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ABSTRACT

Regional, multicultural, and national divergences in Canadian politics and education have contributed to the emergence of different forms of nationalism, identity, and citizenship in Canada. The practice and content of secondary education in B.C. and Québec illustrate this general proposition.

Two multi-ethnic high schools, one in Québec (Montréal) and one in B.C. (Vancouver), provide a window into Québec history (grade 10) and B.C. social studies (grade 11) classrooms. These classes are used to examine how students construct and understand their citizenship. Key concepts (citizenship rights, participation, pluralism, collective identity) guided this research. Using a multiple case study design, this qualitative study employed multiple data collection. In addition to the analysis of the documentary record, I observed and interviewed B.C. and Québec high school students, history and social studies teachers, and finally staff from each school.

The study generated findings on citizenship education practice and learning. In both provinces, citizenship education is the raison d'être of history and social studies. Despite divergent programs and teaching approaches, teachers at both sites recognize the necessity of preparing students for the exercise of democratic citizenship. Students at both sites accord importance to the key citizenship concepts introduced in their history/social studies classes. Yet, contrasts emerge in the findings between francophone Québécois and anglophone British Columbian students, particularly in terms of collective identity.

The findings suggest that theoretical discussions on multicultural and multinational citizenship in political theory does not adequately take into account all the complex views of B.C. and Québec student informants. This study concludes with further research into the study of students' conceptions of citizenship.
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INTRODUCTION

"Without citizens, democracy is a hollow shell. Without public schools and universities, citizenship is an empty boast."
Benjamin R. Barber (1997, p. xi)

"The greatest title any one of us can ever hold is Citizen."

Political theorists have long argued that the future of democratic states is dependent on the education of their citizens. Democratic societies, notes Barber (1997), are sustained only by hard work. The knowledge, attitudes, and skills that permit citizens to think, deliberate, participate, and ultimately live democratically are not innate; they have to be learned. Public education\(^1\) helps develop the civic competencies, or ‘virtues,’ essential to citizenship in a democracy. Schools have thus been identified as the critical link between education and citizenship, and the locus from which democratic citizens emerge. Education has a political dimension that relates to given societies.

In the 1990s, there has been a flurry of interest in the concepts of ‘citizenship’ and ‘education’ in both English Canada and Québec (Sears, Clarke & Hughes, 1998; Lévesque, 1997). Pluralism, identity politics, civic apathy, regionalism, and the resurgence of nationalism in Québec have compelled politicians, scholars, policy-makers, and educators to accord an important role to these issues. Unable to make informed judgments about issues of democracy, nationalism, identity, and pluralism, many Canadians could be tempted to turn to simple answers, to slogans, or to nostalgia for a ‘mythical’ world. More gravely, they could simply withdraw from the public sphere, convinced that nothing can be done to solve our problems. As

\(^{1}\)
Kymlicka (1998) notes, more and more Canadians are disillusioned with the basic institutions and principles that underlie the Canadian state.

If pluralism is perceived as a threat to our ability to act collectively as citizens (Granatstein, 1998; Gwyn, 1995; Bissoondath, 1994), the real difficulty for the survival of our democratic state is the tension between Québécois and English Canadians. The relationship between these historical ‘nations’ remains the most serious threat to the stability and survival of Canada. In this thesis, I use the terms ‘English Canada’ and ‘English Canadians’ to refer to the non-Québécois, non-Franco-Canadians, non-Aboriginal English-speaking majority. I prefer it to the other term commonly used in Québec, the ‘Rest of Canada,’ which wrongly refers to a set of disconnected individuals having nothing in common except language. The central advantage of accepting the term, both in Québec and in the English-speaking provinces, is that it makes clear that the reference of ‘English’ is neither to individuals nor their country of origin, but to a common feature of the entire anglophone society (see Angus, 1997). Similarly, I use the term ‘Québécois’ to refer not only to the descendants of French-Canadian colonists — the so-called pure-laine — but to all those who live and participate in the French-language nation in Québec, regardless of ethnic descent. Except for a minority of strong Québec sovereignists, the term ‘Québécois’ is commonly and also legally used in that province as an inclusive term of political membership, not in the restrictive, ethnic sense as implied by some (Webber, 1999). From the historical dual view of Canada, Québécois regard their country as a ‘multinational’ state; that is, a state made up of distinct national groups. In the view of most Québécois, the structure of Canadian society and the character of Canadian public education must recognize this reality.

