice against Indigenous peoples. She described this benefit in terms of the

land that she owns, recognizing the displacement of Indigenous peoples that may have afforded

her this space. In addition to acknowledging a sense of guilt, she spoke to the importance of such

feelings: "I think we should own it and have at least a sense of guilt…And it's not done overbearingly; it's done more as a call out and a question, 'so how do you see yourself benefiting? Think about this.'". These responses reflect a wide variance on how participants describe their sense of guilt: ignorance, group affiliation, sense of benefit.

These characteristics were not predictive of feelings of guilt. As noted earlier in this chapter, many other participants acknowledged their ignorance (P2, P4, P5, P6, P7), but these participants did not acknowledge feelings of guilt. Additionally, some participants acknowledged affiliation with Christianity (P5, P6, P7), but did not link this affiliation to issues of guilt, as P3 had done. Lastly, a number of participants acknowledged a sense of benefit (P4, P5, P7) without acknowledging issues of guilt. Clearly, there is great variance in how participants experienced guilt. These differences become even more pronounced as one closely examines the participants who did not describe feelings of guilt.

Whereas prior ignorance/bias was a source of guilt for P1, participants also described their newfound understanding as a reason that they did not experience guilt. P5 described this shift: "I don't think I felt guilty per se because I don't. I guess now that I changed my mindset I don't feel guilty because I realized that I really am not going to…put those stereotypes on [Indigenous people]". P7 similarly linked her lack of guilt to her newly gained perspective:

> I don't think that the course made me feel guilty in any way…We had a lot of talk about allyship and I think, [the instructor] was like, 'Okay, if you have this mentality that all people are equal, decolonize your ways of thinking, Indigenous people are great, then you're good.' (P7)

Given that both P5 and P7 had previously acknowledged their ignorance/bias against Indigenous people, these passages suggest that they had addressed these biases and, therefore, did not feel

guilty. These participants linked their lack of guilt to their new perspectives, whereas P1 linked

her experiences of guilt to her old perspectives.

One sees another interesting parallel when considering the relationship between group

membership and feelings of guilt. For P3, her previous group identity (Catholic) was a source of

guilt. For P2, personal identity was linked to his lack of guilt: "Personally, no because I myself

am a visible minority so I don't think I am benefiting or participating in anything" (P2).

The data also revealed competing conceptualizations of "guilt". As described above, P8

described her sense of guilt in relation to the benefits that she had received/is receiving. This

broad conceptualization is distinct from the description of guilt that P4 and P6 used to describe

their own experiences:

> It didn't make me feel guilty or responsible. I feel like as much as I can change things in
>
> my own life and whatnot, the only responsibility that I have is to be informed and take
>
> that information and do what I can with it, such as voting which I've always done
>
> anyways. It never made me feel like, 'Oh my God, I've done this'. I didn't feel that kind
>
> of guilt. (P4)
>
> Well, it's tough, I don't know. I don't feel personally responsible in the sense that, I mean,
>
> it all happened so far in the past, right? But it makes me feel responsible to try and do
>
> something in the future. (P6)

Sharp contrasts exist across these descriptions. P8 draws clear connections between historical

injustice and her experience of guilt, but P4 suggests that such historical distance separates him

from a sense of guilt. Similarly, P8 seems to conceptualize guilt in broad, systemic terms,

whereas P6 describes a much more personal interpretation of culpability. Considered together,

these descriptions reflect many different points of emphasis regarding guilt: Past views vs.

current views, group affiliation, historical interpretation, personal vs. systemic. There is little

commonality across participants regarding feelings of guilt.

      Formation of disruptive knowledge. In order to provide a richer context for these

experiences, it is important to consider descriptions that extend beyond the course content itself.

The following sections will include participants' descriptions of the learning environment

(learning experiences, classroom culture, etc.) surrounding this disruptive knowledge. When

describing their experiences in these ICR courses, participants made passing mention of lectures,

podcasts, books, and videos, but there were no notable themes in regards to these learning

materials. Instead, themes emerged around various voices within ICR courses. I will outline

participants' reflections on the value of the lived experiences of Indigenous people, the

classroom as an open/accepting space, and the role of the instructor in the presentation of

disruptive knowledge.

      Lived Indigenous experiences. A common theme across participants focused on the

educational value of Indigenous experiences. These first-hand accounts from residential school

survivors, guest speakers, Indigenous classmates, and Indigenous instructors served as a window

into historical and contemporary discrimination in Canada. When describing their encounters

with this difficult information, students emphasized the importance of learning directly from

Indigenous people. Students in the French and International Development courses (P4, P5, P7)

stressed the value of learning from guest speakers. For P5, this value was relational: "Meeting

the speakers and meeting different Indigenous people [was important], because you build those

relationships and understand more through that". P4 and P7 described the emotional impact of

hearing from Indigenous speakers. P7 contrasted this type of learning with gathering impersonal

information: "I guess the individual stories affected me a lot more than the statistics". Students

within the Indigenous Studies (P8) and International Development Course (P4, P7) course also

emphasized the presence of Indigenous voices within their classroom community, citing the

experiences of both their Indigenous classmates and their Indigenous instructor:

> All of these emotions people were comfortable sharing…that was really nice but having
>
> to listen to people explain the racism that they faced or these really awful situations, you
>
> just feel for those people and I'm sitting there knowing that I wouldn't face those same
>
> things because I'm not Indigenous. (P4)

Participants in the History course (P1, P3, P6) made no direct mention of learning from the lived

experiences of Indigenous people in person. Instead, they referenced various learning resources

(books, podcasts, etc.) that introduced them to the stories and experiences of Indigenous people.

Regardless of the form that it took, most participants described the value of learning from the

lived experiences of Indigenous people.

   Classroom as an open/closed space.   Related to this idea of sharing experiences,

participants offered competing descriptions of the level of openness within their ICR classrooms.

Even within the same classroom, students expressed different opinions on the extent to which

varying perspectives were welcomed. P3 (History) and P4 (International Development Studies)

described their courses as spaces in which they could freely, openly, and constructively share

ideas and opinions with their classmates:

> I think everybody just got on the same page, really, that—Or was, like, more accepting to
>
> be open. Just kind of people were more lending an ear. They were more open to hearing
>
> stories…in a classroom where we were safe to talk about it and safe to hear different
>
> views and opinions. (P3)

It was a safe space and you could say what you need to say or wanted to say and there

wasn't judgment, so that was really nice. (P4)

In both classes, this type of openness was framed in positive terms, as a supportive element of

addressing difficult subject matter. P3 contrasted this culture of openness with the politics that

might surround everyday conversations at a dinner table. She described the way that classrooms,

in general, and this course, in particular, fostered frank discussions that might not be acceptable

in household exchanges: "I think people were more open to have an open conversation about

[these issues] [in the classroom], whereas…when you're at the dinner table it's something you

don't want to talk about".

P7, however, offered a very different description regarding the openness of her

classroom. Participating in the same class that P4 described as open and free of judgment, P7

offered a different description:

I don't think that other perspectives would have been welcomed… [The instructor]

…would basically reprimand anyone who would not be pro Indigenous rights, which was

a little bit difficult because sometimes there were a few students, including probably

myself … where they would ask a question, an actual question, then there would be

almost like an upset answer because the question was maybe interpreted as against

Indigenous [sic], whereas it was simply asking the elephant in the room that some of the

people have probably heard or thought, like different prejudiced views about Indigenous

[sic].

Across the reflections of these three participants, the idealized classroom is described as one in

which all views can be expressed freely without judgment. However, P4 and P7 offered very

different assessments of this quality within their ICR course.

Instructor's navigation of non-Indigenous guilt. In the previous passage, P7's

description of the closed nature of her classroom foregrounded the role of her instructor. In doing

so, she touched on an important question that was present across three participants' responses:

How did/should instructors frame the relationship between disruptive knowledge and non-

Indigenous guilt? Interestingly, two participants who described divergent relationships to guilt

offered similar descriptions of this dynamic. P8, who described feelings of guilt, and P4, who did

not describe feelings of guilt, both positively described the ways that their instructors avoided

laying blame on students. P4 described how her instructor allayed her concerns surrounding guilt

during the very first class. Acknowledging that she "didn't want to sit there as a white girl getting

blamed for things", P4 described how the instructor assured her that this would not be a "preachy

class", but instead would be a "presentation of information". P8 offered a similar description of

her own experience: "[Professor's name] was very careful to bring the truth to light without

laying blame". Including the earlier reflections of P7, these excerpts suggest a shared belief

across these three participants: Instructors should not intentionally elicit guilt within their

students. This theme is admittedly under-represented across all participants. However, the

broader lack of data on this issue may also be telling. All participants were asked whether any

aspect of the course made them feel guilty, but only P7 mentioned an incident wherein the

instructor elicited guilt in students. It is not possible to arrive at any conclusive statements due to

the absence of further supporting information, but this section does suggest that most participants

did not feel as though their instructor intentionally elicited feelings of guilt.

Identity of instructors. Another partially developed theme relates to participants'

descriptions of their instructors' identity. Participants in courses with self-identified Indigenous

instructors drew particular attention to matters of identity, whereas the other participants did not.

As mentioned earlier, P4, P7, and P8 all spoke positively of how their Indigenous instructors shared their experiences of discrimination within the class discussion. P1, P3, and P6, whose instructor is a self-described "settler", made no mention of their instructor's ethnic identity.

Within the descriptions of Indigenous instructors, the matter of identity went beyond a direct connection to matters of discrimination. These descriptions offered complex and competing notions of Indigenous identity. P7 and P8 described the value of an "Indigenous lens" (P8) or an "Indigenous perspective" (P7). This approach offered a new perspective on key aspects of this disruptive knowledge: "It was really interesting to look at colonization from an *Indigenous* perspective … [T]he west or the European view of land was very different than the Indigenous view of land" (P7). In describing the value of her instructor's Indigenous identity, P8 similarly stressed the value of this perspective. The following was part of her response when she was asked to discuss the nature and benefit of an "Indigenous lens":

> Especially with [professor name] being Metis, very proud of Metis, very rooted in her culture and traditions, she spoke strongly on the Indigenous side and yet was very much on par. She still was very professional like a regular professor, she wasn't just—She didn't totally indigenize it, but had a really good balance. I guess that would be the best way to sum it up. (P8)

When asked to clarify the phrase "she didn't totally indigenize it", P8 elaborated on this issue of identity: "Well, it means that she didn't just speak totally on an Indigenous perspective. She did give—It was done through an Indigenous lens, but it was also bearing weight to historical facts, but looking at them from the Indigenous side". In light of earlier data, this passage provides a few points of note.

First, it suggests a certain tension between impersonal information and more embodied, personal approaches to understanding. Earlier, P4 contrasted "presentation of facts" with a "preachy class" and P8 similarly described a tension between "historical facts" and "an Indigenous perspective". In both cases, it seems like the presentation of information was the central focus, with matters of personal identity or belief acting as supportive or even opposing forces in this work. Additionally, both P7 and P8 described their instructors' strength of identity in a manner that held positive and negative potential. In P8's description, attention is drawn to the fact that her instructor is both "very rooted in her culture and traditions" *but still* "very professional, like a regular professor". This seems to suggest that these two characteristics are usually in some type of conflict. This idea is similar to P7's earlier description that, "[The instructor] was also was very clear on her view and very involved in advocacy for Indigenous rights and would basically reprimand anyone who would not be pro Indigenous rights". In both cases, such strong cultural ties are framed as positive attributes which also hold the potential for unprofessional teaching or negative actions. These perspectives are not representative trends across the data; they identify particular descriptions of the complex relationship between Indigenous instructors, non-Indigenous students, and disruptive knowledge.

Outcomes of disruptive knowledge. After examining the nature and formation of disruptive knowledge, it is important to consider the broader implications of these experiences. The intention of these ICR courses isn't merely to elicit cognitive and affective change within these students; the hope of these courses is that such changes in attitudes will lead to embodied responses to matters of reconciliation. The following section explores themes related to this idea. It will outline participants' responses with regards to governmental and personal responsibilities related to reconciliation.

More knowledge, more support. When asked to consider how the ICR courses affected their level of support for various government initiatives, participants addressed many different issues. Participants expressed increased support for various initiatives, ranging from increased funding for the preservation of Indigenous languages to adequate housing on reserves:

I think [my support increased] maybe for the adequate housing and stuff like that. Something I grew up believing was that it's the fault of the Indigenous people that the reserves are [in poor condition]. Whereas now, my professor would just talk about how it wasn't built right in the first place. (P5)

Languages, I would say are important too, just cause that's part of the backbone of their culture…[Before the course] [i]t probably would've and something that I didn't really think about at all and then [the course] just planted the idea of how it would be important. (P6)

 One common theme across these reflections was a connection between newfound knowledge and their increased support for these initiatives. Participants described how their deeper understanding of these ongoing issues helped them recognize the need for change.

