

Kari McNabb

200464686

October 30,2021

### Midterm: Question 1

Typification/Identity typing is the simple and memorable characteristics of a person, and thus creates groups out of these characteristics (Dyer). Identity typing is the harmless version of stereotyping and does not vandalize the groups made out of the set characteristics but instead is just giving a name to different personalities/attributes. Examples of this could be; a parent, boss, lover, and worker (Dyer). Another set of typification could be the 16 personalities (ENTP, ISFJ, and more) and this is also through the ideologies of taking attributes and giving names to such aspects of a person. In addition to the 16 personalities there is the types of people that through the use of social media we have come across; such as the “mom” friend or the “crazy” friend. The whole meaning of identity typing is to be able to give groups names without causing inconveniences to them like how stereotyping and othering has.

Stereotyping, however, is the negative grouping of people that excludes some of the public who are abnormal/unacceptable in society from the “normal” groups (Dyer). Stereotyping is surrounded by worldviews and the representation of people (Dyer). Stereotyping can be seen just as much as identity typing throughout the media/world with examples such as; the jock or sporty dude, a dumb cheerleader, smart people that are unattractive. These stereotypes are seen a lot in the movie area of social media. There is a huge difference between stereotyping and identity typing though they do seem quite similar. The difference between the two is that one causes harm while the other does not, and through examples of both we can see that the groups that stereotypes make are quite harmful to many people who don't fit into the said categories and to the people who do fit the characteristics. The difference in an identity type and a stereotype can

also be how these groups are portrayed; many if not most stereotypes are not depicted in the best of lights throughout media while an identity type is one that is just grouping people into a faction that shares simple characteristics (parents for example, their characteristic would be having children). Many people are affected by stereotyping; I myself being one of these people as someone who is bisexual, there are lots of stereotypes surrounding sexuality (being unfaithful or unable to remain monogynous, as well as being seen as not actually bisexual whilst in a relationship). This stereotyping can cause harmful things to happen such as bullying or the suppressing of one's identity, as well as stereotyping in general undermining any “acceptable” group.

Othering is another harmful type of grouping; and is the securing of one's own identity or privilege with the negation of an unequal, and is the self-affirmation that depends on being different than another group (Dyer). The dimensions of othering can be disability, race, ethnicity, religion, sex, social class, and sexual orientation (Dyer). Stereotyping of any sort can lead to othering. This can be seen with certain groups that are stereotyped as being odd, and these said groups being ostracized in society or being “cast off” (Kristeva). This process of being cast off is also abjection, which disturbs conventional identity as well as cultural concepts, is also used to explain the behaviors of misogyny, homophobia, and genocide (Kristeva). The concept of othering primarily surrounds the thought of “Us vs. Them” which influences people's perceptions of others and associates negative characteristics (Dyer). Othering can also lead to the persecution of a marginalized group following the whole “Us vs. Them” ideology (Dyer). Edward Saids view of orientalism can also be seen as a part of othering. The concept of orientalism is the promotion of western superiority at the expense of other people, particularly eastern practices (Said). Saids concept of orientalism can also be described as a system of ideological fiction, and a matter of

power (Storey 2009). Using Said's concept of orientalism, we can see how similar it is to othering with both raising a group above others based on characteristics, and excluding or casting off others who do not fit the description of the higher placed group.

With the analysis of identity types/typification, stereotyping, othering and orientalism we can see how all four are connected. Identity types and stereotyping are very closely related, however, are noticeably different with identity typing not being harmful and stereotyping being incredibly harmful. Othering and stereotyping are very closely related and unlike identity typing, both are very destructive to the groups that are being stereotyped/othered. Lastly, orientalism ties into othering with its exclusion of eastern practices and its endorsement of western superiority. Concluding this analysis, we can see what Dyer means by identity typing and the difference between stereotyping and an identity type as well how stereotyping can lead to othering with implications to orientalism.

#### Midterm Question 2:

Public memory is consistently referred to as a collective memory and this holds true throughout Stanley's article. The Grand Narrative that Stanley mentions is interlineated with public memory as they both are quite close in definition (Stanley 2002). The public memory of Canada is the widely known/common sense representations that are circulated in the world (for example, Canada really enjoying hockey, beer, and maple syrup) (Stanley 2002). There can be many variations of public memory but all of them share certain features (Stanley 2002). Public memory/grand narrative tends to often not be good history which can result in a failed attempt to represent distinct events in the history of Canada, which could be the fixation on European history instead of First Nation history (Stanley 2002). English Canadian narratives tend to exclude others as well such as marginalizing First Nations, infantilizing Quebec, and excluding African-

Americans and Asians (Stanley 2002). What Stanley means with the public memory of Canada is that though this country is seen as such a multi-cultural/diverse country, the history and narrative of the country does not include many of those who live in Canada. The narrative is mainly focusing on the white culture of the country instead of including the people who were here before Europeans and the other cultures that immigrated. Stanley also talks about the connection of students and the history curriculum. The history curriculum is a required class in school and affects students of all ethnicities/culture, with the relationship between the students and curriculum being vastly different for everyone (Stanley 2002). For some students, Canada is the best country to them while to some it is an alien place that is far removed from their daily life (Stanley 2002). This relationship that Stanley references is one that is different and unique to everyone that goes through school, and can be good or bad. The problem with the history curriculum and grand narrative is that it defines people as Canadian or non-Canadian, and does not apply the other perspectives in Canada's history even if important.

With reading the article and listening the discussion of Grand Narrative, I think that Stanley is quite right in how European culture is really the only one represented in the history curriculum. While there is more representation now since this article was written in 2002 and it is now 2021, the depiction of other cultures/ethnicities is still very low, even with the teachers having more resources (Stanley 2002). Stanley's understanding of the topic gave great insight to how students are affected by the teaching of history in school, and while many think it is a minor class that is required, it can be detrimental to the way a student perceives their own culture and the way Canadian schools are run. Examples of this is how many African-Canadian students disengaged from school because of their lack of representation in history. One student said "school is about and for white people" (Stanley 2002), and that has held true. In the high-school I went to which

is very south eastern Saskatchewan, we did not have many people of different cultures and were a mainly white school and the history I was taught focused a lot on European grand narrative with very little representation of other cultures. That and the discussion of grand narrative have helped shape my perspective to be that schools and the history curriculum need to have more diverse resources and to teach more diversely instead of mainly focusing on the European side of history.

Stanley's take on grand narrative compared to Granastein's is completely different but center around the same thing which is looking at history and Canada's grand narrative. While Stanley's is about the nation being constantly under revision and changing, Granastein's is more about bringing the past to the future and is very traditional (The Imagined Canadian). The argument behind Granastein's narrative is that it's a consensus view that stresses the commonalities; it also emphasizes progress and individual achievements (The Imagined Canadian). However, Stanley's argument is a particularist view and focuses on diversity, as well as emphasizing power and injustice (The Imagined Canadian). Looking at both these views many can see just how different they are; one being very traditional and the other being more modern but both are important to look at. With that though I will have to choose Stanley's theory and argument instead of Granastein's, while both are good and centered around the same thing Stanley's is just more with the time of 2021 and the way of thinking many in this generation has. It's important to be diverse and not just talk about the past but to actively teach about it from different perspectives.