English Canadians, for their part, have been slow to fully understand the significance of these differences, their implications, and how differing conceptions of the nation and the state might be incorporated into Canadian citizenship. Many English Canadians rally around
multiculturalism, the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and national standards in education without realizing the degree to which their aspirations and values conflict with Québécois' ideas of citizenship, nationalism, and education.

A minority of Canadians have come to realize that their multicultural conception of citizenship, based on the nation-state, is not acceptable for Québécois, and if not altered could lead to the breakup of the country. They reason that if democracy is to survive in this century we all need to take Québec nationalism much more seriously. The world, says Taylor (1993), "needs other models to be legitimated in order to allow for more humane and less constraining modes of political cohabitation" (p. 183). Resnick (1997b) in his Twenty-First Century Democracy adds that Canadians need to start thinking of organizations and possibly political structures "that go beyond the nation-state" (p. 129). Rather than trying, through policies and public institutions, to make Québécois 'real' Canadians, we should focus on "identifying the benefits that [all] Canadians [could] gain from living in a multinational federation" (Kymlicka, 1998, pp. 180-181). This referent implies recognizing English Canadians and Québécois for what they are (nations), and for what they have done in the building of their country.

But, the survival of a democratic, multinational state like Canada is complicated. It requires various civic competencies or virtues from its citizens. Without the knowledge and skills necessary to analyse, criticize, and participate, and the attitudes and abilities to tolerate, respect, and share a sense of solidarity, a democracy becomes unstable and difficult to govern.

Citizenship education contributes to the development of those competencies. In Canada, schools have historically played an important role in this political project despite the fact that under the Constitution education falls within provincial jurisdiction. But, if regional tensions between English Canadian provinces have not impeded the teaching and learning of Canadian citizenship,
the ‘national’ divergences between Québec and English Canada have historically led to different views of Canada, citizenship, nationalism, and history in education.

Students in our schools, at the turn of this century, are the leaders of tomorrow; those who will shape this large, regionally divided, multi-ethnic, and multinational country. School history, social representations, historical experiences, language and many other factors play a key role in the construction of their collective memory and conceptions of citizenship.

As a Québécois d’origine, born in rural francophone Québec and now living in British Columbia (B.C.), I believe that we urgently need to know (1) what teachers formally and informally present to high school students in citizenship education, and more importantly, (2) what students learn from these classes in English Canada and Québec. Two multi-ethnic high schools, one in Québec (Montréal) and one in B.C. (Vancouver), provide a window into history and social studies classrooms. These classes will be used to examine how students construct and understand citizenship in light of their schooling experience. The classrooms are chosen since much of the burden of Canadian citizenship education has officially been assigned to history (grade 10) in Québec and social studies (grade 11) in B.C.

In our multinational state, such inquiries ought to receive significant attention as they have serious implications for the future of our democracy. Our history can tell us that, so far, we have managed to live together in relative peace (Morton, 1997). We have adapted our political institutions, policies, cultures, and schools to changing circumstances and new aspirations related to our pluralistic society. We have also moved away from conservative democracy, dominated by governments and representatives, to a more participatory form of democracy driven by citizens, interest groups, and nations (Ignatieff, 2000a).

Yet, it seems today that many Canadians have lost the will and confidence to learn from their past experiences. I believe that we have to be inventive in finding new ways to enable our
multi-ethnic and multinational state to survive and flourish. This dissertation looks at how young
Canadians envisage their lives as citizens in light of their experience in B.C. and Québec schools.

Taking a socio-constructivist perspective (see Saint-Onge, 1993), this research assumes
that what is transmitted in class is not passively assimilated by students but reinterpreted and
reconstructed in light of their own understandings, representations, and past experiences. We
need to understand students' thinking — what they believe and understand when they enter and
leave the classroom — if we are to know more about citizenship education.