Within particular issues, this supporting knowledge was diverse. When discussing support for land claim settlements and increased Indigenous control over natural resources, P2 cited the importance of land within an Indigenous worldview: "the unfairness of land rights and claims sort of made me want to see these outstanding claims that they still do have settled because… I feel that it would a positive step for reconciliation because land is an important part of Indigenous culture". P6 discussed the problem of financial exploitation: "When the government is making money off of selling wood or something like that and it's from a reserve, that shouldn't work. Or we shouldn't just be able to say, 'this land is the government's now'

rather than something that was signed off on a treaty". P7 linked her support to learning about specific matters of injustice:

> I was not aware of the injustice of the Shoal Lake 40 community, all the pipelines, and the resources on reserves, even tertiary reserves as they've been moved three times and those resources are still being exploited and realizing the lack of control that they have over *their land*…I think that my support for Indigenous communities having control over resources definitely has increased.

Bringing varying justifications to a shared belief, each of these participants linked their increased level of support for government initiatives to specific course content.

    Knowledge as power/empowering. This increased level of support reflected a larger belief in the power and value of education about Indigenous issues/histories/perspectives. This belief was also evident in participants' sense of responsibility following their ICR course. When asked to describe their role in the work of reconciliation, most participants (*n* = 7) discussed the importance of educating others:

> I will definitely continue to educate people if I get the chance on what [Indigenous people] have been through and how [Indigenous people] are and if people have this idea, I will try to get [other people] to not have that set idea and explain to them why [Indigenous people] are like this and all what they have been through. (P1)

Within related descriptions, a few key themes emerged. Participants acknowledged the social difficulty in addressing racist or stereotypical language. They described the ways that it can be difficult to address these topics with friends and family. Participants went on to describe the ways that this course gave them information and knowledge to intervene in such situations, despite social unease. P6 described the value of such information: "When you hear kind of

offhand comments that seem kind of racist or whatever, I would have something to respond with

that's actually fact-based". P4 offered similar descriptions of her own experience:

> There's lots of times where I could argue a point or share information that I have and I
>
> just don't, because it's like I'm in a room full of people who just won't hear it or won't
>
> understand it, won't want to hear it, so I'm just going to like not [sic]. But now, I'm like,
>
> 'No. I'm going to argue that point'. I'm going to say, 'Hey, but did you know this?' I feel
>
> like that's changed a lot since I have taken the course. (P4)

Four participants (P1, P3, P4, P6) described specific situations in which they were able to engage

in this type of a conversation as a result of their ICR course:

> For instance, I had a conversation with someone in my family who is a police officer and
>
> he was like 'They are using their excuses to benefit in the justice courts'…I'd kind of be
>
> like, 'There's nothing else that really benefits them, really. I feel like they are second-
>
> class in the justice system based on stereotypes'. (P3)

> This person that I talked to, I explained to them and they were like 'OK, why don't they
>
> defend themselves?' I said, 'well, the Canadian government and the Indigenous people
>
> they made this thing called the treaty, but the government tricked them because the
>
> Indigenous [sic] they said that whatever they said orally that's what they focus on, but the
>
> government focused on what was written in the final text and what the Indigenous [sic]
>
> said orally the government didn't include that in the final text'. (P1)

> Well, I would say I've had conversations with people where they say, 'Why don't they
>
> just move on from residential schools?' Or 'why don't they just—Why can't they be
>
> independent? Why do we have to keep paying them money?' We learned about that,
>
> right? (P6)

These responses suggest a change that extends from an attitudinal shift into a behavioural shift. For these participants, their new-found knowledge has already shifted their actions surrounding matters of reconciliation.

     Value of the ICR. Participants also described the power of education when discussing their support for the ICR itself. Nearly all participants ($n = 7$) described increased support for requiring all post-secondary students to take at least one course on Indigenous issues/perspectives/histories. For most of these participants ($n = 6$), this change was not simply an increase in an already strongly supportive attitude. These participants described their initial opposition to the idea of an Indigenous Course Requirement. Participants previously viewed the course as "a waste of time" (P1), a threat to their GPA (P1), unnecessary (P3, P4, P5, P7), and an annoyance (P6). Following the course, these same participants offered alternative perspectives on such a course requirement:

> Now I know what [Indigenous people] been through, so now I'm not really worried about my grade. I think everyone should take a course prior to graduation. (P1)

> I think I changed my view, because I realized that Canadian history is based off of Indigenous people, about how we came. I also believe that because of racism, assimilation, discrimination, it's really just our Canadian history and because it's had so many long-term effects that have changed people's opinion on Indigenous people…If we have mandatory Indigenous classes you'd be more empathetic or more just educated and maybe care more about the topic. (P3)

> You can't have a full generation of people signing on board to support reconciliation when they don't know what that looks like. For a lot of people, education stops when it's

not mandatory, right? So, I just think this is a great step in getting people to support and recognize and just get on board with the idea of reconciliation. (P4)

I realized that if you are working in Canada you will be interacting with Indigenous people and it's a major social justice issue that you will be harmful in implementing these colonial views if you aren't aware of it. (P7)

These data reflect a wide range of interpretations of the value of such education. In these descriptions, ICR courses are not only important for understanding the historical mistreatment of Indigenous peoples, but also for engaging in contemporary realities. Issues of empathy (P6), reconciliation (P4) and contemporary expressions of colonialism (P7) are present realities which Indigenous Course Requirements can address.

Participants further supported this idea when describing the content of their ICR courses. The following are participants' descriptions of the most important content within their ICR course and their explanations as to why that content was important:

There are a few, but I suppose some of the important ones are the struggles that people who live on reserves face and the neglect, the consistent neglect that they've received from the government and on a provincial and federal level. That was very shocking to me…Because I feel the general public, in general, also has this belief that Indigenous people have support from the government, but they just don't use it or they misuse it. Whereas they are not being supported as they should be compared to the rest of Canada. (P2)

I think it's how it's still—how Indigenous people are still treated today and how it's still not fair. I guess within the government maybe and how they still struggle. It wasn't just residential schools…it's in all areas of their lives…It's not something that can be erased.

Like it's something that was really traumatic for everyone and that we can each play a

part in kind of building those relationships again, whereas we don't want to push them off

to the side that they have been throughout history. (P5)

The government worked to eliminate them rather than trying to fit them into the society

they were trying to build…I guess you look at all the current issues, right? And I think it

all kinda stems back from that. [The Canadian government] never really tried—They

never stuck to the agreements that they had made. They more or less just said, 'this is

what we're going to do now. You're not really fitting into our plans' to a society or group

of people that was already there. (P6)

Probably, I would say, the decolonizing narrative…It just really exposed a clear

understanding of the oppression and marginalization of peoples that is ongoing and

continuing. A lot of times people talk about reconciliation like these atrocities, genocide,

and all of these things, abuses—this is all things [sic] of the past and that we need to

make that right, but they're not things of the past. Well, they are things of the past but

they are still *ongoing*. (P8)

Across these descriptions, participants pointed to a shared belief that disruptive knowledge was

the most important aspect their ICR course content. Again, the exact justification for this

sentiment varied across participants (addressing stereotypes, understanding contemporary issues,

etc.), but all participants saw value in the ways that their course drew attention to ongoing

injustice against Indigenous people.

Beyond disruptive knowledge. Disruptive knowledge may have served one of the theoretical frameworks for this study, but—upon examining participants' responses—it was clear that it was not an all-encompassing framework. If disruptive knowledge was understood as a difficult, unsettling reality of the injustice facing Indigenous peoples, a secondary framework emerged which provided a counter-narrative of resilience and beauty. In contrast to the critical nature of disruptive knowledge, participants ($n = 5$) also described the strength of Indigenous peoples and the value of their cultural practices.

Indigenous people as resilient agents. Earlier sections of this chapter highlighted the persistent theme of the victimization of Indigenous peoples. This theme may have drawn attention to issues of historical and contemporary oppression, but, as the following reflections will show, did not capture a balanced understanding of the reality of Indigenous peoples. Alongside this recognition of injustice and mistreatment, some participants ($n = 3$) articulated a newfound understanding of Indigenous agency and resilience. P7 described her appreciation of local grassroots responses to CFS that drew on Indigenous knowledge and culture:

> [An Indigenous community member] basically started this prevention to the CFS system, where it would promote families staying together instead of total [sic] being apprehended, they would have lessons for the families, how you work through these things, 'let's get you in rehab but keeping the families together at cultural events'… not just a Western way, but saying, 'let's teach you how to take care of yourself, how to take care of your baby, using the medicine wheel'.

 P2 described the "Idle No More" movement as an act of resistance. He went on to describe his broader reaction to learning about Indigenous resilience:

And I also see that there are movements and there is pushback from Indigenous

communities which I felt that was something that wasn't happening, so I was able to learn

about the movements and organizations that are supporting the improvement of the lives

of Indigenous people in Canada. (P2)

P8 also stressed the value of acknowledging this type of work: "You have to look at the beauty

and the incredible—[Indigenous people] are doing amazing things. You have to see that". These

reflections offer a perspective that extends beyond victimhood.

The value of Indigenous culture. The second counter-narrative within these responses

revolved around the value of Indigenous culture. When discussing Indigenous culture,

participants tended to focus on the assimilatory practices of previous governments, the damage

of these practices to Indigenous cultures, and the need to revitalize these cultures and languages.

As a counter to this narrative, some participants *(n = 4)* discussed the ways in which these

courses highlighted the universal insights and benefits of Indigenous culture. P8 described the

benefits of the sacred teachings (love, humility, honesty, wisdom, courage, truth, respect):

"Sacred Teachings. We all can grow from those kind of their teachings [sic] and their ways are

beautiful and inclusive. They have so much to be proud of. It's remarkable" (P8). Using very

similar language, P4 discussed the value of bringing the sacred teachings into her work as an

early years educator: "[The sacred teachings] are really good principles to live by and this is how

you be a good person and this is what we're trying to do, is be good people" (P4). P5 and P2

identified specific practices within Indigenous cultures wherein they recognized particular

benefits for their own lives. P5 described the importance of learning about self-care within

Indigenous traditions: "We talked about self-care a lot and how that was really important for

Indigenous people and as university students that wasn't something that we really practiced". P2

discussed an increased concern for nature and a deeper sense of connection to the land: "[The course] did affect my consciousness toward [land] in the sense of not being lazy or negligent when I see something that I could or could not do that would either hurt the land or help the land". These data all reflect an appreciation for Indigenous cultures. Like the reflections on "resilience", they also offer an important counter-balance to the narratives that were prominent in most of the reflections on disruptive knowledge.

<div align="center">**Results across Phases 1 and 2**</div>

To this point, this chapter has presented Phase 1 and Phase 2 data as mostly independent findings with very little mixing of the methods from which they draw. The following section is meant to provide a broader perspective of these data sets as they relate to the research questions. This section will consider the ways in which Phase 1 and Phase 2 data converge and diverge in relation to the central inquiries of this study.

Attitudes Towards Contemporary Injustices Facing Indigenous Peoples in Canada

Across timepoints, participants' attitudes shifted regarding the treatment of Indigenous peoples within government-run systems. From Timepoint 1 to Timepoint 2 in Phase 1 responses, participants identified greater mistreatment of Indigenous people within the health, education, criminal justice systems, and the workplace. Within the Phase 2 data, participants linked this sense of injustice to specific course content (Gerald Stanley trial, lack of funding for Indigenous languages, etc.). Phase 2 participants described how this understanding of contemporary injustice, coupled with their learnings regarding historical injustice, helped them reframe their attitudes towards other contemporary issues affecting the well-being of Indigenous peoples (rates of substance abuse, crime rates, etc.). These participants offered a re-telling of these stereotypes that removed the blame from Indigenous people themselves. When describing these experiences,

participants also described intense, but varied emotional reactions (anger, hopelessness, empathy, sympathy, etc.). One common theme across these experiences was feelings of sadness, which Phase 2 participants linked to a recognition of government failure, unjust outcomes and empathy.

For many Phase 2 participants' descriptions, this attitudinal shift was linked to learning from the lived experiences of Indigenous peoples. Participants described the unique impact of hearing first-hand accounts of Indigenous people who face this type of mistreatment. Whether in the form of class discussion, guest speakers, or disclosures from Indigenous instructors, Phase 2 participants described these stories as a source of learning regarding the contemporary experiences of Indigenous people.

Attitudes Towards Specific Government Responses to Matters of Reconciliation

Between Timepoint 1 and Timepoint 2 in Phase 1 data, participants' reported level of support for government initiatives increased. The interview data supported these findings. Students directly described an increased level of support for various initiatives and linked this change to specific course content. At the same time, participants described an increasingly negative view of the Canadian government's involvement with Indigenous people.

Sense of Complicity Regarding Ongoing Injustice Against Indigenous Peoples

Drawing from related literature (Gebhard, 2017; Regan, 2011), "complicity" was meant to describe some sense of involvement in the ongoing mistreatment of Indigenous people. This could include a recognition of ongoing bias, a sense of benefit from one's privileged status, or feelings of guilt from one's role within unjust systems. Looking across both sets of data, this area offers the most complicated results.

On the topic of acknowledged benefit, participants did exhibit some sense of complicity. Participants in Phase 1 increased in their reported levels of benefit. Within Phase 2 interviews,

some participants expanded on this idea as they discussed particulars examples of such benefits (land, preferential treatment in public, etc.). This sense of benefit was not shared across all participants. Some participants directly refuted the idea that they would benefit from the mistreatment of Indigenous people.

