

Citizenship Education and Current Educational Reform

Alan M. Sears

Andrew S. Hughes

university of new brunswick

This article examines the character of citizenship education in Canada as it is represented in the official policy documents of the provinces and territories, as opposed to the actual classroom practice of the curriculum-in-use. We consider policies in light of a typology of citizenship ranging from elitist to activist, and identify common as well as particular features of citizenship education. We find that the official curriculum of educational policy inclines towards an activist conception of citizenship.

Cet article compare la formation en civisme au Canada, telle qu'elle se dégage des documents de politiques officielles des provinces et des territoires, aux cours de civisme dispensés dans les classes elles-mêmes. Les auteurs analysent les politiques à l'aide d'une typologie du civisme allant de l'élitisme à l'activisme et identifient les caractéristiques communes et distinctes de la formation en civisme. Selon les auteurs, les programmes officiels en la matière tendent plutôt vers une conception activiste du civisme.

Citizenship education has been viewed historically as one of the principal obligations of public schooling. Indeed, Conley (1989) claims that public education's mandate "is to train citizens, in the widest sense of the term" (p. 134). This broad view of citizenship has typically been concerned with the development of a sense of identity, "a feeling of being one-people different from all other people" (McLeod, 1989, p. 6): a sort of ersatz unity. It has also involved a knowledge of rights and obligations as well as a commitment to the ideals of Canadian democracy (Hughes, 1994). In the current round of educational reform, however, the emphasis is on "perceived economic priorities" and "little has been said about citizenship" (Osborne, 1992, p. 375) except, perhaps, that good citizens pay their own way, contribute to the nation's economic well-being, and ensure success in the international marketplace. This is hardly citizenship "in the widest sense of the term," as Conley calls for: it is citizenship down-graded and down-sized, if not totally dismissed. At the same time, curiously, curriculum policy documents of the provinces and territories display an unparalleled interest in citizenship education.

In this article we review current conceptions of citizenship and citizenship education in Canada as found in official educational policy in the provinces and territories. We interpret these policies—expressions of the intended purposes and practices—in light of a typology of citizenship education. Our focus is on the

intended curriculum, keeping in mind the possible disparity between what is intended and the actual curriculum-in-use.

PROCEDURES

During the first phase of our research, we solicited documents about citizenship education from all the provinces and territories. We suggested that materials might include (but should not be limited to) policy documents, curriculum guides, background or discussion papers, and lists of approved resources. All jurisdictions except Quebec and francophone New Brunswick sent documents. Some ministries sent only overall policy documents, some included curriculum documents, and others added detailed course descriptions and student texts.

As a first step in analyzing the documents, we prepared a draft summary of citizenship education for each jurisdiction based on the materials received. We returned each draft to the Ministry involved, requesting that Ministry representatives review the summary, correct any errors of fact, and point out where important points might have been missed. We also invited them to send any additional material that might help us develop a more accurate picture of citizenship education in their jurisdiction. The representatives responded with suggested changes and in several cases sent additional materials. We then analyzed these materials using a set of pre-determined questions (Sears & Hughes, 1994, pp. 2–3). The work we report here centres on the conceptions of citizenship and citizenship education that form the basis of contemporary curriculum policy in anglophone Canada.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

In North America the school's role in educating for citizenship has been exercised primarily through the subjects of the social studies: at first history and geography, later sociology, political science, and economics. Tomkins (1983) points out that "the goal of 'citizenship' probably comes closer than any other to identifying the purpose that Canadians have usually believed the social studies should serve, even though they might not agree on what a 'good' citizen (or a good Canadian) is" (p. 15). A more recent study confirmed that citizenship remains the primary focus of social studies (Masemann, 1987).

Although educating for citizenship is central to social studies, Marker and Mehlinger (1992) point out that "the apparent consensus on behalf of citizenship education is almost meaningless. Behind that totem to which nearly all social studies researchers pay homage lies continuous and rancorous debate about the purposes of social studies" (p. 832). This debate continues, in part at least, because citizenship, as it is used in the field, is a contested concept.

The idea of essentially contested concepts, developed by Gallie (1964), is rooted in the premise that there are some "concepts the proper use of which

inevitably involves endless disputes about their proper uses" (p. 158). These disputes arise not because the people involved are arguing about different concepts to which they have mistakenly given the same name, but because the internal complexity of the concept makes for disputes which "are perfectly genuine: which, although not resolvable by argument of any kind, are nevertheless sustained by perfectly respectable arguments and evidence" (p. 158). Most writers hold a concept of citizenship that contains the same elements, "knowledge, skills, values, and participation" (Marker & Mehlinger, 1992, p. 835), but there is wide disagreement about the role, nature, and relative importance of each element.

Disputes about citizenship arise not only because it is an internally complex concept, but also because it is a normative one. Normative concepts often fail to command a universally shared definition because of their complexity and because they "describe from a moral point of view" (Connolly, 1974, p. 24). Analyses generally reveal variations in the meaning of the concept through time and across cultures, and frequently conclude that limitations of current conceptions make them unacceptable as ideals for modern society. The analyses are variously socio-historical (Heater, 1990; Riesenber, 1992), political and philosophical (Barber, 1984; Ichilov, 1990; Kymlicka, 1989), and feminist (Pateman, 1970; Phillips, 1993). Those who speak of educating for citizenship are concerned not so much with the narrow legal definition of citizenship as with some normative sense of good citizenship (Hughes, 1994).

Woyach (1991) argues that different conceptions of democratic citizenship exist along "a complex continuum of opinion" ranging from "elitist" to "populist" (pp. 46–47). Similarly, Ichilov (1990) writes that "citizenship orientations can be arranged along a continuum from a narrow to a broad definition of the citizen role" (pp. 20–21). These different views of the role of a citizen have developed out of longstanding philosophical traditions (Barber, 1992; Carnoy, 1984; Heater, 1990; Kymlicka, 1989; Pratte, 1988; Resnick, 1990; Riesenber, 1992; Woyach, 1991).