This dissertation begins with two presuppositions. First, it assumed that the ‘nation’ and
‘state’ remain central institutions for the life of democratic citizens. As Kennedy (1993) has
noted, many of the most important international or domestic issues we face as citizens, both
individually and collectively, continue to be addressed within the established institutions of
sovereign states. In comparison to other types of organizations, the state is (so far) the chief
provider of the rights, freedoms, autonomy, equality, peace, justice, and prosperity of its
members. Of course, a democratic state cannot guarantee that all its citizens will inevitably be
happy, prosperous, healthy, wise, or just. To attain these ends, as Dahl (1998) notes, is “beyond
the capacity of any government, including a democratic government” (p. 60). But despite its
limitations, the democratic state is a far better organization than any attainable alternative to it.

In addition, nations remain one of the most important poles of identification for the
majority of citizens. They contribute actively to the establishment of social cohesion, fraternity,
and legitimacy necessary to stable democracy. In other words, if democracy is the ‘rule of the
people,’ then, the members of this ‘people’ must not only decide and act together, but must form
a unit of collective decision and action. This implies a certain degree of cohesion so that
members will know, listen, respect, and understand one another. Both the nation and the state are
these days under attack by transnational trends such as global economy, human rights, and
ecological movements. Yet, no other political model has emerged to replace them (Kennedy, 1993, p. 167). A new interdependence might be emerging, Ignatieff (2000b) adds, “but there is no discernible alternative to the nation state as the chief provider of foreign and domestic security for human populations” (p. 176). Commerce, human rights, and ecology may be borderless, but human beings are not. They need a secure territory in which to live in and to preserve their freedoms. These freedoms can only be provided by sovereign states. Studying citizenship education, then, necessarily implies analyzing the nation and the state in which citizens live.

Second, this thesis assumes that public schooling is a good thing for our democratic societies. Schools are large and expensive institutions, and for certain businessmen, their functions could be better served by the private sector and twenty-first-century technology. Yet, public schools remain the best place to introduce the young to the world of learning and to the world of democratic citizenship. It is in school that students officially learn to become citizens. In the words of Postman (1996), “public school will endure since no one has invented a better way to create a public” (p. 197).

This thesis is divided into ten chapters. In chapter 1, I discuss some historical and political issues of citizenship and citizenship education in Canada. Drawing on the works of Taylor, Kymlicka, Resnick, and other political theorists, I show that Québécois and English Canadians have developed different understandings of Canadian citizenship (multicultural and multinational) based on their divergent conceptions of the nation and the state. I close the chapter with a discussion on the understandings of citizenship in Canadian schools to show that we have very little information on what actually happens in citizenship education classrooms or on how students view and construct their citizenship.
Chapter 2 outlines the origins of modern citizenship. It shows how rights and freedoms, community membership, commitments, legitimacy, and recognition are central aspects of modern citizenship, particularly in multinational states such as Canada.

Chapter 3 provides an analysis of citizenship education in democracy and a review of the evidence that our two historical nations have utilized different conceptions of citizenship and citizenship education. The review of literature is based on studies conducted in English Canada and Québec and having direct bearing on this research. The review also includes two international case studies on citizenship education, one including Canada.3

In chapter 4, I discuss the methodology employed in this thesis. I present the aim of this study and explain why I decided to conduct a qualitative inquiry, using a multiple-case study design. I also discuss my position as a researcher, the selection of the cases, the methods for collecting data, and some concerns regarding validity, reliability, and ethics in case studies.

Chapters 5 and 6 focus on the B.C. case study. Chapter 5 draws on insights gained from my general and specific observations, interviews with teachers and administrators, and document analysis to set the context for better understanding students' conceptions of citizenship as found in one B.C. high school (in the greater Vancouver area), and more specifically in social studies grade 11 classes. Based on student interviews, document analysis and observations, chapter 6 looks at B.C. grade 11 students' own conceptions of citizenship, at how their schooling experience affect their understandings of citizenship. The focus is upon the key concepts presented in chapter 2: citizenship rights, cultural pluralism, and participation.

Chapters 7 and 8 present the Québec case study in light of my general and specific observations, interviews with teachers, administrators, and students, and document analysis. Chapter 7 sets the context for understanding students' conceptions of citizenship. It focuses on citizenship education practices as found in one francophone Québec high school (école
secondaire) in Montréal, and more specifically in grade 10 history classes. Chapter 8 looks at Québec students’ understandings of citizenship, at how in light of their schooling experience they understand citizenship in terms of the key concepts presented earlier.