This diversity of reflections is also characteristic of participants' responses to matter of interpersonal bias. There were no statistically significant changes between Timepoint 1 and Timepoint 2 on related Phase 1 measures ("Most Canadians are prejudiced against Indigenous peoples, whether or not they always are conscious of it" and "I am never prejudiced against Indigenous"). It should be noted that, as single-item measures, this lack of significance may be due to the small sample size. Despite a lack of evidence regarding change over time, these data reveal that participants were quick to acknowledge the presence of interpersonal bias within others. At Timepoint 2, 82% of respondents agreed to some extent ("Agree" or "Strongly Agree") that "Most Canadians are prejudiced against Indigenous peoples, whether or not they always are conscious of it". In the interviews, many participants similarly described stereotypes and discrimination that existed within society at large. In numerous cases, participants even described such discrimination as existing in their own families. Such acknowledgements are starkly contrasted against measures of personal bias. At the same timepoint, only 36% of participants reported that they harboured some personal discrimination against Indigenous people. Most interview participants were also quick to distance themselves from personal expressions of bias. While some participants did acknowledge having such biases before their ICR course, some members of this group suggested that they had addressed their biases through this course.

Another aspect of complicity was the idea of "guilt". Phase 2 data present many different renderings of this idea and students' experiences with it. Students who expressed feelings of guilt linked these feelings to their ignorance, personal biases against Indigenous peoples, and sense of benefit from historical oppression. Students who did not experience feelings of guilt described transformed attitudes and distanced themselves from historical injustices.

Sense of Personal Responsibility Within the Work of Reconciliation

Like the matter of complicity, results regarding students' sense of responsibility are mixed. Between Timepoint 1 and Timepoint 2, participants did increase in their reported attitudes towards personal responsibility. However, this change was not statistically significant at $p \leq .05$, which suggests that this observed change may simply be due to chance. Looking at the broader pattern of responses across these two measures, one sees a noteworthy difference. At both time points, participants reported higher levels of agreement with the broad notion of responsibility than they did with the more personal measure of responsibility. At Timepoint 2, 84% strongly agreed that individual Canadians have a role in bringing about reconciliation. At this same time point, only 66% of participants strongly agreed that they personally have a role in bringing about reconciliation.

Across both phases, participants described the prominent role of education within their personal sense of responsibility. In Phase 1 data, the notion of "educating others" and "educating myself" were the most evident themes across the open-ended descriptions of responsibility at both time points. Similarly, Phase 2 participants expressed their belief in the importance of this work in their own reflections. More than a theoretical position, some participants also described instances in which they have already engaged in educating others as a result of the course. Numerous participants described how the course gave them specific knowledge that they used to

combat ignorance and stereotypes in everyday conversation. In their descriptions of these lived

encounters, participants identified a few characteristics of this work. First, they acknowledged

the social barriers that exist around addressing racist and discriminatory language. Secondly,

they described how the content of this course gave them the specific knowledge and a feeling of

empowerment to overcome these barriers.

Summary of Findings Across Phases

Overall, the findings of Phase 2 supported and deepened the findings of Phase 1. Taken

together, these two phases suggest some attitudinal change across all identified areas:

Recognition of discrimination, sense of complicity, sense of responsibility, and support for

government action. However, this change was not consistent across all measures or all

participants. In Chapter 5, I will discuss the implications of these findings against the larger body

of literature regarding education for reconciliation.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Introduction

As I shift to consider the significance of these findings, I want to explicitly state that the following section is not meant to be read simply as a program evaluation. The Indigenous Course Requirement is much more than a tool of attitudinal remediation for non-Indigenous students. To read this study or this section through a purely evaluative lens is to minimize the complex and multi-faceted nature of the ICR within the University of Winnipeg's larger approach to matters of reconciliation. Instead, it is my hope that the following section can offer some insights into the much larger issue of education for reconciliation, as it presents both reasons for optimism and points of caution.

This study began with a particular problem: Despite a widespread belief that education can serve as a meaningful tool in the work of reconciliation (Hart, 2011; Paulson, 2011), there is relatively limited research on the outcomes of such programs (TRC, 2015b). As governments and universities respond to the TRC's Calls to Action with new course requirements and new curricula (Kairos, 2016), the TRC itself calls for further research on such educational responses to the legacy of the Indian Residential School system (TRC, 2015b). This study was meant to address this gap within the literature through a particular focus on disruptive knowledge and attitude change. Within this framework, I wanted to understand how courses with an explicit focus on historical and contemporary injustice would affect students' attitudes towards various issues related to reconciliation.

Broadly, this study provides some support for the notion of education for reconciliation. Across nearly all quantitative measures, participants described attitude change regarding matters of reconciliation (recognition of ongoing injustice, sense of complicity, sense of responsibility,

support for government action). Interview data supported these findings, as participants

described transformed perspectives and behavioural shifts.

As the following sections will outline, these findings offer reasons for optimism and

points of concern regarding such education. In all areas of this discussion (shifting perspectives;

complicity, benefit, and guilt; and behaviours and behavioural intentions), I will present a

tensioned interpretation of the findings outlined in Chapter 4. Drawing on related literature, I will

also outline the implications of these results for practice and future study.

Shifting Perspectives

Reasons for Optimism

The findings of this study support the broader framework of disruptive knowledge.

Considering the earlier chapters of this study, one notices convergence between the

responses/reflections of participants and the scholarship that formed the theoretical basis of this

study. This convergence is probably most evident in the recognition of ongoing discrimination

against Indigenous peoples in Canada. As outlined in Chapter 2, one of the major barriers to

education for reconciliation in a settler-colonial society is the temporal framing of oppression.

Within schools and public discourse, the idea that Indigenous people have been oppressed, if

acknowledged at all, is often relegated to the "dustbins of history" (Coulthard, 2014) and

contemporary Canada is presented as a society that has moved on from the injustices of the past

(Gebhard, 2017; Lowman & Barker, 2015; Regan, 2010). This study reveals the potential of

disruptive knowledge in addressing this barrier — as an unsettling, counternarrative that draws

particular attention to current injustice. In both phases of the study, participants described a

deeper recognition of the institutional and systemic discrimination that pervades the judicial,

educational, and health care systems today.

This recognition of injustice moves beyond the acquisition of facts about Indigenous peoples and moves towards broader notions of reconciliation. This included a relearning of national narratives of Canadian benevolence (Regan, 2010) and Indigenous helplessness. The ICR courses forced most participants to formulate new answers to two fundamental questions: *What accounts for the lack of well-being (substandard housing, poorer health outcomes, etc.) within many Indigenous communities? How has the government contributed to this situation?* In some cases, the lack of well-being within many Indigenous communities, often understood as a product of their own failings, was relearned in terms of intergenerational trauma, historical injustice, and contemporary institutional discrimination. This shift marks a transition away from some of the most damaging and harmful stereotypes surrounding Indigenous people, and towards recognizing specific historical and contemporary expressions of institutional discrimination. The matter of blame or fault shifts from Indigenous peoples themselves to the institutions and colonial structures that limit their well-being. While this view perpetuates a narrow vision of Indigenous well-being—a potentially problematic idea that will be discussed later—it can have the positive effect of forcing a critical evaluation of the narrative of Canada as an accepting and peaceful country (Lowman & Barker, 2015; Regan, 2010). In these ways, my data represent some of the positive outcomes of such disruptive knowledge.

Points of Concern

It should go without saying that it is impossible to fit hundreds of years of colonial oppression into a 3-credit hour course. It is important to acknowledge the limited understanding that one can gain from a single course and the dangers that such understanding may present. As outlined in Chapter 4, many Phase 2 participants found this information empowering, as it motivated them to educate others and challenge stereotypes in everyday conversations. However,

this newfound understanding was, in many cases, rudimentary. Numerous participants described historical events or facts in factually inaccurate or simplistic ways (e.g., "I didn't know [Residential schools] happened until '98 [sic]" (P8)). Further, while participants questioned the root cause of existing stereotypes, they failed to challenge the stereotype itself. Participants no longer viewed widespread issues of substance abuse, poor parenting, or crime as the *fault* of Indigenous peoples themselves, but themes of helplessness and victimhood were present in their descriptions. Participants did not describe these issues of well-being with nuance and continued to speak in generalizations. As Gaudry (2016) pointed out in his discussion of Indigenous course requirements, students in such courses may arrive a place where they know just enough to be dangerous. Such education may give students a sense of enlightenment without a recognition of the limited or reductive nature of their understanding. In this case, this limited understanding may be one that perpetuates a shallow narrative of Indigenous victimhood.

This limited understanding of Indigenous experiences can have other negative consequences. Numerous scholars have pointed out that such consciousness-raising education can make students "feel good about feeling bad" (Regan, 2010, p. 47), without engendering any real change (Kumashiro, 2000; Tuck & Yang, 2012). It can simply serve as vehicle to swiftly move to an innocent position in which matters of complicity or guilt are no longer threatening (Lowman & Barker, 2015; Tuck & Yang, 2012). These claims are clearly supported in my study. One such example comes from the words of P5 as she stated "I guess now that I changed my mindset I don't feel guilty because I realized that I really am not going to…put those stereotypes on [Indigenous peoples]". In such cases, students cited their newly acquired understanding as evidence of their transformed views and beliefs. In other words, they saw nothing to feel guilty about, as they no longer believed that they held misinformed views or discriminatory beliefs.

Coupled with their emphasis on educating *others* with their new knowledge, there is a sense that these participants position themselves outside of ongoing injustice and are no longer in need of further learning. Across various measures, participants were reluctant to acknowledge any type of ongoing personal bias. This resistance is not surprising – scholars have written at length about the barriers to acknowledging such guilt (Gebhard, 2017; Kumashiro, 2000; Leach, Snider, and Iyer, 2002; Regan, 2010; Schick, 2000). Additionally, one of the foundational functions of attitudes is *externalization*, which protects one's self-identity and ego (Maio & Haddock, 2010; Petty, 2012). Even if these courses do force students to acknowledge their own personal biases, such acknowledgement might be fleeting. There is a danger that such courses will lead students to believe they have completely overcome their racist and discriminatory inclinations.

If such courses do not draw attention to the limits of students' newfound perspective, there is the potential for the perpetuation of problematic understandings and harmful frameworks. This applies both to students' assurance of their understanding and their personal sense of transformation. The following section will explore this idea in more depth, as it considers the complicated relationship between these courses and notions of complicity, benefit, and guilt.

Complicity, Benefit and Guilt

Participants' aforementioned increased recognition of discrimination is significant, but it fails to capture all aspects of disruptive knowledge (Czyzweski, 2011; Regan, 2010). For such education to be truly transformative, it must also help students recognize their place in these systems, pushing them to an embodied response (Gebhard, 2017; Regan, 2010).

Reasons for Optimism

It is notable that participants in this study increased in their reported levels of benefit from the ongoing discrimination against Indigenous people. As many scholars have pointed out, it is one thing for participants to acknowledge ongoing discrimination, but quite another to acknowledge their own sense of benefit from such discrimination (Gebhard, 2017; Regan, 2010). The flipside of discrimination is the less-acknowledged notion of privilege or benefit, which has been met with resistance from students in such classes (Schick, 2000). When faced with a picture of ongoing injustice against Indigenous people—in which they were personally implicated— participants, on average, articulated a greater sense of personal benefit from these unjust systems.

This acknowledgment of benefit is important for making sense of participants' varied affective responses. Using Leach, Snider, and Iyer's (2002) framework of relative advantage, one is able to describe the relationship between participants' interpretation of their privileged position and their affective response. The authors posited that there are three factors that determine one's affective outcome: one's orientation (self-focused vs. other focused), one's perception of the advantage (legitimate vs. illegitimate), and one's sense of control (high vs. low). Each combination of these factors leads to a different affective outcome. This might be helpful in understanding the varied responses to guilt within my study. In Leach, Snider, and Iyer's (2002) model, guilt is the product of a *self-focused orientation,* a *high sense of control*, and a sense that your position of privilege is *illegitimate*. In Phase 2 of my study, all participants who described a sense of benefit were quick to acknowledge their position as *illegitimate*. However, there was little uniformity across or within responses regarding matters of control or orientation. Participants described reconciliation both as a failure of structural powers beyond their control and as a matter of personal responsibility (low control vs. high control). Similarly,

they shifted between describing the experiences of Indigenous peoples and their role in these

systems of injustice (other-focused vs. self-focused).

There are multiple ways to read the findings of this study in light of this theoretical

consideration. The first is to see this "other-focused" orientation as an avoidance of complicity.

When recognizing injustice, a self-focused orientation can produce unsettling feelings of moral

responsibility (Regan, 2010). As a response, the protective, externalization function of attitudes

can help us interpret events in ways that keep our self-image and ego intact (Maio & Haddock,

2012; Petty, 2012). Within this interpretation, such an other-focused orientation – and the

avoidance of guilt that comes with it – could be seen as yet another troubling "move to

innocence" (Tuck & Yang, 2011) in which one's sense of complicity is avoided or overcome.