Although in modern democratic states proponents of these conceptions of citizenship would agree that full citizenship ought to be extended to almost all native-born or naturalized adults, they differ significantly in their view of the nature of citizenship, the degree to which the citizen ought to participate in the affairs of state, and the conditions necessary to make that participation possible. Advocates of more elitist conceptions are doubtful about the average citizen's capacity to understand and competently judge public issues. Consequently, they regard politics as a realm for well-educated "experts" and would accord ordinary citizens merely the opportunity to choose the experts through duly constituted elections. Activists reject this view of citizenship and are firmly committed to wide public participation in the political process. They argue that "individual citizens are the best judges of their own interests" (Woyach, 1991, p. 48) and that participation itself will enhance understanding of the common interest

(Pateman, 1970). Between the extremes of elitism and radical activism lies a variety of eclectic possibilities.

Misunderstandings often arise in discussions of citizenship education because the same language means different things to different people. Phrases such as “the educated citizen,” or “responsible citizenship,” often touted as the desired outcomes of citizenship education, operate as educational slogans in that they are “systematically ambiguous” (Komisar & McClellan, 1961, p. 200) and often represent particular political and social interests (Popkewitz, 1980). Komisar and McClellan (1961) describe such slogans as “meaningless” (p. 200) until they are interpreted, that is, until someone delimits or restricts their “application to some limited set of proposals within the larger amorphous class” (p. 201).

MODELS OF CITIZENSHIP AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Different understandings of the nature of good citizenship have given rise to different conceptions of citizenship education. For example, Barr, Barth, and Shermis (1978) outline three models of citizenship education and Dynneson and Gross (1991) propose 12. The models pay little attention to the citizenship-citizenship education connection, so, drawing on Resnick’s (1990) work on the state, we propose for this study a typology comprising four conceptions of citizenship (see Table 1) and citizenship education (see Table 2). Each conception illustrates a view of what constitutes good citizenship and the corresponding knowledge, values, and skills students must learn to be good citizens. We do not claim that the conceptions we describe represent the totality of belief and practice in citizenship education, but propose them as ideal types to which actual approaches can be compared (Abrams, 1982). We use the typology to situate current conceptions of citizenship and citizenship education in public education in English-speaking Canada within the range of possibilities.

FINDINGS

Implicit and Explicit Citizenship Education

There is a considerable range in how explicitly notions of citizenship and citizenship education are treated. In Nova Scotia, for example, the concept of “citizen” is seldom addressed explicitly in the documentation. This is not to say that there is no concern for educational ideas usually linked to notions of citizenship, but simply that citizenship is not used explicitly in the curriculum as an organizing theme. Although concern for citizenship development is apparent, it tends to be lumped together with other interests; for example, the curriculum guide for the Grade 12 Global History course (Nova Scotia Department of Education, 1993) aims at assisting students to “function effectively outside the school as *individuals, citizens, workers and life-long learners*” (p. 20; emphasis added).

TABLE 1
Conceptions of Citizenship

<i>Aspect of citizenship</i>	<i>Conception A</i>	<i>Conception B</i>	<i>Conception C</i>	<i>Conception D</i>
Sovereignty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> resides in parliament. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> resides in the people. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> resides with the peoples of the earth. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> resides in the people.
Government	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> made up of elected people with appropriate background and training. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> liberal democracy made up of representatives elected from and by the people. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> liberal democratic national governments responsive to individuals and willing to act with other governments and organizations to solve global issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> made up of free and equal citizens (equality is emphasized in three areas — before the law, in the opportunity and ability to participate, and in relative access to material resources) who exercise power in more direct ways than voting every 4 years.
Citizens	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> are loyal to the national state and its institutions. have a common body of knowledge about the history and political structures of the country. are part of a common national culture and set of traditions. obey the law. inform themselves about the positions of the various political parties. vote. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> are committed to the principles of liberal democracy (e.g., individual rights, property rights, wide participation of individuals). actively participate in community and national affairs. are committed to the “public good.” use rational processes as a way to inform themselves about public issues and to get involved in resolving them, thereby reforming society. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> are citizens of individual nations but with a sense of commitment and loyalty to the whole world that transcends national self-interest. are informed about global issues and committed to acting to solve them in order to improve life for all on the earth while preserving the environment. have a deep cross cultural awareness and respect for alternative world views. are able to deal creatively and positively with pluralism, interdependence, and change. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> are committed to participating in free and equal discourse where all voices are heard and power is relatively equally distributed. are knowledgeable about the ways in which institutions and structures privilege some people and groups while discriminating against others and are committed to and skilled at challenging them. are open to multiple understandings of national citizenship (e.g., it is possible to consider oneself a citizen of an Aboriginal nation and Canada). are committed to citizen participation in the “public” sphere of politics and in the “private” sphere of community, home, and family.