Chapter 9 makes a comparative study of both B.C. and Québec students’ understandings of their national identity, nation, and citizenship. This chapter, drawn from the analysis of the two case studies, provides a comparative analysis of B.C. and Québec students’ understandings of national identity, nation, and citizenship.

Finally, in the concluding chapter (chapter 10), I review the whole thesis with specific emphasis on the findings. I first provide a brief review of the problem investigated, the purpose of the study, and the justification for investigating it. Then, I review the findings of this research and briefly discuss the implications of this study for citizenship education in Canada and for further research in the area.

1 In this research I use the terms ‘public education’ and ‘public schooling’ interchangeably. Although I recognize that education, which we all get from simply living with others, is different from the formal learning process in school, I think the two terms can be used in this research without confusion because they both refer to a ‘public’ process that can only be associated to schooling. Saying this is not to say, however, that education for citizenship cannot be found in general education. Rather, I want to argue that for the purpose of this research both public education and public schooling refer to the same learning activity that occurs in our public schools.

2 In this thesis, I use Québécois and English Canadians in order to be able to generalize about those two entities. As several commentators have observed, Canada cannot be understood as a nation-state because some of its inhabitants do think of themselves linguistically, culturally, and even legally constituting national communities of their own. I do recognize, however, that these ‘national’ communities are diverse and (often) fragmented and, as such, cannot be reduced to a single ethnic view.

3 Two comparative case studies on citizenship education were being conducted in Québec when this research was written. The first one, led by Dr. Yuki Shiose of the Université de Sherbrooke, focuses on how students become citizens in Québec and Japan public schools; see Hauenschild (1998). The second one is directed by McAndrew, Bourgeault, and Pagé, from the Université de Montréal, focuses on citizenship education practices as found in Québec and Ontario (see Hébert & Pagé, 2000).
I. RETHINKING CITIZENSHIP AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

1.1 A Canadian experiment

A pair of twins is separated at birth. One is sent to an English-Canadian family in Vancouver, the other is raised in a French neighbourhood in Montréal. After 18 years, the English brother manages to trace his French brother in Québec. In an unprecedented outpouring of emotion, he visits him a couple of days before the Referendum of October 1995 — with free airfares offered by Air Canada for the occasion — to tell him how much he loves him. At first, they are delighted to be in each other’s company, and to rediscover, as it were, their lost half. But within a couple of hours, they find each other’s company irritating. The English brother speaks a very fast English and masters only a few words in French. The French brother, who has never been in English Canada, is extremely disappointed to discover that his lost half is unable to communicate in French. When the English brother tells him that speaking Chinese is more an asset than speaking French for people in Vancouver, the French brother angrily refuses to believe it. He cannot understand and accept that there is great pressure to make French no more important than other minority languages. Soon, they are sitting in silence in a bar on St. Catherine Street, both thinking that it might have been better if they had never met. Beyond the ‘accident’ of having the same neglectful parents, they seem to have little in common.

Then, the girlfriend of the French brother comes out and meets the two brothers who are, according to her, identical. The English brother realizes that she has red hair like his own girlfriend, and smells the same pleasant odour, obviously the perfume Estée Lauder. He notices also that they have both ordered the same beer, Molson. More confused than ever, he discovers that they both like the same music, Céline Dion, Sarah McLachlan, Shania Twain, and both share a passion for hockey, although the French brother is a Canadiens’ fan and the English brother...
cheers for the Canucks. Finally, when the English brother says what he wants to do later, the French brother discovers that they have chosen the same field of study, education.

Take a state, say Canada, and settle it with two nations. Ensure that these two nations have different philosophies, cultures, and languages. Attempt to guarantee that the people of each nation have common, but also separate institutions such as schools, and are told for generations different stories about their country. Centuries later, ask one of the nations (the smaller one) to vote on the possibility of creating its own nation-state. Will it decide to go on its own or stay with its half part?