Even if unconscious, this outcome could be understood as an avoidance of guilt and a troubling

expression of settler-colonial tendencies. In such a light, it could be concluded that these courses

failed to properly elicit critical self-reflection from participants.

Alternatively, this other-focused orientation could also be read as an important and

necessary foregrounding of Indigenous experiences. As noted earlier, Gaudry (2016) warned

about the dangers of catering such requirements to non-Indigenous students and their

development (Gaudry, 2016). He argued that these courses are meant to support Indigenous

peoples and their experiences. As such, there is real danger in prioritizing the self-focused

orientation of non-Indigenous students. Monture-Angus, as cited in Czyzweski (2011), argues

that promoting feelings of guilt is, in fact, a deeply damaging practice: "When non-Aboriginal

guilt becomes the focus of any process meant to address historical wrongs, Aboriginal pain is

appropriated and then transformed. This transformation is a recreation of colonial relationships"

(p. 5). This passage reminds us that non-Indigenous guilt, while it may have some place in such education, cannot serve as the primary affective outcome of such courses.

Returning to the data, one finds evidence that some course instructors intentionally avoided a self-focused experience. Participants in these courses described the intentional efforts of their instructors to avoid "laying blame" or inducing guilt in non-Indigenous participants. Instead, they described the ways that the courses drew particular attention to the lived experiences of Indigenous disadvantage. In this light, the lack of widespread guilt among non-Indigenous participants cannot simply be read as a result of their refusal to accept personal complicity. It may also have been the outcome of intentional decisions of course instructors to prioritize an other-focused reading of relative advantage, which produced alternative affective responses (empathy, moral outrage, etc.) among participants (Leach, Snider, & Iyer, 2002).

These mixed affective outcomes surrounding matters of complicity offer hope for this type of education. Across participants, there seemed to be some increased willingness to acknowledge their place as benefactors from the ongoing discrimination against Indigenous people. This acknowledgement of illegitimate advantage is crucial in promoting the type of affective outcomes (moral outrage, empathy, and guilt) that lead to positive behavioural change (Leach, Snider, & Iyer, 2002). This section of data also illuminated the complicated place of guilt within the work of education for reconciliation. A sense of moral culpability may play a necessary and helpful role in the transformation of non-Indigenous perspectives, but it should not be mistaken for the only or primary affective outcome of value. These data reflect this tensioned reality in the experiences of non-Indigenous participants.

In this analysis, it is also important to acknowledge the demographic diversity of participants. In Phase 2, one participant directly rejected the notion of benefit, citing his minority

group identity. The category of "non-Indigenous" is so broad that it includes participants with

diverse experiences of privilege and benefit. Most of the scholarship on this topic focuses on

Settler experiences, a category that—depending on which definition is used—likely does not

apply to all participants in this study. The frameworks above may be helpful in describing the

relationship of benefit and guilt for Settler Canadians, but they may not capture the experiences

of participants who do not experience such privilege in society.

Reasons for Caution

In addition to notions of benefit and guilt, this broad idea of complicity also includes a

direct acknowledgement of personal prejudice. While there is clear overlap between each of

these ideas, participants' descriptions differentiated between them. Whereas benefit and guilt can

be understood in broader, corporate terms (associated with group affiliation), acknowledgement

of bias, as described here, is a personal matter. Across different measures, some participants

denied this type of complicity, even when faced with their own biases.

Within the survey data, most participants described pervasive interpersonal prejudice in

other non-Indigenous Canadians, while few described being prejudiced themselves. The number

of students who self-reported discriminatory views on the survey did slightly increase over the

course of the study, but this group was still in the minority (36%) and much lower than the

number who reported interpersonal prejudice in others (82%). Across the interview data, there

were nevertheless various passages which could be read as signs of ongoing prejudice (e.g.

Contrasting the instructors' indigeneity with notions of a "regular professor"), even among

participants who denied that they were personally biased. These findings draw more attention to

a point of caution that has already been addressed: Instead of promoting ongoing self-critical

reflection on ingrained biases, these courses may allow students to feel as if they have addressed and overcome their biases.

The literature surrounding settler-colonialism suggests that prejudice and discrimination are interwoven into many aspects of Canadian society and are nearly inescapable, even for those who express commitment to matters of social justice (Barker & Lowman, 2015). Such biases and discriminatory orientations are not obstacles that are easily overcome but are habits of settler-colonialism in need of constant attention. As will be discussed later, this point of caution requires a particular framing of such courses that draws attention to the self-critical and never-ending nature of such education for reconciliation.

Behaviour Intentions and Behaviour Change

One of the greatest obstacles in traditional attitudinal studies is the tenuous relationship between attitudes and behaviour (Maio & Haddock, 2012). Describing support for a behaviour on a survey can require far less of an individual than the actual behaviour may involve. As such, it is important to delineate between the data that point to behavioural intentions and that which describe actual behavioural change.

Reasons for Optimism

The survey data suggests that participants slightly increased in their belief that individuals play a role in the work of reconciliation. Similarly, the open-ended responses suggested that their understanding of this work shifted as well, with an increase in the descriptions involving addressing injustice and acknowledging personal bias. Participants moved away from general discussions of fair treatment to descriptions of challenging inequality. These descriptions strengthen the connection between these courses and the belief that disruptive knowledge can empower embodied change that challenges oppressive structures (Kumashiro,

2000). Alone, these survey results would merely indicate behavioural intentions – participants'

aspirational attitudes towards the work of reconciliation. Read alongside the interview data,

however, these responses reveal the potential of these courses to bring about meaningful

behaviour change.

Numerous participants described the ways in which they had – since their ICR course –

addressed ignorance and stereotypes in conversation with others. Within these descriptions, they

suggested that their ICR courses had given them the empowering knowledge to engage in these

socially-challenging conversations. This finding is notable for two reasons. First, these small

steps of advocacy, although limited, are important. Discussing the value of acts as simple as

coffeeshop conversations, Sinclair (2018) suggested that work of reconciliation for non-

Indigenous people requires, "the confidence to be uncomfortable in egregious times". Put

differently, engagement in reconciliation is not limited to government action or institutional

change but extends to the everyday decisions of non-Indigenous Canadians. Such actions may

appear insignificant but nevertheless, hold transformative potential. Secondly, this section of data

is significant as it suggests an embodied response to participants' experiences with disruptive

knowledge (Kumashiro, 2000; Regan, 2010). These actions represent a change within

participants that extends beyond self-reported attitudes.

Cause for Concern

Support for government initiatives may have been high across all measures, but not

equally so. Issues related to land had the lowest levels of participant support as compared to

other measures ("Provide Indigenous communities with full control over natural resources on

traditional territories" and "Settle all outstanding land claims, regardless of cost"). For some

scholars (Alfred, 2005; Tuck & Yang, 2012), land is not one issue of importance among many, it

is *the* issue that lies at the heart of settler-colonialism. From this perspective, if ICR courses are

meant to unsettle aspects of settler-colonialism, land-based issues should be of central concern.

Not only do these issues have the lowest levels of overall support, they also were among the

causes for which one can not conclude that any change in participant attitude occurred.

<div align="center">**Implications of the Study**</div>

This hopeful but cautious description of students' experiences has practical implications

that extend beyond these theoretical considerations. As a small window into the experiences of

students within these classes, this study offers a few insights that can inform the future work of

practitioners at the University of Winnipeg and other researchers. The following sections outline

these possibilities.

Implications for Practice

In the broadest terms, the data on students' experiences in these select classes support the

continuation of these select ICR courses at The University of Winnipeg. The data aligns well

with broad theoretical descriptions of education for reconciliation and the University of

Winnipeg's particular rationale. Within this limited sample, there appeared to be some

relationship between students' learning and an increase in desirable attitudes and behaviours.

Additionally, these data support earlier research which outlined the generally positive

experiences of students in these ICR courses (Lepp-Friesen, 2018). Over the duration of this

study, participants became more supportive of such a course requirement on Indigenous

issues/histories/cultures. Although these positive experiences are not universal and some student

resistance to such a requirement continues, this study does provide broad support for continued

implementation of such courses at the University of Winnipeg.

A closer examination of this data, however, reveals pressing questions for the instructors of these courses. The data reveal a number of notable tensions that must be addressed. First, instructors must consider the complicated notion of non-Indigenous guilt. Some of the literature surrounding such education for reconciliation in Canada suggests that a sense of moral responsibility is an important component of this work (Czyzweski, 2011; Gebhard, 2012; Regan, 2010;). Alternatively, other scholars warn of the dangers of non-Indigenous guilt, as a colonial instrument that usurps Indigenous suffering and relegates it to a secondary concern (Monture-Angus, 1999; Alfred, 2015). The data in this study reveal varied and sometimes competing experiences of students when confronted with notions of benefit, guilt, and personal bias in regards to Indigenous peoples. So, what does all of this mean for instructors of ICR courses? How should instructors of these courses address the issue of non-Indigenous guilt? While data from this study do not definitively answer this question, they suggest consideration of a different question: *What is the goal of an Indigenous course requirement?*

Even though transformed attitudes are part of this goal, it is clear that there is something much larger at stake — a transformed relationship between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people. Such a relationship will ultimately require much more than the attitude change that a single ICR course can produce. I have already highlighted the danger that exists in students' sense that they have acquired a full understanding of Indigenous issues or a fully transformed view of reconciliation. In response to this danger, Gaudy (2016) suggests that the goal of such Indigenous course requirements should be to get students to take additional courses on Indigenous issues, pushing them into a continual transformation through learning. This echoes Kumashiro's (2000) idea that disruptive knowledge "is not an end in itself, but a means toward the always-shifting end/goal of learning more" (p. 34). In this sense, the value of such

requirements is not the magnitude of change that is experienced over the span of four months. Instead, the value of such courses is found in the ways that they prepare students for ongoing learning and continued growth as they engage in the work of reconciliation.

Planning Indigenous course requirements with this consideration in mind might also address the earlier conundrum of complicity. Ignorance, guilt, benefit, and personal bias cannot be framed as obstacles which can be overcome within a single course. Instead, these constructs need to be seen as symptoms of settler-colonialism in need of ongoing attention. Students need to understand that they cannot fully overcome the effects of injustice. This interpretation does not excuse discriminatory thoughts or actions, but it does situate those discriminatory tendencies within the larger narrative of systemic injustice. It invites those individuals into an ongoing and arduous process of constant reflexivity. Such a pedagogy explicitly recognizes its role in ever-unfinished work. Additionally, it illuminates the thinly veiled attempts at self-protection, externalization and "moves to innocence", as it constantly returns us to an unsettling, but not paralyzing recognition of our ignorance and complicity.

Instructors in Indigenous course requirements must make this process of ongoing transformation explicit. They must draw attention to the systemic forces of settler-colonialism and the individual expressions of bias and discrimination, moving between self and other orientations in foregrounding Indigenous experiences. This tensioned and complex approach is responsive both to the Calls to Action of the TRC and to the broader goal of disruptive knowledge (Kumashiro, 2000; Regan, 2010, TRC, 2015a).

Additionally, this study suggests that instructors should explore disruptive knowledge beyond narratives of Indigenous victimhood. Disruptive knowledge is not merely about unsettling narratives of Canadian benevolence, but also about dismantling narratives of

Indigenous helplessness. In addition to revealing ongoing injustice, these courses also helped

students to recognize the value of Indigenous culture and to discover the presence of Indigenous

resilience. Such findings affirm the call by scholars for ICR courses to empower and support

Indigenous faculty and students as academics and members of society (Gaudry, 2016; Smith &

Summerville, 2017). As noted earlier, in Chapter 2, there is danger in focusing exclusively on

Indigenous culture and neglecting the nature of ongoing injustice (St. Denis, 2005), but these

data remind us that there is equal danger in focusing exclusively on injustice and, thereby,

perpetuating a narrow narrative of Indigenous victimhood. This sentiment, reflective of the data

as a whole, was perfectly summarized in the words of one participant:

> I'm passionate about the wonderful things and I'm passionate about the bad things
>
> because you have to see both, right? You can't just look at—and sometimes I forget, I've
>
> had a few people remind me and [instructor's name] is one of them—You have to look at
>
> the beauty and the incredible—people are doing amazing things. You have to see that.
>
> It's really important to have this history and all those things. Again, I come back to
>
> saying, because I think it's really important, if it placed any merit in decision-making,
>
> that people have a course like this, where you have to learn all the hard and difficult
>
> knowledge, then you have another: Indigenous ways of knowing or something else where
>
> you are just celebrating the Indigenous spirit, where you're really about celebrating all
>
> these incredible teachings. (P8)

Offering a new vision of the Indigenous course requirement, this participant describes the

importance of disruptive knowledge that both acknowledges discrimination and celebrates

Indigenous resilience. P8 offers an important reminder of the value of capturing a broader image

of indigeneity in these courses. These courses must disrupt the narrative that discrimination is a

matter of the past, but it must also disrupt the narrative of Indigenous failure and helplessness.