TABLE 2
Conceptions of Citizenship Education

<i>Aspect of citizenship education</i>	<i>Conception A</i>	<i>Conception B</i>	<i>Conception C</i>	<i>Conception D</i>
Knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> students should be taught a common body of knowledge about the history and political structures of the nation. political/military history is emphasized and is presented as a narrative of continuous progress. political institutions are presented as operating in a lock-step fashion (e.g., how a bill is passed). teaching styles and techniques may vary but are focused on students arriving at common answers on matters of fact and/or value. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> students learn the knowledge necessary to become involved in resolving public issues. relevant knowledge is drawn from history, the social sciences, literature, the humanities, journalism, and the experience of teachers and students. liberal democratic institutions and structures are presented as the best theoretical form of social organization but as flawed in practice. teaching styles and techniques may vary but are focused on students arriving at well grounded alternative possibilities for resolving social public issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> students should develop a knowledge of world systems (e.g., economic, environmental, political), human values, global issues, and world issues. global topics and issues should show up across the curriculum and the knowledge and experience of individuals with different (particularly non-western) backgrounds is regarded as important. students are taught to imagine and plan for alternative futures. teaching and learning are conceived of in non-traditional ways. Teachers and students are co-learners in finding out about and solving global issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> students should be taught the ways in which institutions and structures support certain oppressive forms of social organization (e.g., capitalism and patriarchy). curricula and school structures have to be examined to find the ways in which they have discriminated against certain groups. New curricula should actively challenge systemic discrimination (e.g., anti-racist education).
Values	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> students are taught a particular set of national values and norms (e.g., that current political structures are the best ones possible). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> students are encouraged to explore questions of value, particularly as they relate to public issues; to recognize and to respect different value positions; and to articulate, support, and act on their own value position. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a commitment to environmental responsibility, social justice, pluralism, and anti-racism are key values that students should develop, as is the view that individual choice and action has global consequences. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> students should develop a commitment to the equal participation of all individuals and groups in society as well as a commitment to participate on that basis and to confront any manifestations of privilege and inequality.
Skills/ Participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> informed voting is presented as the general level of participation in government by the average citizen; students therefore need information-gathering skills to allow them to vote in an informed manner. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> active participation in public affairs is required of each citizen; therefore, students need to learn critical reflective processes (e.g., identify a problem, collect and analyze information, explore alternatives, take action) and develop skills that will help them participate effectively. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> students need to develop critical/reflective problem-solving skills (see Conception B) and cross-cultural skills so that they can participate with a wide variety of people in making the world more just and human activity more environmentally sustainable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> students have to develop the skills to recognize oppressive and unequal social structures, to discover their points of contradiction and weakness, and to act to challenge and change them. Opportunity should be provided to take such action.

In British Columbia, on the other hand, the curriculum documents are structured so as to give very explicit and significant attention to the notion of “citizenship.” An important feature of every Curriculum Assessment Framework we examined is a section explicitly devoted to the relationship between that particular course and “citizenship.” For example, one can read of “dance and the educated citizen,” “science and the educated citizen,” “social science and the educated citizen,” and “technology and the educated citizen.” We understand that this explicit treatment is not a feature of curricula now under development.

Although the other jurisdictions range somewhere between these two provinces in the specific attention paid to citizenship as a central concept for public education, the tendency is toward explicit rather than implicit consideration of matters of citizenship.

The Common Components of Citizenship Education

All the jurisdictions consider knowledge, skills, and dispositions to be the three components of citizenship education. They do not always use the same language. One document (Newfoundland and Labrador Department of Education, 1993), for example, refers to understandings, dispositions, and competencies, whereas another (Northwest Territories Department of Education, 1978) uses the phrase “civic virtues” (p. 8) to capture the same ideas. What is interesting is the relative attention given to the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of citizenship education.

Although research indicates that conceptions of citizenship and citizenship education in Canada in the past have been consistent with those outlined in Conception A (Sears, 1994), there has been movement along the continuum toward the more activist conceptions, at least in terms of official policy and mandated curricula. We found that the adjectives used to describe citizens included “informed” and “responsible,” which could be consistent with more conservative and passive notions of citizenship, but also included far more activist terms such as: “adaptive, enterprising, [and] inventive” (Newfoundland and Labrador Department of Education, 1993, p. 3); “effective” (Manitoba Education, 1985, p. 11); and “self-motivated, self-directed problem solvers” (Alberta Education, 1989, p. 1).

Masemann (1987) found that “the main ideology of citizenship education is the importance of citizen action and participation” (p. 5). From coast to coast this emphasis has permeated policy. In some cases a shift in emphasis from knowledge to participation was clear. A 1982 course description from Newfoundland refers to “an informed citizenry . . . willing and able to participate” (Newfoundland and Labrador Department of Education, 1982, p. 1) but the emphasis is clearly on being “informed” and the participation skills identified are those of group learning and decision making. A newer document (Newfoundland and Labrador Department of Education, 1993), however, strongly implies that

information is useful only insofar as it serves the needs of participation. The document states:

Competencies rest on a knowledge base (understandings) and are considered essential to the participation of the learner in society. [There is a] need for a shift in emphasis from passively learning knowledge in favour of an active acquisition and utilization of knowledge. (p. 24)

These competencies are viewed as having “instrumental worth” (p. 15) and as enhancing the individual’s capacity to participate meaningfully in the affairs of society. As it has traditionally, the knowledge that forms the core of citizenship education across the country “draws upon history, geography, other social sciences, the behavioral sciences and the humanities” (Alberta Education, 1990a, p. 1).

Acquisition of knowledge is seen not as an end in itself but as a vehicle through which to involve students in past and current issues. One document from Manitoba (Manitoba Education, 1985), for example, contains an explicit list of 10 “basic features” of Canada students are expected to understand before leaving high school. One of these is that Canada

is a country in which national unity cannot be taken for granted. It is multicultural, with many of its various cultural groups experiencing a new sense of identity. It is geographically diverse, officially bilingual, and often subject to severe divergent forces. (pp. 1–2)

The document argues that “these features essentially describe the reality of Canada” (p. 2) and that students need not only to have knowledge about them but to understand the issues involved and to be able to “frame defensible viewpoints on them and be aware of possible courses of citizen action” (p. 3).