This theoretical question leads to another: do Québécois and English-Canadians have similar conceptions of the nation, the state, and citizenship? To English-Canadians, as suggested by Dion (1976), these concepts are directly related to the notion of ‘nation-state,’ the combined people of a country. Membership in and allegiance to the state are synonymous with membership and allegiance to the nation. But to Québécois, these concepts are seen very differently. For them, citizenship means membership and allegiance to state via membership and allegiance to a constituent element of the state, in this case, la nation québécoise. Being Canadian, for Québécois, is being a member of a socio-geographical entity, Québec, contributing to the whole. Their citizenship is officially Canadian but their national identity (or allegiance to the nation) is Québécois. This is the reason why, for example, the national holiday of Québécois (originally for French-Canadians) is not July 1, the date of Canadian Confederation, but it is June 24, la fête de la St-Jean-Baptiste. In this sense, they have multiple allegiances since they belong to both a state and a nation, but not to a nation-state. For Québécois, ‘nation’ and ‘state’ are conceptually distinct. The former refers to the sociological community (see Bouchard, 2000), the latter to the sovereign political framework within which the nation can be democratically free. But, if we want to go deeper into the bases of citizenship, we need to understand more about the concepts of nationalism and federalism.
1.2 Nationalism and federalism

Nationalism is one of the most powerful forces in the modern world, yet its definition is somewhat contested. There seems to be no 'scientific' definition of the nation on which we can all agree. Some equate nationalism with national sentiment, others with national ideology and common language, others again with independence movements. A difference also exists between those who stress the 'cultural' rather than the 'political' aspects of nationalism.

Although there are various definitions of nationalism in the literature (see Gellner, 1997; Hutchinson & Smith, 1994; Greenfeld, 1992), I think Ignatieff (1993) provides the most appropriate and explicit one for this thesis. For him, nationalism is a modern political doctrine which holds that (1) the world’s peoples should be divided into free nations (or peoples), and (2) these nations should have the right to self-determination, either as self-governing units within existing states or as nation-states of their own. Ignatieff adds that nationalism is also a ‘cultural ideal’ which claims that while men and women have different identities, it is the nation that provides them with their primary form of belonging (patriotism). As a ‘moral ideal,’ nationalism also implies that people could fight or sacrifice their life to protect the collectivity and its common good against perceived enemies, internal or external. These claims (political, cultural, moral), as Ignatieff (1993) indicates, underwrite each other. The moral claim that nations are entitled to be defended depends on the cultural claim that the needs they satisfy for security and protection are uniquely important. The political ideal that people should struggle for nationhood depends on the cultural claim that only nations can satisfy these needs. Finally, the cultural idea underwrites the political claim that these needs cannot be satisfied without self-determination (either through a multinational polity or nation-state). Each of these claims is, of course, contestable and understood differently by different people. This is one of the reasons why nations are 'imagined communities,' in Anderson’s terms. They are imagined because "members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them,
or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion” (Anderson, 1991, p. 6). So people imagine what it is that they have in common, and through this shared imagining, people become members of the same nation.²

But not all collectivities that consider themselves culturally or linguistically distinct necessarily constitute nations. What distinguishes nations, says Weber (1994), is their commitment to a political project. This political project has for goal the development and flourishing of a national or ‘societal culture.’ Relying on Kymlicka (1998), I refer to a national/societal culture as a territorially concentrated public culture centered on a shared language used in common social, economical, political, and educational institutions (see Kymlicka, 1998, pp. 27-28). Participation in this culture, as Kymlicka (1998) argues, “provides [its members] access to meaningful ways of life across the full range of human activities — social, educational, religious, recreational, economic — encompassing both public and private spheres” (p. 27). This political project of securing a national culture requires the use of, and the control over, a variety of socio-political powers and institutions. This is one reason why nationalists claim they must to be self-governing.

But if nationalism presupposes ‘self-determination,’ that is, that people should rule themselves, some nations have voluntarily or sometimes involuntarily (because of conquest or annexation) decided to achieve their collective goals within the framework of a larger entity, such as a federation. This is the case of Québécois, Catalans in Spain, Flemish in Belgium, and Scots in the United Kingdom (although this is not officially a federal state).³

All forms of nationalism vest political authority in the people (also a synonym of the nation) but not all nationalist movements create democratic regimes. Some movements, while based on a doctrine of ‘popular sovereignty,’ exclude individuals from their definition of the nation based on ethnic criteria (for example, Serbian nationalism). The history of the twentieth century provides many examples of the possible connection between nationalism and racism. For
many people, the connection between the two concepts is clearly related to wars and authoritarian militarism. Many opponents of nationalism are disturbed by its connection to warfare. They contend that a sense of belonging to the nation "feeds belligerence and dulls our sense of the importance of shunning unnecessary violence" (Nathanson, 1993, p. 133).