Implications for Future Research

       Experience of Indigenous students. Indigenous students were not the focus of this

study. However, in important ways, this study illuminated the need to understand the experiences

of Indigenous students, both in what it found, but—more notably—in what it didn't attempt to

find. Within this study, numerous students highlighted the way in which the personal accounts of

Indigenous classmates and Indigenous instructors served as a source of transformation. In light

of related scholarship, this raises an important tension. Scholars point to the value of Indigenous

voices and perspectives as pathways to "indigenize" academia (Smith & Summerville, 2017). At

the same time, other research has highlighted the burden that this role places on Indigenous

students, saddling them with the role of Indigenous expert (Lepp-Friesen, 2018). These two

narratives necessitate a consideration of the experiences of Indigenous students within these

courses, which is something that this study does not provide. Given my focus on non-Indigenous

participants, I recognize the way that this work might unintentionally reinforce the narrative that

these ICR courses are primarily meant for non-Indigenous students (Gaudry, 2016). In this way,

my study—in both what it found and what it couldn't find—highlights the need to learn more

about the experiences of Indigenous students.

       Long-term studies. Returning to Chapter 2, one is reminded of the danger in overstating

the value of such short-term changes within this type of research. Hill and Augoustinos (2001)

found statistically significant changes in non-Indigenous participants levels of prejudice and

stereotyping at the end of a similar course, but these effects disappeared over the span of three

months. Maddison and Stastny (2016) also highlighted the inability of educational interventions

to produce long-term change. Both studies reflect a larger concern surrounding such

programming, namely that most educational efforts have a defined endpoint, but the larger

ideological forces of settler-colonialism are not in immediate threat of disruption. There is

skepticism that such courses can produce enduring change against the broader narratives of the

societies in which they exist. This study supports the idea that such educational efforts can

produce short-term changes, but it does little to address this larger critique. Additional research

is, therefore, needed to understand the experiences of students over time.

Further Limitations of the Study

The preceding discussion must be read in light of the shortcomings of this study. Chapter

1 identified some of the limitations that were evident before the study began. In this section, I

will outline additional limitations that were discovered as part of the analysis of data. One such

limitation was my sample size. With a larger sample, it is possible that I would have been able to

report changes at a level of statistical significance ($p < .05$) across all measures in Phase 1 of the

study. Additionally, my sample size made it difficult to make meaningful statistical comparisons

across specific subgroups: With a larger sample size, it may have been possible to compare

results across measures across courses, genders, academic history, and family history. Phase 2 of

this study may also have yielded more diverse responses to the interview questions than those

provided in this thesis.

Not only was this sample small in number, it was also limited in its demographic and

ideological diversity; as such, the generalizability of the results may be limited. It is possible that

the results may generalize to the larger University of Winnipeg population: The sample was

somewhat representative of the school's population, but it did contain a higher percentage of

women. The results observed in this study also appear to differ from results reported in other

similar studies. For example, compared to the results of *Canadian Public Opinion on Aboriginal Peoples* (Environics Institute for Survey Research, 2016) and the *National Narrative on Reconciliation Report* (Reconciliation Canada, 2017), respondents in my study noted higher levels of systemic discrimination, higher levels of support for government initiatives, a higher sense of individual responsibility, and a higher sense of benefit from discrimination. This suggests that my sample entered their ICR courses with attitudes towards issues of reconciliation that were more supportive than the national average. This characteristic may be an inherent aspect of conducting research with a group of university students. Thus, it is important to understand my findings within the unique demographic and ideological characteristics of the University of Winnipeg.

These ideological characteristics also have implications for my data analysis and results. Across some measures, participants' views were heavily skewed (i.e., highly positive), even at Timepoint 1. This restricted variability (coupled with my small sample size) limited my ability to detect change across timepoints, in that there was little room for change. For example, when participants were asked to list their level of support for "Government funding to reserves for clean drinking water/adequate housing", all participants expressed support at Timepoint 1: 94% chose "strongly agree" and 6% chose "agree". At Timepoint 2, 100% of participants chose "strongly agree". Despite the fact that this difference reflected the most change possible, it did not produce a statistically significant change ($p < .05$) on this single item measure. This limitation is known as the ceiling effect, where most responses cluster at one end of a scale, limiting the researcher's ability to accurately measure and describe change over time (Salkind, 2010).

Conclusion

This study offers insights into the possibilities and limitations of education for reconciliation in the context of The University of Winnipeg's Indigenous Course Requirement. For many of the participants in this study, these select ICR courses were linked to improved attitudes that are central to the work of reconciliation, both in terms of the realities facing Indigenous peoples and participants' relationship to these oppressive systems. In the informal context of everyday conversations and the formal context of required Indigenous courses, participants described an embodied support for this type of education more broadly.

Understood in the broader frameworks of settler-colonialism and disruptive knowledge, these seemingly positive results must be received with caution. Attitudinal change, although important, is not a marker of some reconciled state. As the broader body of literature and the data from this study remind us, the desire to understand oneself as "innocent" or "transformed" is an instinctual but dangerous outcome of such education. This study is a reminder that Indigenous course requirements must not only be part of a much larger process of decolonization, but they must draw students' attention to the need for ongoing, critical self-reflection in the work of reconciliation.

Indigenous course requirements, like the students taking them, must balance a set of tensioned identities. On the one hand, they must recognize the importance of small cognitive and affective transformations, which support a healthier relationship with Indigenous people. On the other hand, they must not mistake this progress for a "healthy" relationship with Indigenous peoples, but instead constantly examine the ways in which their work/outlook is limited and in need of broader transformation. Such an undertaking is not simple or straightforward, but neither is the work of reconciliation.

References

Adams, M., & Bell, L. A. (2016). *Teaching for diversity and social justice*. Taylor and Francis.

Retrieved from

https://books.google.ca/books?id=lIpwCwAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_g

e_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false

Aikenhead, G., & Michell, H. (2011). *Bridging cultures: Indigenous and scientific ways of

knowing nature.* Toronto, Canada: Pearson.

Alfred, Taiaiake. (2005). *Wasase: Indigenous pathways of action and freedom*. Toronto, Canada:

University of Toronto Press.

Alfred, Taiaiake. (2015). *Restitution is the real pathway to justice for Indigenous peoples*.

Retrieved from: https://taiaiake.files.wordpress.com/2015/01/ahf-restitution-article.pdf

Australian Human Rights Commission (2016). *Close the gap*. Retrieved from

https://www.humanrights.gov.au/sites/default/files/document/publication/Progress_priorit

ies_report_CTG_2016_0.pdf

Bar-Tal, D. (2002). The elusive nature of peace education. In G. Salomon & B. Nevo (Eds.),

Peace education: The concept, principles and practice in the world (pp.27-36). Mahwah,

NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bar-Tal, D., & Rosen, Y. (2009). Peace education in societies involved in intractable conflicts:

Direct and indirect models. *Review of Educational Research,79*, 557-575.

Battiste, M. (2013). *Decolonizing education: Nourishing the learning spirit.* Saskatoon, Canada:

Purich.

Beelmann, A., & Heinemann, K. S. (2014). Preventing prejudice and improving intergroup

    attitudes: A meta-analysis of child and adolescent training programs. *Journal of Applied*

    Developmental Psychology, 35(1), 10-24.

Bergman, M.M. (2008). The straw men of the qualitative-quantitative divide and their influence

    on mixed methods research. In M.M. Bergman (Ed.), *Advances in mixed methods*

    research (pp. 10-21). London, England: SAGE Publications.

Biton, Y., & Salomon, G. (2006). Peace in the eyes of Israeli and Palestinian youths: Effects of

    collective narratives and peace education program. *Journal of Peace Research, 43*, 167-

    180.

Bowers, C. A. (2001). *Educating for eco-justice and community*. Athens, GA: University of

    Georgia Press.

Buckley-Zistel, S. (2009). Nation, narration, unification? The politics of history teaching after

    the Rwandan genocide. *Journal of Genocide Research, 11*(1), 31-53.

Chiodo, L. N., Sonn, C. C., & Morda, R. (2014). Implementing an intercultural psychology

    undergraduate unit: Approach, strategies, and outcomes. *Australian Psychologist*, *49*,

    181-192.

City of Winnipeg. (2016). Mayor Bowman declares 2016 as the year of reconciliation. Retrieved

    from http://www.winnipeg.ca/cao/media/news/nr_2016/nr_20160122.stm

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences.* Erlbaum: Hillsdale, NJ.

Cole, E. (2007). *Teaching the violent past: History education and reconciliation*. New York,

    NY: Rowan and Littlefield.

Coulthard, G. S. (2014). *Red skin, white masks: Rejecting the colonial politics of recognition*.

    Retrieved from http://ebookcentral.proquest.com

Creswell, J., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Czyzewski, K. (2011). The Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada: Insights into the goal of transformative education. *International Indigenous Policy Journal, 2*(3), 1-12.

de Costa, R. (2016). Two kinds of recognition: The politics of entanglement in settler societies. In S. Maddison, T. Clark, & R. de Costa (Eds.), *The limits of settler colonial reconciliation: Non-Indigenous people and the responsibility to engage* (pp. 49-66). Singapore: Springer.

de Costa, R. (2017). Discursive institutions in non-transitional societies: The Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. *International Political Science Review*, *38*, 185-199.

Dei, G. J. S. (1996). *Anti-racist education: Theory and practice*. Toronto, Canada: Fernwood Publishing.

Dei, G. J. S. (2005). Critical issues in anti-racist research methodologies: An introduction. In G.J.S. Dei (Ed.) *Critical issues in anti-racist research methodologies.* New York, NY: Peter Land.

Dei, G. J. S. (2014). *Politics of anti-racism education: In search of strategies for transformative learning*. Retrieved from http://www.springer.com

Deer, F. (2013). Integrating Aboriginal perspectives in education: Perceptions of pre-service teachers. *Canadian Journal of Education, 36*, 175-211.

Doosje, B., Branscombe, N., Spears, R., & Manstead, A. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of group-based guilt: The effects of ingroup identification. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 9*, 325-338.

Eagly, A.H. & Chaiken, S. (1993). *The psychology of attitudes*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace.

Environics Institute for Survey Research. (2016). *Canadian public opinion on Aboriginal peoples*. Retrieved from:

http://nctr.ca/assets/reports/Modern%20Reports/canadian_public_opinion.pdf

Ermine, W. (2007). The ethical space of engagement. *Indigenous Law Journal*, *6*, 193-203.

Feuerverger, G. (2001). *Oasis of dreams: Teaching and learning peace in a Jewish-Palestinian village in Israel*. New York, NY: RoutledgeFalmer.

Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics*. London, England: SAGE Publications.

Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. London, England: Sheed and Ward.

Friesen, J. (2018). Gerald Stanley acquitted in shooting death of Colten Boushie. The Globe and Mail. Retrieved from:

https://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/national/gerald-stanley-acquitted-in-death-of-colten-boushie/article37929427/

Furr, R. (2011). *The sage library of methods in social and personality psychology: Scale construction and psychometrics for social and personality psychology*. London, England: SAGE Publications.

Gaudry, A. (2016). Paved with good intentions: Simply requiring Indigenous content is not enough. Active History. Retrieved from:

http://activehistory.ca/2016/01/paved-with-good-intentions-simply-requiring-Indigenous-content-is-not-enough/

Gebhard, A. (2017). Reconciliation or racialization? contemporary discourses about residential schools in the Canadian prairies. *Canadian Journal of Education, 40*(1), 1-30

Giroux, H. A. (2011). *On critical pedagogy.* New York, NY: Continuum.

Glesne, C. (2016). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction*. Boston, MA: Pearson.

Golafshani, N. (2003). Understanding reliability and validity in qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report, 8*, 597-606.

Government of Canada (n.d.). Minister of Northern and Indigenous Affairs letter. Retrieved from http://pm.gc.ca/eng/minister-Indigenous-and-northern-affairs-mandate-letter

Greene, J. (2007). *Mixed methods in social inquiry*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Hart, J. (2011). Young people and conflict: Implications for education. In J. Paulson (Eds.), *Education and reconciliation: Exploring conflict and post-conflict situations* (pp. 11-28). New York, NY: Continuum.

Harris, I. M. & Morrison, M. L. (2012). *Peace education*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company.

Hattie, J. (2012). Visible learning for teachers: Maximizing impact on learning. Routledge: New York, NY.

Henderson, J., & Wakeham, P. (2009). Colonial reckoning, national reconciliation?: Aboriginal peoples and the culture of redress in Canada. *ESC: English Studies in Canada, 35*(1), 1-26.

Herek, G. M. (2000). The social construction of attitudes: Functional consensus and divergence in the U. S. public's reactions to AIDS. In G. R. Maio & J. M. Olson (Eds.), *Why we evaluate: Functions of attitudes* (pp. 325-364). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Hill, M. E., & Augoustinos, M. (2001). Stereotype change and prejudice reduction: Short- and long-term evaluation of a cross–cultural awareness programme. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, *11*, 243–262.

Ivankova, N. V., Creswell, J. W., & Stick, S. L. (2006). Using mixed-methods sequential explanatory design: From theory to practice. *Field Methods*, *18*(1), 3–20.