Even Prince Edward Island, a province which says little about involving students in studying and acting on public issues, clearly sees citizenship in activist terms. One document (Prince Edward Island Department of Education, 1990) states that “the purpose of the Prince Edward Island public education system is to provide for the development of children so that each may take a meaningful place in society” (p. 1). It goes on to emphasize the importance of preparing students to participate by helping them develop as critical thinkers and skilled decision makers, which is seen as part of “the basic education required to participate in and contribute to society” (p.1).

Citizenship education emphasizes skills that enable students to become effective decision-makers who can participate in society. One Alberta document argues that “the concept of learners as receivers of information should be replaced with a view of learners as self-motivated, self-directed problem solvers and decision makers who are developing the skills necessary for learning” (Alberta Education, 1989, p. 1). Some of the kinds of skills specifically identified

in other Alberta documents include: “skills that acquire, evaluate and use information and ideas” (Alberta Education, 1990b, p. 3); “good communication and decision making skills” (Alberta Education, 1987, p. 10); and skills “to resolve difference and conflicts constructively” (Alberta Education, 1993b, p. 11). A document from Ontario breaks some of these down further into an “inquiry model” that requires the ability to: “focus, organize, locate, record, evaluate/assess, synthesize/conclude, apply and communicate” (Ontario Ministry of Education, 1991a, p. 6).

Citizenship education aimed at fostering both the ability to participate and the inclination to do so has recently found expression in the growth of community service programs (Rutter & Newmann, 1989). *The Common Curriculum* in Ontario (Ontario Ministry of Education, 1993b) calls for students to develop participation skills from the primary grades up as they do such things as: “identify and perform a service in the school community or at home and evaluate the experience” (p. 68); and “develop and participate in an activity related to a global and/or environmental issue and evaluate its impact” (p. 69). In Manitoba this involvement in community service is seen as moving from a classroom level (e.g., “helping and working with other students”) to

participating actively in society, i.e., participation in volunteer work that helps young children, the elderly, ill, handicapped; participating in (or observing) efforts directed toward solving some community problems; criticizing society constructively and working to improve it where necessary; participating in a political campaign of a candidate of the student’s own choice, writing letters to elected officials, etc. (Manitoba Education, 1985, p. 12)

Emerging Interest in Dispositions

Although recent developments concerning citizenship education in Canada appear to emphasize an “informed action,” an emerging interest in the realm of citizenship dispositions is also evident. Hughes (1994) found general consensus among a group of Canadians that their ideal of good citizenship is characterized by dispositions such as “open-mindedness, civic mindedness, respect, willingness to compromise, tolerance, compassion, generosity of spirit, and loyalty” (p. 21). He points out that “many of these ideals would seem to be characterized by a willingness to set aside private interests and concern for the sake of the common good” (p. 21). These kinds of altruistic dispositions or values appear consistently in documents from across the country. They are seen to be key in a country where “cultural pluralism” is viewed as “a positive force in society” and citizenship education seems to emphasize attaining the “multicultural ideal” (Manitoba Education and Training, 1992, pp. 1–2).

Several documents from Ontario emphasize the rapidly changing nature of Canadian society “in the structure of families, in the composition of the

population, and in the nature of the economy” (Ontario Ministry of Education, 1993b, p. 4). One role of citizenship education is to equip students to understand and manage change, particularly in regard to understanding and appreciating the “role that diverse cultures have played and continue to play within our country” (Ontario Ministry of Education, 1993c, p. 7). Ontario contends that in the past school knowledge has emphasized “the values, experiences, achievements, and perspectives of white-European members of society” and has excluded or distorted “those of other groups in Canada and throughout the world” (Ontario Ministry of Education, 1993a, p. 13). Although students are expected to acquire traditional knowledge “about the structure and functions of government” (Ontario Ministry of Education, 1991a, p. 2), the documents consistently make the case that students should also be exposed to materials and experiences from a wide variety of cultural, gender, and class perspectives. Among other things, a good citizen is one who “[knows] about and [values] the contributions of people from a variety of cultures, races, religions, socio-economic backgrounds, and abilities, in the school, community, Canada, and the world” (Ontario Ministry of Education, 1993b, p. 23).

To support the development of these values of respect and appreciation for diversity, programs in Human Rights and Multicultural Education have been developed and implemented across Canada. The principles of the proposed Intermediate Program in British Columbia, for example, emphasize that there should be

system-wide adoption of practices that

- promote gender equity
- promote positive multicultural and race relations
- respond to the particular requirements of First Nations learners
- meet the needs of learners for whom English is a second language
- serve young people with special needs. (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 1992, p. 72)

Although almost all jurisdictions have moved in similar directions, one of the most interesting examples is provided by two textbooks currently used in high schools in the Yukon: *Our Land, Too: Women of Canada and the Northwest 1860–1914* (Moore, 1992) and *Dan Dha Ts’edenintth’e: Reading Voices: Oral and Written Interpretations of the Yukon Past* (Cruikshank, 1991). These books are premised on the idea that women and Aboriginal peoples have largely been left out of the historical record studied in schools. Both books overtly challenge the view that history is an objective version of the past and actively present it as constructed accounts which differ depending on the perspective and/or biases of the historian. Moore (1992), for example, writes that “history is most often told from the perspective of men” and this, she argues, “explains, in part, why women have customarily been absent from the historical record” (p. 1).

Cruikshank (1991) juxtaposes two versions of the history of the Yukon for students and tells them that: “science and oral tradition present us with different, but equally valuable ways of understanding relationships between environment, animals, and humans. These ways of understanding can’t easily be compared, because they have different objectives” (p. 41). Throughout both books students are reminded that any version of history is a constructed account reflecting particular cultural values and relying on certain types of evidence while rejecting others.