Nationalism would be a dangerous ideology, "the most ubiquitous, explosive, and intractable [problem] at the end of the twentieth century" (Hutchinson & Smith, 1994, p. 11). The recently ethnic cleansing in Bosnia and Kosovo are reason enough to support this view.

Consequently, many critics of nationalism have rejected all forms of nationalism and nationalistic feelings (patriotism) because they are too often negative, dangerous, and unworthy. For example, Tolstoy (1968), writing in Russia at the turning of the 20th century, argued that nationalism would conflict with morality. Because it requires special duties toward our fellow national members — that we ought to treat them better than we treat people in general — nationalism clashes with our basic moral principles of equality for all human beings. Patriotism becomes nothing more than 'national egoism,' sanctioning actions and attitudes that are condemned at the individual level. Faced with such dangers, some are tempted to discard the concept of nationalism altogether.

However, for various Canadian scholars such as Kymlicka (1998), Resnick (1997a), Derriennic (1995), and Taylor (1993) nationalism is compatible with treating all the citizens of a particular territory as equal community members. In this view, nationalism harmonizes with liberal democracy, and ethnic tolerance. Nation-building projects, Kymlicka (1998) insists, "are a fundamental, defining feature of modern democratic states" (p. 29) since democratic institutions (and social programs) are more likely to develop and endure in a country that is fairly stable and homogeneous in terms of language, history, and culture.

That being said, we must keep in mind that nations tend to attribute to themselves a greater degree of homogeneity than their members actually display. This is the reason why
Miller (1995b) argues that we should think of a national culture in terms of "a set of overlapping cultural characteristics — beliefs, practices, sensibilities — which different members exhibit in different combinations and to different degrees" (p. 85).

If we want to study nationalism as a modern, liberal phenomenon, we need to make a clear distinction between two types of nationalism: civic and ethnic. Civic nationalism, like Québec nationalism (see Derriennic, 1995), maintains that the nation should be composed of all members, regardless of race, color, gender, ethnicity. This nationalism is called 'civic' because it envisages the nation as a territorial community of equal, rights-bearing citizens, united with a shared set of liberal values, practices, and institutions. In this sense, the community is a political unit in which the individuals are equal members committed to protect citizenship rights and promote the community's common good. According to civic nationalists, what holds a nation together is not common roots or ancestry, but the common will of a people to be self-governing. In other words, it is inclusive of all community members and it assumes that members are all equally and legally qualified and competent to rule themselves.

Ethnic nationalism, on the contrary, claims that "an individual's deepest attachments are inherited [usually by common ancestry], not chosen" (Ignatieff, 1993, p. 8). One is born into a particular ethnic nation and cannot simply abandon this identity for another one. Because common ethnicity, by itself, does not create social cohesion, ethnic nationalist regimes tend to be more authoritarian than civic nationalist regimes. Ethnic nationalist regimes sometimes appear to be democratic, but their institutions and governments always favour one ethnic group over others. As a result, not all members are considered 'politically equal.'

Unlike nationalism, federalism is not a political ideology, but a particular way of sharing political powers among peoples and governments within a single state (Ignatieff, 1993). It provides meaningful self-realization and self-government for peoples living in a state, especially if the country is of vast size, multi-ethnic, and regionally divided (see Jackson & Jackson, 1997,
For philosophers like Montesquieu and Rousseau, federalism was perceived either as a way to preserve the principles of the separation of powers (as in Switzerland) or as a means of reconciling efficacy with participatory democracy. Federalism would have for them the potential of uniting people of different regions for certain ends, such as defense, while preserving their independence or autonomy for others, like language.

In Canada, certain scholars have argued that federalism was adopted by the Fathers of Confederation because prime minister Macdonald’s idea of a legislative union was totally unacceptable to French-Canadians in Lower Canada who refused to become a minority ruled by the British-Canadian majority. If Canadian federalism was, at its origins, conservative and somewhat hostile to Rousseau’s views on popular support, many Canadians, particularly in Lower Canada and the Maritimes, had strong regional or national consciousness which made it next to impossible to create a strong legislative union. As Resnick (1990) puts it:

> The main reason federalism was adopted at all, despite Macdonald’s clear preference for a legislative union, was recognition that “the people of lower [sic] Canada” […] would never assent to this. Canada, in other words, had to come to terms with its national question. (p. 233)