Iyer, A., Leach, C., & Crosby, F. (2003). White guilt and racial compensation: The benefits and limits of self-focus. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*(1), 117-129.

Johnson, D. (2011). A cloud over the rainbow nation? Language, national reconciliation, and educational transformation in post-apartheid South Africa. In J. Paulson (Ed.) *Education and reconciliation: Exploring conflict and post-conflict situations* (pp. 103-125). New York, NY: Continuum.

Johnson, J. M., & Rowlands, T. (2012). The interpersonal dynamics of in-depth interviewing. In J.F. Gubrium, J.A. Holstein, & A.B. Marvasti (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of interview research: The complexity of the craft* (pp. 99-114). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Kairos. (2016). Education for reconciliation report card. Retrieved from: http://www.kairoscanada.org/product/education-report-card

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

Krumpal, I. (2013). Determinants of social desirability bias in sensitive surveys: A literature review. *Quality & Quantity, 47*, 2025-2047.

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

Lavrakas, P. J. (2008). *Encyclopedia of survey research methods.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE
Publications.

Leach, C.W., Snider, S., & Iyer, A. (2002). "Poisoning the consciences of the fortunate": The
experience of relative advantage and support for social equality. In I. Walker & H.J.
Smith (Eds.), *Relative deprivation: Specification, development, and integration* (pp. 136-
163) New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Lepp Friesen, H. (2018). "We are all relations": An Indigenous Course Requirement (ICR) as
part of a good way to reconciliation. Retrieved from:
https://www.uwinnipeg.ca/community-engagement/docs/8-1-ICR-We-are-all-relations-
Lepp-Friesen.pdf

Litwin, M. (1995). *How to measure survey reliability and validity*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE
Publications.

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

Macdonald, M. (2016). Indigenizing the academy: What some universities are doing to weave
Indigenous peoples, cultures, and knowledge into the fabric of their campuses. Retrieved
from: https://www.universityaffairs.ca/features/feature-article/indigenizing-the-academy/

Macdonald, N. (2015). Welcome to Winnipeg: Where Canada's racism problem is at its worst.
Retrieved from http://www.macleans.ca/news/canada/welcome-to-winnipeg-where-
canadas-racism-problem-is-at-its-worst/

MacIntosh, C. (2016). University of Winnipeg makes Indigenous studies mandatory. CBC News.

Retrieved from: https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/manitoba/university-of-winnipeg-

makes-indigenous-studies-mandatory-1.3763846

Macoun, A. (2016). Colonising white innocence: Complicity and critical encounters. In S.

Maddison, T. Clark, & R. de Costa (Eds.), *The limits of settler colonial reconciliation:*

Non-Indigenous people and the responsibility to engage (pp. 85-102). Singapore:

Springer.

Maddison, S. & Stastny, A. (2016). Silence or deafness? Education and the non-Indigenous

responsibility to engage. In S. Maddison, T. Clark, & R. de Costa (Eds.), *The limits of*

settler colonial reconciliation: Non-Indigenous people and the responsibility to engage

(pp. 231-248). Singapore: Springer.

Maio, G.R., Esses, V., Arnold, K. & Olson, J.M. (2004). The function-structure model of

attitude: Incorporating the need for affect. In G. Haddock & G. R. Maio (Eds.),

Contemporary perspectives on the psychology of attitudes (pp. 425-453*)*. New York, NY:

Psychology Press.

Maio, G.R. & Haddock, G. (2004). Theories of attitude: Creating a witches' brew. In G.

Haddock & G.R. Maio (Eds.), *Contemporary perspectives on the psychology of attitudes*

(pp. 425-453*)*. New York, NY: Psychology Press.

Maio, G.R. & Haddock, G. (2010). *The psychology of attitudes and attitude change*. Thousand

Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Maxwell, J. (2013). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA:

SAGE Publications.

McCallum, M.J.L., Nagam, J., Hanley, J., Caudano, A., Gavrus, D. (2017). Decolonization, indigenization and the history department in Canada. *Canadian Historical Association Bulletin*. *43*(2), 32-33.

Mcglynn, C., Niens, U., Cairns, E., & Hewstone, M. (2004). Moving out of conflict: The contribution of integrated schools in Northern Ireland to identity, attitudes, forgiveness and reconciliation. *Journal of Peace Education, 1*(2), 147-163.

Monture-Angus, P. (1999). *Journeying forward: Dreaming First Nations' independence*. Winnipeg, Canada: Fernwood Publishing.

Morrison, M. L. (2011). Peace education. In D.K. Chatterjee (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Global Justice*. SpringerLink. Retrieved from https://link-springer-com.uml.idm.oclc.org/book/10.1007/978-1-4020-9160-5/page/1

Niens, U., & Cairns, E. (2005). Conflict, contact, and education in Northern Ireland. *Theory Into Practice, 44*, 337-344.

Oxford Dictionaries (2017). Reconciliation. Retrieved from: https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/reconciliation

Paulson, J. (2011). Introduction: Education and reconciliation. In J. Paulson (Ed.) *Education and reconciliation: Exploring conflict and post-conflict situations*. (pp. 1-10). New York, NY: Continuum.

Paradies, Y. (2005). Anti-Racism and Indigenous Australians. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, *5*(1), 1–28.

Pedersen, A., & Barlow, F. K. (2008). Theory to social action: A university-based strategy targeting prejudice against Aboriginal Australians. *Australian Psychologist*, *43*(3), 148–159.

Pedersen, A., Walker, I., & Wise, M. (2005). "Talk does not cook rice": Beyond anti-racism

   rhetoric to strategies for social action. *Australian Psychologist*, *40*(1), 20–31.

Petty, R.E. (2012). Attitude Change. *Encyclopedia of Human Behaviour*. Retrieved from:

   http://www.sciencedirect.com.uml.idm.oclc.org/science/article/pii/B97801237500060004

   09.

Pidgeon, M. (2016). More than a checklist: Meaningful Indigenous inclusion in higher education.

   Social Inclusion, *4*(1),77-79.

Ranzijn, R., Mcconnochie, K., Day, A., Nolan, W., & Wharton, M. (2008). Towards cultural

   competence: Australian Indigenous content in undergraduate psychology. *Australian

   Psychologist*, *43*(2), 132–139.

Regan, P. (2010). *Unsettling the settler within: Indian Residential Schools, truth telling, and

   reconciliation in Canada.* Vancouver, Canada: UBC Press.

Salomon, G. (2004). Does peace education make a difference in the context of an intractable

   conflict? *Journal of Peace Psychology, 10*, 257-274.

Salkind, N. J. (2010). *Encyclopedia of research design*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE

   Publications.

Sapsford, R. (2007). *Survey research*. Thousand Oaks, CA.: SAGE Publications.

Schick, C. (2000). 'By virtue of being white': Resistance in anti-racist pedagogy. *Race Ethnicity

   and Education, 3*(1), 83-101.

Short, D. (2003). Reconciliation, assimilation, and the Indigenous peoples of

   Australia. *International Political Science Review, 24*, 491-513.

Sinclair, N. (2018, May 2). *The Winter of Loss: A Discussion of What Reconciliation Looks Like

   Now*. Lecture presented in Westminster United Church, Winnipeg, Canada.

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.

Smith, A. (2011). Education and reconciliation in Northern Ireland. In J. Paulson (Ed.)

    Education and reconciliation: Exploring conflict and post-conflict situations (pp. 55-78).

    New York, NY: Continuum.

Smith, H., & Summerville, T. (2017). Four conversations we need to have about teaching and

    learning in Canadian political science. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, *50*, 263-

    279.

St. Denis, V. (2007). Aboriginal education with anti- racist education: Building alliances across

    cultural and racial identity politics. *Canadian Journal of Education, 30*, 1068-1092.

St. Denis, V. (2011). Silencing Aboriginal curricular content and perspectives through

    multiculturalism: "There are other children here". *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and

    Cultural Studies, 33*, 306-317.

St. Denis, V., & Schick, C. (2003). What makes anti-racist pedagogy in teacher education

    difficult? Three popular ideological assumptions. *Alberta Journal of Educational

    Research, 49*(1), 55-69.

Strakosch, E. (2016) Beyond colonial conceptualization: Arendt, settler colonialism, and the end

    of politics. In S. Maddison, T. Clark, & R. de Costa (Eds.), *The limits of settler colonial

    reconciliation: Non-Indigenous people and the responsibility to engage* (pp. 15-34).

    Singapore: Springer.

Taylor, J. (2017). Manitoba Premier's reconciliation ride includes PC fundraiser but no meetings

    with Indigenous people. CBC News. Retrieved from

    http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/manitoba/brian-pallister-bike-ride-fundraiser-1.4173289

Tashakkori, A., Teddlie, C., & Johnson, B. (2015). Mixed methods. In J.D. Wright (Ed.),

    International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences (pp. 618-623).

Tashakkori, A. & Teddlie, C. (2010). Research questions in mixed methods research. In A.

    Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *SAGE handbook of mixed methods in social &*

    behavioral research (pp. 275-304). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. (2015a). *Canada's residential schools:*

    Legacy. Retrieved from

    http://www.myrobust.com/websites/trcinstitution/File/Reports/Volume_5_Legacy_Englis

    h_Web.pdf

Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. (2015b). *Canada's residential schools:*

    Reconciliation. Retrieved from

    http://www.myrobust.com/websites/trcinstitution/File/Reports/Volume_6_Reconciliation

    _English_Web.pdf

Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. (2015c). Canada's residential schools: Legacy.

    Retrieved from

    http://www.myrobust.com/websites/trcinstitution/File/Reports/Volume_6_Reconciliation

    _English_Web.pdf

Tuck, E. & Yang, K.W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity,*

    Education and Society, *1*(1), 1-40.

Tupper, J. (2014). The possibilities for reconciliation through difficult dialogues: Treaty

    education as peacebuilding. *Curriculum Inquiry, 44*, 469-488.

UM Today (2015). New undergraduate medical education Indigenous health curriculum.

Retrieved from http://news.umanitoba.ca/new-undergraduate-medical-education-

Indigenous-health-curriculum/

University of Manitoba (n.d.). Academic calendar and catalog. Retrieved from:

http://crscalprod1.cc.umanitoba.ca/Catalog/ViewCatalog.aspx?pageid=viewcatalog&catal

ogid=320&chapterid=3887&topicgroupid=20793&loaduseredits=False

University of Saskatchewan (n.d.). Bachelor of Science in Nursing. Retrieved from

http://crscalprod1.cc.umanitoba.ca/Catalog/ViewCatalog.aspx?pageid=viewcatalog&catal

ogid=320&chapterid=3887&topicgroupid=20793&loaduseredits=False

University of Winnipeg (n.d.). Indigenous Course Requirement. Retrieved from

http://uwinnipeg.ca/Indigenous-course-requirement/

Veracini, L. (2010). *Settler colonialism: A theoretical overview*. New York, NY: Palgrave

Macmillan.

Veracini, L (2016). Facing the settler colonial present. In S. Maddison, T. Clark, & R. de Costa

(Eds.), *The limits of settler colonial reconciliation: Non-Indigenous people and the

responsibility to engage (pp. 35-48)*. Singapore: Springer.

Vowel, C (2016). *Indigenous writes: A guide to First Nations, Métis, and Inuit issues in Canada*.

Winnipeg, Canada: Highwater Press.

Watters, H. (2015). Truth and Reconciliation chair urges Canada to adopt UN declaration on

Indigenous Peoples. CBC News. Retrieved from: https://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/truth-

and-reconciliation-chair-urges-canada-to-adopt-un-declaration-on-indigenous-peoples-

1.3096225

Williams, W.R. & Melchiori, K.J. (2013). Class action: Experiential learning to raise awareness

    of social class privilege. In K. Case (Ed.) *Deconstructing privilege: Teaching and*

    learning as allies in the classroom (pp.169-187). New York, NY: Routledge.

Wolfe, P. (1999). *Settler colonialism: The politics and poetics of an ethnographic event.* London,

    England: Continuum International Publishing.

Zohrabi, M. (2013). Mixed method research: Instruments, validity, reliability and reporting

    findings. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 3*(2), 254-262.