Citizenship as Global-Mindedness

In the documents, the notion of citizenship is widely seen as extending beyond the community, province, and nation to include important global elements. A typical argument is that “today’s citizen is increasingly a world citizen” and educating “for global citizenship” is important (New Brunswick Department of Education, 1990, p. 1). Most jurisdictions have developed one or more specific programs or courses that would fall under the rubric of global education and aim to develop “responsible world citizens” (Alberta Education, 1990b, p. 33). Some of these are general programs, such as the Grade 12 Global History and Global Geography courses in Nova Scotia; others have more specific concerns, such as Strand 7 of the Northwest Territories social studies curriculum, which is a study of the circumpolar world. Whether general or specific, all of these global education programs are designed to produce citizens who are knowledgeable about global issues, sensitive to other ways of seeing the world, and disposed to act with other global citizens to make the planet a better place. The rationale for studying the circumpolar world in the Northwest Territories (Northwest Territories Department of Education, 1993) illustrates this well when it states:

Students will study the circumpolar world so that they can develop an understanding and appreciation of their unique and challenging northern environment, and so they can recognize shared interests and concerns with other circumpolar peoples and see opportunities for common action and co-operative solutions. (p. 20)

A Common Countenance

Studies of education in Canada (Conley & Osborne, 1983; Redden, 1982; Tomkins, 1986) have shown that although education is administered provincially, there is “a fair degree of similarity across the different systems” (Conley & Osborne, 1983, p. 65). The policy and curricular documents we examined show that this commonality of perspective persists in citizenship education. There are different nuances in different jurisdictions, but all the conceptions of citizenship and citizenship education that form the basis for policy in English-Canadian public school curricula fall toward the activist end of the continuum. Officially

at least, good Canadian citizens are seen as people who are: knowledgeable about contemporary society and the issues it faces; disposed to work toward the common good; supportive of pluralism; and skilled at taking action to make their communities, nation, and world a better place for all people.

DISCUSSION

Many scholars have argued that, traditionally, citizenship in Canada has been constructed in more elitist and passive terms than in some other democracies (Bothwell, 1993; Lipset, 1990; Regenstreif, 1974; Resnick, 1990). Regenstreif (1974) argues that “instead of liberty, individualism, achievement, and optimism,” the founding ideas of the American state, “Canada institutionalized authority, order, ascription, and a certain pessimism” (p. 54). Resnick (1990) supports this view and points out that the so-called Fathers of Confederation clearly did not support wide citizen participation and contends that their model of “constitution-making from above” (p. 92) has been a persistent feature of Canadian politics. “The upshot,” he continues, “has been the exclusion of popular sovereignty as an operating construct or ideal for the large part of Canadian history” (p. 92).

In the past, citizenship education in Canada has largely reinforced this elitist conception of democratic citizenship. Curtis (1988) points out that from the earliest years of public schooling in Canada West (Ontario) “education was centrally concerned with the making of political subjects, with *subjectification*. But these political subjects were not seen as self-creating. They were to be made by their governors after the image of an easily governed population” (p. 102).

Hodgetts (1968) wrote about the “bland consensus version of history” (p. 24) that dominated Canadian social studies classrooms. History teaching of this type concentrated almost exclusively on political and military matters, avoided controversy, did not make connections to the present, and emphasized the memorization of, among other things, “nice, neat little acts of parliament” (p. 19). Other studies have supported the argument that this conception of citizenship education has dominated Canadian social studies (Conley, 1989; Conley & Osborne, 1983; Osborne, 1980, 1991) and several researchers make the case that citizenship education in Canada has often been used to impose a narrow view of national culture on all students (Jaenen, 1981; McLeod, 1989; Tomkins, 1983, 1986; Werner, Connors, Aoki, & Dahlie, 1977).

Although today the officially prescribed curricula across Canada direct considerable attention toward the more activist conceptions of citizenship and citizenship education, it does not necessarily follow that this interest is borne out in actual classroom practice. Analysis of policy documents does not determine the extent to which the programs described actually guide classroom practice.

In their study of political education in Canada, Conley and Osborne (1983) found that most courses in political science took a “traditional civics” (p. 83)

approach to political education, emphasizing the rote learning of political systems and avoiding debates about issues. They found one course in Manitoba which “appears to be one of the few political science courses available which makes an active attempt at developing ‘political skills’” (p. 77). Further investigation showed, however, that this course was “an elective offered by no school in the province” (p. 77).

The availability of programs is not the only factor that might inhibit the practice of more activist forms of citizenship education. There is evidence that despite educational reform at the policy level, the “transmission view of education” (Osborne, 1991, p. 27) has continued to dominate Canadian classrooms. This approach to education assigns “one particular role to teachers—active, dominant, powerful—and another to students—subordinate, docile, powerless” (p. 27). It sees the curriculum not as the study of issues but rather as “that which the students have to learn, with no ifs or buts” (p. 27). Transmission is far more consistent with passive notions of citizenship than with the activist ones advocated in official policy.

Social studies has not been immune to this discrepancy between the curriculum as intended and the curriculum as practised. Although modern social studies theory and curriculum development for more than 70 years have emphasized an issues-centred, critical-thinking approach to citizenship education (Sears & Parsons, 1991), Tomkins (1983) points out that “the formalism of Canadian classrooms and the rote learning of traditional content have attenuated such an approach” (p. 18). In his national study of civic education, Hodgetts (1968) found considerable differences between the intention and practice of citizenship education. For example, he found that “no prescribed course of study in Canada and no textbook (and very few of the classes we observed) make any attempt to relate the events of the past to the problems and concerns of today” (p. 21). This, he wrote, is “diametrically opposed to the advice of all Departments of Education. Every one of them, without exception, emphasizes the need to make ‘constant references to the present’” (p. 22).