### 1.3 The meaning of citizenship and Canadian citizenship

Like nationalism and federalism, citizenship is “an extremely flexible concept” (Alejandro, 1998, p. 9) meaning different things to different people. At one level, it simply refers to a legal contract binding individuals to respect the law of a state. Legal definitions often relate to naturalization processes or ways of accepting incoming citizens into the state (see the discussion in Tilly, 1995). For others, citizenship is also understood as a set of ideals that represent what citizens ought to be and how they ought to live in order to enjoy the full rights and freedoms of citizenship (Osborne, 1996).
The difficulty with the concept of citizenship is that it refers to both an ideal and a pragmatic notion. Political philosophers have for a long time engaged in debates about the differences between moral or value judgements (trying to answer questions like 'what ought I to do?') and practical or empirical judgements (related to question such as 'what can I do?'). In answering the question 'what is citizenship?' scholars inextricably make judgements that depend heavily on their values, on what we believe is good, right, or desirable for us and for others. Here, citizenship is purely an 'ideal,' a moral claim about how things should be from a moral point of view. But when we try to decide 'what kind of citizenship is the more appropriate for us,' as Canadians, we still depend on moral judgments but we rely much more on evidence and empirical judgements based on beliefs about causal connotations and limits. Citizenship becomes a concept that we apply to particular circumstances and particular people(s), place(s), and institutions.

In this thesis, I will refer to both moral and practical judgements. In the first parts, I will discuss citizenship more as an 'ideal' (what I believe is desirable for us). But as we will move along in the thesis, we will encounter a mixture of value judgments and empirical judgments, particularly in the two case studies. When asking people (students, teachers, administrators) what they understand by citizenship, we have to keep in mind that participants rely both on moral and practical judgments to construct their answers to such a theoretical concept.

During the 1990s, a number of researchers defined the concept of citizenship (see Miller, 1995a; Kymlicka & Norman, 1994) or offered a theory of citizenship (Janoski, 1998). As suggested by Gagnon and Pagé (1999), the concept of citizenship, particularly in Canada, historically refers to more than a legal status. Citizenship is a social role which is partly, but not wholly, defined in terms of various rights. It means something more than merely being subject to the laws of a given state.
In this thesis, I define citizenship as a desirable activity where the quality of one’s citizenship is a function of rights, participation, and membership in the affairs of the communities and state to which one belongs. Citizenship, here, is not simply a passive status conferred by the state but an ‘activity,’ which implies a set of practices or commitments that support the rights provided by the state to all its citizens. This means that citizens are not simply passive beneficiaries of various civil, political, and social rights. Rather, they have to participate actively to protect what they value both as individuals and collectivities, for example, their freedoms. Since citizens are, by definition, members of a particular nation and state; they also have to establish their rights, freedoms, autonomy, and development (both personal and collective) within the limits of a defined territory. As Janoski (1998) notes, “citizenship is an act of closure about a group of people it calls citizens, and consequently states and societies are very particular about whom they call citizens” (p. 46). The particular relationship between citizens and their state, as Cairns (1999) explains, is extremely important because “[it reinforces] the idea that it is ‘their’ state — that they are full members of an ongoing association that is expected to survive the passing generations” (p. 4).

Similarly, it is important that citizens develop a sense of collective identification as valued and equal members of a political community. Here, citizenship reinforces solidarity and empathy necessary for stable democracy. As Tamir (1995) puts it, it allows for a certain degree of cohesion, respect, trust, sympathy, security, and transparency that can facilitate the participation of citizens in public affairs. Yet, we accept today that membership in a given state is to be found at various levels, not only in a direct relationship to the state (see Pagé, 1996). So citizenship necessarily involves a respect of pluralism and a commitment to the many communities to which one belongs (local, provincial, ethnic, national). Some scholars (Kymlicka, 1995; Spinner, 1994) have shown that in order to have a full, inclusive citizenship, citizens must be able to express their particular identities. This implies a capacity for citizens to
act as free persons in both the private and public spheres (schools, religious organization, professional associations, interest groups).  

The notion of citizenship used in this thesis takes into consideration the key components (rights, pluralism, participation, and membership) that are found in different political regimes. It is applicable to traditional, homogeneous nation-states as well as to multi-ethnic and multinational states. My notion of citizenship is thus inclusive of the many ethnic, national identities and communities that compose our modern states.