Table 1

Non-Indigenous Participant Demographics—Phase 1 + Phase 2

	Phase 1		Phase 2	
	n	*%*	*n*	*%*
Gender Identity				
Male	12	24.0	2	25.0
Female	38	76.0	6	75.0
Ethnicity				
Arab	2	4.0	1	12.5
Black	3	6.0	1	12.5
Filipino	4	8.0	0	0.0
Korean	1	2.0	0	0.0
Southeast Asian	1	2.0	0	0.0
White	37	74.0	6	75.0
Other	1	2.0	0	0.0
Missing	1	0.0	0	0.0
Years of Post-Secondary Education				
Less than one	11	22.0	2	25.0
1-2	20	40.0	3	37.5
3-4	16	32.0	3	37.5
5+	3	6.0	0	0.0
Family History in Canada				
Born in Canada	37	74.0	6	75.0
Both birth parents were born in Canada	29	58.0	6	75.0
All grandparents were born in Canada	21	42.0	5	62.5
Course Discipline				
French	5	10.0	1	12.5
History	17	34.0	3	37.5
Indigenous Studies	5	10.0	1	12.5
International Development Studies	23	46.0	3	37.5

Table 2

Internal Consistency of Measures with Three or More Items

Construct (question numbers)	Timepoint 1	Timepoint 2
	α	α
Recognition of discrimination (2-5)	.748	.752
Support for government initiatives (13-19)	.753	.781

Table 3

Correlation Between Item Pairs Assessing the Same Construct

Construct (question numbers)	Timepoint 1	Timepoint 2
	r	r
Sense of benefit (6 + 7)	.658*	.658*
Sense of responsibility (10 + 11)	.662*	.506*
Ongoing bias (8 + 9)	.405*	.216

Note. *Significant at $p \leq .01$ (2-tailed)

Table 4

Inferential Statistics for Multi-Item Measures

Construct (items included)	Mean score at Timepoint 1	Mean score at Timepoint 2	t	p (2-tailed)	d
Recognition of discrimination (2-5)	4.148	4.372	3.55	.001*	**0.51**
Sense of benefit (6-7)	2.826	3.294	3.51	.001*	**0.52**
Sense of responsibility (10-11)	4.524	4.674	1.65	.104	**0.24**
Support for government initiatives (13-19)	4.538	4.742	3.60	.001*	**0.54**

Note. d values > .20 are in bold face * $p \geq .01$

Table 5

Inferential Statistics for Single-Item Measures

Question	Difference in means	t	p (2-tailed)	d
Q1: How often do you think Indigenous peoples are the subject of discrimination in Canadian society today?	0.04	0.47	.642	0.07
Q8: Most Canadians are prejudiced against Indigenous peoples, whether or not they always are conscious of it	-0.10	0.66	.513	-0.09
Q9: I am never prejudiced against Indigenous	0.15	1.07	.291	0.16

Table 6

Most Frequent Responses to Q12 "Please briefly describe how you, as an individual, can bring about reconciliation in Canada"

Code	Timepoint 1 % of Cases	Timepoint 2 % of Cases
Educate others	44.7	42.1
Educate myself	26.3	23.7
In my work/vocation	15.8	13.2
Activism/address systemic injustice	13.2	21.1
Recognize and address my own biases/privilege	13.2	18.4
Act as an ally/stand with Indigenous peoples	10.5	13.2
Treat others equally/fairly	10.5	5.3
Address stereotypes/discrimination	10.5	13.2

Appendix A: ICR Course Descriptions

CRS-2443 (3) Conflict and Development Issues in Indigenous Communities (3 hrs Lecture)

> Within the broad frameworks of international development and conflict resolution
>
> studies, this course explores the dynamics of Indigenous people globally, with special
>
> reference to the Canadian context. The course describes key elements of Indigenous
>
> cultures and world views. It examines inter- and intra-group conflict and conflict
>
> resolution processes involving Indigenous communities. Processes of marginalization and
>
> underdevelopment are presented in order to understand the Indigenous communities'
>
> social, economic, and political situations. Strategies for community development and
>
> conflict resolution will be highlighted as means to achieve transformation.

FREN-3609 (3) Decolonizing Voices: Francophone Indigenous Literature (3 hrs Lecture) This

> course examines the responses of Indigenous writers and artists (through novels, poems,
>
> plays, and movies) to colonial structures and colonial discourse in Canada. All works are
>
> read in French. Indigenous guests are invited to the class and the students are asked to
>
> attend events in the Indigenous community as part of their course requirement. Students
>
> finish the course with a good understanding of Canada's historic relationship with
>
> Indigenous Canadians and how colonialism still affects present relationships.

HIST-1007 (3) Indigenous History Since 1900: Racism, Resistance, Renewal (3 hrs Lecture)

> This course gives students the opportunity to explore themes and topics in modern
>
> Indigenous history from 1900 to the present. Course content focuses on the themes of
>
> Racism, Resistance and Renewal, and topics include: anti-Indigenous racism and
>
> inequality in education, health, and the law; histories of Indigenous agency and resistance
>
> in political movements, court action and everyday acts; and examples of efforts to define

and enact decolonization such as cultural revitalization and repatriation. The course

focuses on the history of Winnipeg and the surrounding area, while examples are also

drawn from across Canada and the United States.

IS-2020/UIC-3060/POL-2020/UIC-2020 (3) Colonization and Aboriginal Peoples (3 hrs

Lecture) This course examines the Aboriginal colonial experience, particularly in

Western Canada, and the impact colonization has had and continues to have on the

relationship between Aboriginal peoples and Canadian governments. This course

emphasizes the contemporary effects of colonization, particularly as regards identity

issues and how they play out in the urban and inner-city environment, and also processes

and strategies for Decolonization.

Appendix B: Phase 1 Survey

<u>Demographic and personal information</u>

Participant Number: _____

Full name:_____

1. What is your ethnicity? Please circle as many as applicable. Examples within brackets are not complete—other groups are possible within categories.
   a. Arab
   b. Black
   c. Chinese
   d. Filipino
   e. Indigenous (First Nations, Métis, Inuit)
   f. Japanese
   g. Korean
   h. Latin America
   i. South Asian (e.g., East Indian, Pakistani, Sri Lankan, etc.)
   j. Southeast Asian (e.g., Vietnamese, Cambodian, Laotian, Thai, etc.)
   k. White
   l. Other, please specify: _____

2. Of the above, what is your main/primary identity? _____

3. Circle <u>ALL</u> the statements that apply to you
   a. All of my grandparents were born in Canada
   b. At least one of my grandparents were born in Canada
   c. Both of my birth parents were born in Canada
   d. Only one of my birth parents was born in Canada
   e. I was born in Canada

Participant number: _____

<u>Survey questions</u>

1. How often do you think Indigenous Peoples are the subject of discrimination in Canadian society today?
   a. Always
   b. Most of the time
   c. Sometimes
   d. Rarely
   e. Never

2. How are Indigenous Peoples treated by the health care system in Canada compared to other Canadians?

   a. Treated much better
   b. Treated somewhat better
   c. Treated the same
   d. Treated somewhat worse
   e. Treated much worse

3. How are Indigenous Peoples treated by the education system in Canada compared to other Canadians?

   a. Treated much better
   b. Treated somewhat better
   c. Treated the same
   d. Treated somewhat worse
   e. Treated much worse

4. How are Indigenous Peoples treated by the criminal justice system compared to the other Canadians?

   a. Treated much better
   b. Treated somewhat better
   c. Treated the same
   d. Treated somewhat worse
   e. Treated much worse

5. How are Indigenous Peoples treated in the workplace in Canada compared to other Canadians?

   a. Treated much better
   b. Treated somewhat better
   c. Treated the same
   d. Treated somewhat worse
   e. Treated much worse

Please identify your level of agreement/disagreement with the following statements.

6. Mainstream Canadian society benefits from ongoing discrimination against Indigenous peoples
   a. Strongly agree
   b. Somewhat agree
   c. Neither agree nor disagree
   d. Somewhat disagree
   e. Strongly disagree

If you identify as Indigenous, please skip question #7 and proceed to question #8

7. I personally benefit from ongoing discrimination against Indigenous peoples (preferential treatment, etc.)
   a. Strongly agree
   b. Somewhat agree
   c. Neither agree nor disagree
   d. Somewhat disagree
   e. Strongly disagree

8. Most Canadians are prejudiced against Indigenous peoples, whether or not they always are conscious of it
   a. Strongly agree
   b. Somewhat agree
   c. Neither agree nor disagree
   d. Somewhat disagree
   e. Strongly disagree

If you identify as Indigenous, please skip question #9 and proceed to question #10

9. I am never prejudiced against Indigenous peoples in Canada
    a. Strongly agree
    b. Somewhat agree
    c. Neither agree nor disagree
    d. Somewhat disagree
    e. Strongly disagree

10. Individual Canadians have a role in bringing about reconciliation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in Canada
    a. Strongly agree
    b. Somewhat agree
    c. Neither agree nor disagree
    d. Somewhat disagree
    e. Strongly disagree

11. I personally have a role in bringing about reconciliation between Indigenous and Non-Indigenous people in Canada
    a. Strongly agree
    b. Somewhat agree
    c. Neither agree nor disagree
    d. Somewhat disagree
    e. Strongly disagree

12. If you answered "strongly agree" or "somewhat agree" to #11 please briefly describe how you, as an individual, can bring about reconciliation in Canada.

Please identify your level of support/opposition regarding the following government initiatives to address reconciliation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in Canada.

13. Increase government funding for Indigenous education to match other schools
    a. Strongly support
    b. Somewhat support
    c. Neither support nor oppose
    d. Somewhat oppose
    e. Strongly oppose

14. Government funding to reserves for clean drinking water/adequate housing
    a. Strongly support
    b. Somewhat support
    c. Neither support nor oppose
    d. Somewhat oppose
    e. Strongly oppose

15. Mandatory curriculum in all schools to teach Indigenous history and culture
    a. Strongly support
    b. Somewhat support
    c. Neither support nor oppose
    d. Somewhat oppose
    e. Strongly oppose

16. Government funding to ensure protection of Indigenous languages
    a. Strongly support
    b. Somewhat support
    c. Neither support nor oppose
    d. Somewhat oppose
    e. Strongly oppose

17. Require all post-secondary students to take at least one course on Indigenous perspectives/issues/history prior to graduation
    a. Strongly support
    b. Somewhat support
    c. Neither support nor oppose
    d. Somewhat oppose
    e. Strongly oppose

18. Provide Indigenous communities with full control over natural resources on traditional territories
    a. Strongly support
    b. Somewhat support
    c. Neither support nor oppose
    d. Somewhat oppose
    e. Strongly oppose

19. Settling all outstanding land claims, regardless of what this may cost
    a. Strongly support
    b. Somewhat support
    c. Neither support nor oppose
    d. Somewhat oppose
    e. Strongly oppose

Appendix C: Interview Schedule

Thank you for volunteering to participate in this interview. Before we begin, I want to remind you that you are free to leave at any time without any penalty and can answer all, some, or none of the following questions. I will be using a digital audio device to record this interview. Let me know when you are ready.

Before we get to any questions, I want to let you know that these questions are meant to help me better understand your experiences in this course. While I have your survey data to consider, this interview will provide richer descriptions of your experiences. Throughout this interview, I will ask you about how the course affected your views/beliefs and your emotions. If any of these questions don't apply—if you don't feel as though the course had an effect in a certain area—just say so and we can move on to another question.

1. Let's begin by discussing your general experiences in this course.
    a. In your own words, please describe the content of the course.
    b. Of these topics, what would you say is the most important thing that you learned in this class?
        i. Why do you believe this is important?

2. Next, I want to discuss your attitudes regarding certain course-related topics. These questions are based on the idea that our attitudes are made up of different parts, including our views/beliefs and our emotions/feelings. I have a few questions that will address these aspects of attitude as they relate to your experience in this course. I will give you a few prompts and I want you to describe your experience in this course:

    a. Describe how, if at all, this course affected your view/beliefs regarding the experiences of Indigenous people in Canada today.
        i. Describe the topics or ideas from your course that addressed these experiences.

    b. Related to this idea, there was a section of the survey that you completed which addressed the treatment of Indigenous people in various intuitions, including health care, education, the criminal justice system and the work place. How, if at all, did this course affect your views/beliefs of the treatment of Indigenous people within these systems?

        i. Describe the topics or ideas from your course that addressed these experiences.

    c. Describe how this course made you *feel* regarding the experiences of Indigenous people in Canada today. In other words, what emotions did these topics create for you?
        i. Describe the specific topics or ideas from your course that brought about these emotions for you.

d. The next few questions will ask you to consider how this course affected your attitudes regarding your relationship to ongoing discrimination against Indigenous Peoples.

    i. How, if at all, did this course affect your view/beliefs about your relationship to the discrimination facing Indigenous Peoples in Canada?

    ii. Describe the specific topics or ideas from your course that presented these ideas.

    iii. Within this idea, there are two key topics that I want to explore further.

        1. The first is the idea of "complicity". This idea relates to a sense guilt within systems of injustice.

            a. Were there any ways in which this course made you feel as if you were responsible for or benefitting from ongoing discrimination against Indigenous people in Canada? If so, please describe how the course supported this idea.

            b. Please describe your emotional reaction to this content. How did it make you feel?

        2. The second idea that I wanted to address in this area is "responsibility". This refers to your sense of duty in contributing to the promotion of reconciliation in Canada.

            a. Were there any ways in which this course made you feel as if you have a personal role in the work of improving the relationship between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in Canada? If so, please describe how the course supported this idea.

            b. Please describe your emotional reaction to this content. How did it make you feel?

3. The last major section of the survey that you completed examined your level of support for various government initiatives. I want to learn more about how this course affected your attitudes in this area.

    a. In general terms, how, if at all, did this course affect your views/beliefs regarding government initiatives in relation to the work of reconciliation?

    b. Describe the specific course content or ideas that addressed this idea

    c. Here's a list of the government initiatives that were part of your survey. In light of your experiences in this course, are there any specific initiatives from this list for which you feel your level of support has changed? If so, explain how this course has changed your view.