One particular area where classroom practice may be inconsistent with policy is the discussion of public issues. Documents in all the jurisdictions advocate involving students in the analysis of issues and several propose that students be encouraged to take public action based on their analysis. Teachers are often reluctant, however, to deal with controversial issues in class, particularly when the issues are contemporary and local. A survey of Manitoba upper elementary teachers who had worked with curriculum materials designed to develop in students “a sense of political efficacy and a disposition to participate” (Osborne & Seymour, 1988, p. 63) showed that although teachers liked studying issues in the abstract, they did not follow suggestions in the material to involve students in studying a local issue. The teachers cited lack of time as one reason for this but they “also voiced concerns about the possibility of negative community reaction” (Osborne & Seymour, 1988, p. 73). Social studies teachers in the

United States are also reluctant to deal with issues unless they are far removed in time or space (Nelson & Drake, 1994).

To support the teaching of issues, Alberta Education has issued a policy document which states:

Alberta Education believes that studying controversial issues is important in preparing students to participate responsibly in a democratic and pluralistic society. Such study provides opportunities to develop students' capacities to think clearly, to reason logically, to open-mindedly and respectfully examine different points of view, and to reach sound judgements. (Alberta Education, 1993a, p. 1)

The document goes on to outline appropriate procedures for dealing with issues in the classroom. Similarly, Ontario has produced a policy document on teaching about religion (a potentially controversial topic) which first establishes it as an important aspect of education and then outlines appropriate ways to deal with it (Ontario Ministry of Education, 1991b). Policy statements like these might help overcome teachers' reluctance to deal with issues by assuring them of official support for the practice and providing a framework for planning and instruction.

Another curriculum area in which research shows practice often does not mirror rhetoric is that of multiculturalism, human rights, and equality of opportunity. Masemann's (1987) study found a shift in emphasis away from the mechanics of government to multiculturalism, bilingualism, regional accommodation, human rights, and global awareness. Our data indicate that most of these trends continue, but some research has called into question the degree to which education systems are truly committed to ideals such as multiculturalism and gender equity. Werner et al. (1977) attempted to uncover the hidden curriculum concerning the treatment of ethnic groups in social studies, and concluded that in most programs "the underlying value system is that of the dominant white (and even middle class) culture" (p. 17). The authors found that mainstream British and French cultural perspectives dominated most curricula and where other cultures were present they "are interpreted in terms of one or both of these dominant groups" (p. 55).

Studies by Troper (1978) and Cummins and Danesi (1990) examine the new emphasis on multiculturalism in the curriculum and conclude that it does not substantially improve the situation Werner et al. describe. Cummins and Danesi (1990) scrutinize the public response to government-sponsored heritage language programs and argue that "the current rhetoric of multiculturalism . . . is frequently at variance with the continuing underground reality of Anglo-conformity" (p. 13). They cite research showing that Canadians of English and French background support "celebratory multiculturalism" (p. 15) manifest in things like "ethnic festivals, community centres, etc." (p. 25), but not more substantial cultural initiatives such as teaching heritage languages in regular school programs. The work of Aoki (1977) and Ijaz and Ijaz (1981) demonstrates that

multicultural programs in schools have often been of the “celebratory” type, highlighting food, dress, and music rather than substantial inter-cultural issues.

A similar theme is taken up in the work of Gaskell, McLaren, and Novogrodsky (1989) and Brookes (1990) with respect to the gendered character of the school curriculum. They argue that women’s experience and knowledge are inadequately represented and call for a reexamination of “the entire curriculum,” which is more than “just asking that women be added to parts of the curriculum from which they have been excluded” (Gaskell et al., 1989, p. 22). Similarly, Noddings (1992) calls for a rethinking of the whole emphasis of social studies and citizenship education to put “much more emphasis on what we once called ‘private’ life as contrasted with ‘public’ life” (p. 234). The knowledge and skills of the private sphere, of “family membership and homemaking” (p. 234), she argues, are as important to citizenship as skills of political organization or large-scale social action.

Adding to the concerns about curricula that are overly ethnocentric and gendered, some authors have expressed concern about evidence that the structure of schooling supports the division of society along class lines. Osborne (1991) writes that “research has established quite conclusively that middle-class and working-class students do not receive the same education” (p. 82). Curtis, Livingstone, and Smaller (1992) examine the streaming of students by ability level in Ontario schools and argue that this process “is a *systemic political problem*” (p. 1) that does violence to many students, especially those from working-class, single-parent, and minority backgrounds, by limiting rather than equalizing their opportunities. Because curricular tracking persists at the high school level in many jurisdictions, the question remains as to whether substantially different citizenship education is provided to students in different tracks.

Our data indicate that some of these issues are now being dealt with at a policy level (see also Tarrow, 1990). For example, Werner et al. reported in 1977 that

Some social studies programs neither have explicitly stated rationales on multiculturalism (whether for integration, diversity, or awareness) nor display much evidence in the prescribed content and goals of even an implicit rationale. In such cases, the notion of multiculturalism does not appear to be an important organizing idea for the study of Canadian society. (p. 46)

Today, multiculturalism is seen as an important organizing idea for the study of Canadian society, and detailed programs with explicit rationales have been developed and implemented. Many programs, particularly in Native Studies (see, for example, Cruikshank, 1991; New Brunswick Department of Education, 1993), include substantial material from the perspectives of different ethnic and cultural groups. Gender equity is also explicitly an important goal for citizenship education in several jurisdictions, although its treatment is not as extensive as that of

multiculturalism in terms of the development of specific courses or materials. The Yukon textbook dealing with women's history (Moore, 1992) is one example of curricular movement in this direction.

CONCLUSION

With their own particular emphases, the education jurisdictions we considered are committed to conceptions of citizenship and citizenship education that incline well toward the activist end of the continuum discussed at the beginning of this paper. All jurisdictions have developed and put into place some specific programs to support this commitment. We hope our review of the curriculum-as-intended in citizenship education in Canada will provide a benchmark against which to evaluate the actual practice of citizenship education.