4. All of the things that we have discussed so far relate to your attitudes towards issues of reconciliation. I want to take a few moments to consider the relationship between these attitudes and your future actions.

    a. How, if at all, do you see these experiences – the things that you've learned and the emotions you've felt– affecting the way that you live your life outside of this course?

5. Would you like to add anything about your experience in this course that we haven't already covered in the interview?

That concludes our interview. Thank you for your time.

Appendix D: Consent Form

Faculty of Education

230 Education Building

University of Manitoba

Winnipeg, Manitoba

Canada R3T 2N2

Telephone (204) 474-9014

Research Project Title: Education for Reconciliation: The Effects of an Indigenous Course Requirement on Non-Indigenous Students' Attitudes on Reconciliation

Researcher:
Jeremy Siemens
umsieme4@myumanitoba.ca

Research Supervisor:
Dr. Yatta Kanu

yatta.kanu@umanitoba.ca

This consent form, a copy of which will be left with you for your records and reference, is only part of the process of informed consent. It should give you the basic idea of what the research is about and what your participation will involve. If you would like more detail about something mentioned here, or information not included here, you should feel free to ask. Please take the time to read this carefully and to understand any accompanying information.

Purpose of Research: This project is led by Jeremy Siemens, a Master's student in Education at the University in Manitoba. The purpose of this study is to better understand the effect of select Indigenous Course Requirement (ICR) courses on non-Indigenous students' attitudes towards reconciliation.

Procedures and Instruments:

The study will include two phases. For Phase 1, participants will complete a 19-question survey. This survey will take about 10 minutes to complete. This survey will assess their attitudes on issues towards reconciliation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in Canada.

Students will self-complete this survey at two timepoints: Before their ICR course and after their ICR course.

Students identities will not be attached to their responses and, as outlined below, steps will be taken to ensure the confidentiality of the information provided.

For Phase 2 of the study, a small number of participants will be contacted to complete an in-depth interview. Participants will be selected based on how their data from Phase 1 compares to the larger trends in the data. This interview will last 40-60 minutes in length and will be at a time and location that is convenient to the participant.

The interview will include questions regarding the student's experiences in the ICR course, as it relates to their attitudes towards reconciliation. A copy of the interview script will be provided one week before scheduled interview.

Benefits/Risks: Potential benefits include an increased understanding of reconciliation through personal reflection. As participants reflect on their attitudes towards reconciliation, it may prepare them for deeper engagement in the work of reconciliation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples.

Potential risks of this study do not exceed those encountered in the everyday lives of the participants and can be classified as minimal risk. As students who are studying related content, the interview questions cover topics that are regularly addressed in their studies.

However, given the wide range of topics associated with reconciliation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in Canada, there remains a potential risk of emotional harm. For instance, discussion of systemic injustice and colonization can address matters of emotional, physical, and spiritual abuse. Discussing these topics could elicit emotional distress in participants. In order to address this potential risk, a list of counseling services.

Privacy/Anonymity: Only the Researcher, research assistant, and faculty advisor (Dr. Yatta Kanu) will have access to participant's personal information and data. Personal information (names, e-mail correspondence, etc.) will be stored in a password-protected spreadsheet that is separate from the research data. This will decrease the likelihood of anyone associating the personal information with the research data. While working with the data, the Researcher will use a coding system in place of personal information. The key to these codes will be kept in a locked filing cabinet to which only the Researcher and his faculty advisor (Dr. Yatta Kanu) have access.

Participants will be asked if they are willing to be contacted for future studies. If participants indicate that they are open to this, their information will be stored in another spreadsheet that is stored apart from all other data.

Remuneration: Participants in Phase 1 will be entered into a draw for a $200 gift card to The University of Winnipeg Bookstore. This draw will take place following Phase 1 of data collection.

Participants in Phase 2 will be given a $10 gift card to a local coffeeshop (EX: Starbucks, Thom Bargen Coffee and Tea, etc.).

Bus fare will also be provided for participants who need transportation to the interview.

Withdrawal/Data Review: Participation in this study is voluntary and participants may leave the study at any point. Additionally, participants are free to answer some, all or none of the questions

provided. If a participant leaves the study, all information and data related to that participant will be destroyed immediately, unless the participant voluntarily advises otherwise.

Participants may withdraw from the study by contacting the Researcher at any stage of the study.

Following the completion of Phase 2, all participants will receive a copy of the debriefing e-mail. This message will provide a detailed description of the study and its purposes.

Participants in both Phase 1 and Phase 2 will also be given the opportunity to read a summary of the research findings.

Dissemination: This data will be used as part of my Master's thesis which will be publically defended. Additionally, this work may inform future research projects, presentations and publications. In such cases, the data would be shared with academic, professional and public audiences. In all cases, the anonymity and confidentiality of participants would be maintained.

Participants who wish to receive a summary of research findings can indicate this request below. Participants will receive a digital copy of this summary by January 1, 2019.

Data destruction: All confidential material and data will be kept for five years following the completion of the study. The spreadsheet containing the code that links personal information to individual responses will be destroyed by January, 2023. This will include deleting all electronic files and digital recordings.

The researcher also requests to retain your contact information for future studies. If you agree to this, you are under no obligation to participate in future studies. If the researcher contacts you for a future study, he will provide you with another consent form regarding that study. You are free to decline to participate if contacted for future studies.

Consent: Your signature on this form indicates that you have understood to your satisfaction the information regarding participation in the research project and agree to participate as a subject. In no way does this waive your legal rights nor release the researchers, sponsors, or involved institutions from their legal and professional responsibilities. You are free to withdraw from the study at any time, and /or refrain from answering any questions you prefer to omit, without prejudice or consequence. Your continued participation should be as informed as your initial consent, so you should feel free to ask for clarification or new information throughout your participation. The University of Manitoba may look at your research records to see that the research is being done in a safe and proper way. This research has been approved by the Education/Nursing Research Ethics Board (ENREB) If you have any concerns or complaints about this project, you may contact any of the above-named persons or the Human Ethics Coordinator at 204-474-7122 or humanethics@umanitoba.ca.

A copy of this consent form will be given to you to keep for your records and reference.

Thank you.

Mark the following with an "X" where appropriate:

_____ If I participate in Phase 2, I would like to receive a copy the initial analysis of my data via e-mail

_____ I would like to receive a summary of the research findings via e-mail

_____ The Researcher may contact me for future studies

By signing the line below, you indicate that you freely agree to participate in this study.

Participant's Signature _____ Date _____

Participant's name: _____

Participant's e-mail address _____

Participant's phone number_____

Appendix E: Frequencies of Responses for Non-Indigenous Participants

Question	Timepoint 1		Timepoint 2	
	n	*%*	*n*	*%*
Q1: How often do you think Indigenous peoples are the subject of discrimination in Canadian society today?				
Always	11	22.0	15	30.0
Often	34	68.0	28	56.0
Sometimes	5	10.0	7	14.0
Rarely	0	0.0	0	0.0
Never	0	0.0	0	0.0
Q2: How are Indigenous peoples treated by the health care system in Canada compared to other Canadians?				
Treated much better	0	0.0	0	0.0
Treated somewhat better	1	2.0	0	0.0
Treated the same	8	16.0	2	4.0
Treated somewhat worse	27	54.0	25	50.0
Treated much worse	13	26.0	23	46.0
Missing	1	2.0	0	0.0
Q3: How are Indigenous peoples treated by the education system in Canada compared to other Canadians?				
Treated much better	0	0.0	0	0.0
Treated somewhat better	1	2.0	1	2.0
Treated the same	9	18.0	4	8.0
Treated somewhat worse	28	56.0	25	50.0
Treated much worse	11	22.0	20	40.0
Missing	1	2.0	0	0.0
Q4: How are Indigenous peoples treated by the criminal system in Canada compared to other Canadians?				
Treated much better	0	0.0	0	0.0
Treated somewhat better	0	0.0	0	0.0
Treated the same	4	8.0	0	0.0
Treated somewhat worse	13	26.0	13	26.0
Treated much worse	33	66.0	37	74.0
Missing	0	0.0	0	0.0
Q5: How are Indigenous peoples treated in the workplace in Canada compared to other Canadians?				
Treated much better	0	0.0	0	0.0
Treated somewhat better	0	0.0	0	0.0
Treated the same	14	28.0	10	20.0
Treated somewhat worse	23	46.0	29	58.0
Treated much worse	12	24.0	11	22.0

Missing	1	2.0	0	0.0

Q6: Mainstream Canadian society benefits from ongoing discrimination against Indigenous peoples

Strongly agree	6	12.0	16	32.0
Somewhat agree	16	32.0	16	32.0
Neither agree nor disagree	9	18.0	8	16.0
Somewhat disagree	6	12.0	2	4.0
Strongly disagree	12	24.0	8	16.0
Missing	1	2.0	0	0.0

Q7: I personally benefit from ongoing discrimination against Indigenous peoples (preferential treatment, etc.)

Strongly agree	5	10.0	10	20.0
Somewhat agree	13	26.0	12	24.0
Neither agree nor disagree	7	14.0	8	16.0
Somewhat disagree	6	12.0	4	8.0
Strongly disagree	16	32.0	14	28.0
Missing	3	6.0	2	4.0

Q8: Most Canadians are prejudiced against Indigenous peoples, whether or not they always are conscious of it

Strongly agree	19	38.0	18	36.0
Somewhat agree	23	46.0	23	46.0
Neither agree nor disagree	4	8.0	2	4.0
Somewhat disagree	3	6.0	6	12.0
Strongly disagree	1	2.0	1	2.0
Missing	0	0.0	0	0.0

Q9: I am never prejudiced against Indigenous

Strongly agree	9	18.0	10	20.0
Somewhat agree	13	26.0	13	26.0
Neither agree nor disagree	12	24.0	8	16.0
Somewhat disagree	10	20.0	14	28.0
Strongly disagree	3	6.0	4	8.0
Missing	3	6.0	1	2.0

Q10: Individual Canadians have a role in bringing about reconciliation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in Canada

Strongly agree	35	70.0	42	84.0
Somewhat agree	13	26.0	7	14.0
Neither agree nor disagree	1	2.0	1	2.0
Somewhat disagree	1	2.0	0	0.0
Strongly disagree	0	0.0	0	0.0
Missing	0	0.0	0	0.0

Q11: I personally have a role in bringing about reconciliation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in Canada

Strongly agree	25	50.0	33	66.0
Somewhat agree	20	40.0	11	22.0
Neither agree nor disagree	4	8.0	4	8.0
Somewhat disagree	1	2.0	0	0.0
Strongly disagree	0	0.0	1	2.0
Missing	0	0.0	1	2.0

"Acknowledge your level of support for the following government initiatives"

Q13: Increase government funding for Indigenous education to match other schools

Strongly support	38	76.0	46	92.0
Somewhat support	11	22.0	2	4.0
Neither support nor oppose	1	2.0	2	4.0
Somewhat oppose	0	0.0	0	0.0
Strongly oppose	0	0.0	0	0.0
Missing	0	0.0	0	0.0

Q14: Government funding to reserves for clean drinking water/adequate housing

Strongly support	48	96.0	50	100.0
Somewhat support	2	4.0	0	0.0
Neither support nor oppose	0	0.0	0	0.0
Somewhat oppose	0	0.0	0	0.0
Strongly oppose	0	0.0	0	0.0
Missing	0	0.0	0	0.0

Q15: Mandatory curriculum in all schools to teach Indigenous history and culture

Strongly support	34	68.0	44	88.0
Somewhat support	14	28.0	3	6.0
Neither support nor oppose	0	0.0	1	2.0
Somewhat oppose	0	0.0	1	2.0
Strongly oppose	0	0.0	1	2.0
Missing	2	4.0	0	0.0

Q16: Government funding to ensure protection of Indigenous languages

Strongly support	28	56.0	41	82.0
Somewhat support	15	30.0	7	14.0
Neither support nor oppose	5	10.0	2	4.0
Somewhat oppose	0	0.0	0	0.0
Strongly oppose	0	0.0	0	0.0
Missing	2	4.0	0	0.0

Q17: Require all post-secondary students to take at least one
course on Indigenous perspectives/issues prior to graduation

Strongly support	30	60.0	41	82.0
Somewhat support	14	28.0	6	12.0
Neither support nor oppose	2	4.0	1	2.0
Somewhat oppose	2	4.0	1	2.0
Strongly oppose	1	2.0	1	2.0
Missing	1	2.0	0	0.0

Q18: Provide Indigenous communities will full control over
natural resources on traditional territories

Strongly support	26	52.0	33	66.0
Somewhat support	14	28.0	12	24.0
Neither support nor oppose	6	12.0	2	4.0
Somewhat oppose	2	4.0	1	2.0
Strongly oppose	1	2.0	2	4.0
Missing	1	2.0	0	0.0

Q19: Settle all outstanding land claims, regardless of cost

Strongly support	20	40.0	33	66.0
Somewhat support	17	34.0	11	22.0
Neither support nor oppose	8	16.0	4	8.0
Somewhat oppose	3	6.0	2	4.0
Strongly oppose	0	0.0	0	0.0
Missing	2	4.0	0	0.0