Although evidence from the official curricula suggests that conceptions of citizenship education in Canada may constitute leading-edge thinking, we suspect that the actual practice of citizenship education in the nation's classrooms remain closer to the trailing edge. Bringing practice into line with the advanced thinking represented in policy documents may require a concerted research and development initiative that goes well beyond the sparse and disconnected character of past endeavours (Sears, 1994).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study is part of a larger project funded by the Department of Canadian Heritage. The authors gratefully acknowledge the help of the Department as well as of the provincial representatives designated by the Council of Ministers of Education, Canada.

REFERENCES

- Abrams, P. (1982). *Historical sociology*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Alberta Education. (1987). *Students' interactions—Developmental framework: The social sphere*. Edmonton: Author.
- Alberta Education. (1989). *Social studies—junior high*. Edmonton: Author.
- Alberta Education. (1990a). *Elementary social studies*. Edmonton: Author.
- Alberta Education. (1990b). *Social studies 10—20—30 (senior high school)*. Edmonton: Author.
- Alberta Education. (1993a). *Educational programs: Controversial Issues* (Document No. 02-01-07). Edmonton: Author.
- Alberta Education. (1993b). *Promotion of multiculturalism and human rights in Alberta schools*. Edmonton: Author.
- Aoki, T. (1977). Curriculum approaches to Canadian ethnic histories in the context of citizenship education. *History and Social Science Teacher*, 13, 95–99.
- Barber, B. R. (1984). *Strong democracy: Participatory politics for a new age*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Barber, B. R. (1992). *An aristocracy of everyone: The politics of education and the future of America*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Barr, R. D., Barth, J. L., & Shermis, S. S. (1978). *The nature of the social studies*. Palm Springs, CA: ETC Publications.
- Bothwell, R. (1993). Something of value? Subjects and citizens in Canadian history. In W. Kaplan (Ed.), *Belonging: The meaning and future of Canadian citizenship* (pp. 25–35). Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press.
- British Columbia Ministry of Education. (1992). *The intermediate program: Foundations* (draft). Victoria: Author.
- Brookes, A. (1990). Teaching marginality and voice: A critical pedagogy not critical enough? In D. Henley & J. Young (Eds.), *Canadian perspectives on critical pedagogy* (Canadian Critical Pedagogy Network Occasional Monograph No. 1; pp. 25–34). Winnipeg: Social Education Researchers in Canada.
- Carnoy, M. (1984). *The state and political theory*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Conley, M. W. (1989). Theories and attitudes towards political education. In K. A. McLeod (Ed.), *Canada and citizenship education* (pp. 137–156). Toronto: Canadian Education Association.
- Conley, M. W., & Osborne, K. (1983). Political education in Canadian schools: An assessment of social studies and political sciences courses and pedagogy. *International Journal of Political Education*, 6, 65–85.
- Connolly, W. E. (1974). *The terms of political discourse*. Lexington, KY: D. C. Heath.
- Cruikshank, J. (1991). *Dan Dha Ts'edeninth'e: Reading voices: Oral and written interpretations of the Yukon past*. Vancouver: Douglas and McIntyre.
- Cummins, J., & Danesi, M. (1990). *Heritage languages: The development and denial of Canada's linguistic resources*. Toronto: Our Schools/Our Selves.
- Curtis, B. (1988). *Building the educational state: Canada West, 1836–1871*. London, ON: The Althouse Press.
- Curtis, B., Livingstone, D. W., & Smaller, H. (1992). *Stacking the deck: Streaming of working-class kids in Ontario schools*. Toronto: Our Schools/Our Selves.
- Dynneson, T. L., & Gross, R. E. (1991). The educational perspective: Citizenship in American society. In R. E. Gross & T. L. Dynneson (Eds.), *Social science perspectives on citizenship education* (pp. 1–42). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gallie, W. B. (1964). *Philosophy and historical understanding*. London: Chatto and Windus.
- Gaskell, J., McLaren, A., & Novogrodsky, M. (1989). *Claiming an education: Feminism and Canadian schools*. Toronto: Our Schools/Our Selves.
- Heater, D. (1990). *Citizenship: The civic ideal in world history politics and education*. London: Longman.
- Hodgetts, A. B. (1968). *What culture? What heritage?: A study of civic education in Canada*. Toronto: OISE Press.
- Hughes, A. (1994). Understanding citizenship: A Delphi study. *Canadian and International Education*, 23, 13–26.
- Ichilov, O. (1990). Dimensions and role patterns of citizenship in democracy. In O. Ichilov (Ed.), *Political socialization, citizenship education and democracy* (pp. 11–24). New York: Teachers College Press.

- Ijaz, A. M., & Ijaz, I. H. (1981). A cultural program for changing racial attitudes. *History and Social Science Teacher*, 17, 17–20.
- Jaenen, C. J. (1981). Mutilated multiculturalism. In J. D. Wilson (Ed.), *Canadian education in the 1980s* (pp. 79–96). Calgary: Detselig.
- Komisar, P., & McClellan, J. (1961). The logic of slogans. In B. O. Smith & R. B. Ennis (Eds.), *Language and concepts in education* (pp. 195–215). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Kymlicka, W. (1989). *Liberalism, community and culture*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Lipset, S. M. (1990). *Continental divide: The values and institutions of the United States and Canada*. New York: Routledge.
- Manitoba Education. (1985). *Social studies: K-12 overview*. Winnipeg: Author.
- Manitoba Education and Training. (1992). *Multicultural education: A policy for the 1990s*. Winnipeg: Author.
- Marker, G., & Mehlinger, H. (1992). Social studies. In P. W. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum* (pp. 830–851). New York: Macmillan
- Masemann, V. (1987, November). *Citizenship education in Canada: The current status of teaching about citizenship in Canadian elementary and secondary schools*. A pre-conference report prepared for the delegates to the Forum on Citizenship and Citizenship Education in Schools and Communities sponsored by the Department of the Secretary of State and the Canadian Education Association, Edmonton, Alberta.
- McLeod, K. A. (1989). Exploring citizenship education: Education for citizenship. In K. A. McLeod (Ed.), *Canada and citizenship education* (pp. 5–17). Toronto: Canadian Education Association.
- Moore, C. (1992). *Our land, too: Women of Canada and the Northwest 1860–1914*. Whitehorse: Government of the Yukon.
- Nelson, L. R., & Drake, F. D. (1994). Secondary teachers' reactions to the new social studies. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 22, 44–73.
- New Brunswick Department of Education. (1990). *Developing a global perspective through cultural understanding grade nine social studies*. Fredericton: Author.
- New Brunswick Department of Education. (1993). *Native Studies 120* (Draft). Fredericton: Author.
- Newfoundland and Labrador Department of Education. (1982). *Democracy 2102: Course description*. St. John's: Author.
- Newfoundland and Labrador Department of Education. (1993). *A curriculum framework for social studies: Navigating the future*. St. John's: Author.
- Noddings, N. (1992). Social studies and feminism. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 20, 230–241.
- Northwest Territories Department of Education. (1978). *Civics: Introduction*. Yellowknife: Author.
- Northwest Territories Department of Education. (1993). *Curriculum: Junior secondary social studies, Grades 7–9*. Yellowknife: Author.
- Nova Scotia Department of Education. (1993). *Global history (Grade 12)* (Curriculum Guide No. 132). Halifax: Author
- Ontario Ministry of Education. (1991a). *Local government (Intermediate division)*. Toronto: Author.
- Ontario Ministry of Education. (1991b). *Policy/Program memorandum no. 112: Education about religion in the public elementary and secondary schools*. Toronto: Author.

- Ontario Ministry of Education. (1993a). *Antiracism and ethnocultural equity in school boards: Guidelines for policy development and implementation*. Toronto: Author.
- Ontario Ministry of Education. (1993b). *The common curriculum, Grades 1–9* (Working document). Toronto: Author.
- Ontario Ministry of Education. (1993c). *Opening or closing exercises for public schools in Ontario*. Toronto: Author.
- Osborne, K. (1980). "Hard-working, temperate and peaceable": The portrayal of workers in Canadian history textbooks. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.
- Osborne, K. (1991). *Teaching for democratic citizenship*. Toronto: Our Schools/Our Selves.
- Osborne, K. (1992). The emerging agenda for Canadian high schools. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 24, 371–379.
- Osborne, K., & Seymour, J. (1988). Political education in upper elementary school. *International Journal of Social Education*, 3, 63–77.
- Pateman, C. (1970). *Participation and democratic theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Phillips, A. (1993). *Democracy and difference*. University Park: Pennsylvania University Press.
- Popkewitz, T. P. (1980). Global education as a slogan system. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 10, 303–316.
- Pratte, R. (1988). *The civic imperative: Examining the need for civic education*. New York: Teachers College Press
- Prince Edward Island Department of Education. (1990). *Philosophy of education*. Charlottetown: Author.
- Redden, G. (1982). *Social studies: A survey of provincial curricula at the elementary and secondary levels*. Toronto: Council of Ministers of Education, Canada
- Regenstreif, P. (1974). Some social and political obstacles to Canadian national consciousness. In G. Milburn & J. Herbert (Eds.), *National consciousness and the curriculum: The Canadian case* (pp. 53–66). Toronto: OISE Press.
- Resnick, P. (1990). *The masks of proteus: Canadian reflections on the state*. Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press.
- Riesenberg, P. (1992). *Citizenship in the western tradition*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Rutter, R. A., & Newmann, F. M. (1989). The potential of community service to enhance civic responsibility. *Social Education*, 53, 371–374.
- Sears, A. (1994). Social studies as citizenship education in English Canada: A review of research. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 22, 6–43.
- Sears, A., & Hughes, A. S. (1994). *A review of citizenship education in Canada*. Unpublished report prepared for the Citizenship and Canadian Identities Sector, Department of Canadian Heritage, Ottawa.
- Sears, A., & Parsons, J. (1991). Towards critical thinking as an ethic. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 19, 45–68.
- Tarrow, N. (1990). Human rights education: A comparison of Canadian and U.S. approaches. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 12, 12–22.
- Tomkins, G. S. (1983). The social studies in Canada. In J. Parsons, G. Milburn, & M. van Manen (Eds.), *A Canadian social studies* (pp. 12–30). Edmonton: University of Alberta Press.

- Tomkins, G. S. (1986). *A common countenance: Stability and change in the Canadian curriculum*. Scarborough, ON: Prentice-Hall.
- Troper, H. (1978). Nationality and history education: Nationalism and the history curriculum in Canada. *The History Teacher*, 12, 11–27.
- Werner, W., Connors, B., Aoki, T., & Dahlie, J. (1977). *Whose culture? Whose heritage? Ethnicity within Canadian social studies curricula*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia, Centre for the Study of Curriculum and Instruction.
- Woyach, R. B. (1991). The political perspective: Civic participation and the public good. In R. E. Gross & T. L. Dynneson (Eds.), *Social science perspectives on citizenship education* (pp. 43–65). New York: Teachers College Press.
-

Alan M. Sears is an associate professor and Andrew S. Hughes is a professor in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, Faculty of Education, University of New Brunswick, Bag Service No. 45333, Fredericton, New Brunswick, E3B 6E3. Both are also Research Associates to the Chair of Studies in Canadian Citizenship and Human Rights at Saint Thomas University in Fredericton.