But because no one is born into a particular conception of citizenship, citizens must possess the necessary civic competencies, or 'virtues,' to play an active role in public affairs. Here, competencies (also known in French as savoir-mobiliser) refer to a set of various knowledge, attitudes, and capacities that are mobilized at a given moment for a specific task (see Perrenoud, 1998). Competencies, then, not only depend on the construction, transmission and appropriation of knowledge, attitudes, and capacities but take their full meaning in the action. Furthermore, competencies are seen as 'transversal,' in that they should be developed not only in one school subject but in all school activities. From this perspective, the entire school environment can contribute to the development of these competencies.

For Gellner (1994), the minimal requirement for full citizenship and effective moral membership is literacy. "Only a person possessing [certain competencies] can really claim and exercise his rights, can attain a level of affluence and style of life compatible with current notions of human dignity" (Gellner, 1994, p. 56). Gellner’s idea is not new. Public education has historically placed a significant role in this ‘political enterprise’ (Oldenquist, 1980). Historically, the task of educating everyone to become citizens was too important and too vital to be left to the private sector. "Both the scale of the educative enterprise and its essential uniformity dictate that it be assumed by the state" (Taylor, 1997, p. 33). But, the historical link
between public education and the state is not necessarily endless. It needs to be continually analyzed, questioned, and reaffirmed.

In Canada, both the concepts of citizenship and citizenship education have been greatly revitalized in the 1990s. The Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology conducted an extensive investigation into Canada citizenship in 1993 (Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology, 1993), while the federal department of Canadian Heritage recently sponsored a range of related research (Kaplan, 1991a; Kaplan 1991b, Kymlicka, 1992; Sears & Hughes, 1994; Gagnon & Pagé, 1999). In Québec, the Council Superior of Education dedicated its 1998 annual report to Citizenship Education. Books, such as Kaplan’s (1993) *Belonging: The Meaning and Nature of Canadian Citizenship*, Taylor’s (1993) *Reconciling the Solitudes: Essays on Canadian Federalism and Nationalism*, Kymlicka’s (1998) *Finding Our Way*, and Cairns’ *Citizenship, Diversity, and Pluralism*, as well as two editions of Canadian journals on citizenship education (*Canadian and International Education*, December 1996; *Canadian Social Studies*, Spring 1997) and two major conferences of the McGill Institute for the Study of Canada on the topics of citizenship and history education are evidence of growing interest among academics in the areas of citizenship and citizenship education. All these initiatives culminated in the foundation of a Canadian Citizenship Education Research Network (CERN) in 1998; a research network which brings together a group of interested researchers, policy-makers, practitioners and stakeholders to carry out an agenda on citizenship education in Canada (see Hébert & Pagé, 2000).

Why all this activity? Two chief factors account for this renewed interest in citizenship and citizenship education in Canada: pluralism and nationalism. The pluralism in our society poses many challenges to citizenship. With the increasing diversity of Canada’s population, Canadian citizens are in the process of adopting a more disparate set of identities, as evidenced by their ethnic affiliations, their class identities, their religious allegiances, their sexual
orientations, their views of personal life, and their ideas about liberal democracy. Kymlicka (1995) refers to such culturally diverse countries as ‘polyethnic’ states.

Recently, the increased pluralism of our society has even fuelled the belief among certain Canadians that ‘things are out of control.’ For some commentators (Gwyn, 1995; Bissoondath, 1994), pluralism and its official recognition — via multiculturalism and multicultural education programs — threatens the shared conception of citizenship that Canadians have managed to achieve. More importantly, multiculturalism, according to these critics, promotes a fragmentation of Canadian society (so-called ‘ghettoization’) and critically endangers our ‘shared way of life.’

As a result, some observers have even suggested that a moratorium on immigration was essential to assimilate “last decade’s scarcely-restrained human flood” (McFeely & Grace, 1994, p. 6). Such criticisms are rooted in the belief that immigrants or members of ethnic minorities are seeking unjust privileges from ‘our’ society, while simultaneously refusing to integrate into it. This backlash, says Granatstein (1998), “comes from the widespread realization that it [multiculturalism] will erode the history and the heritage that Canadians share” (pp. 92-93).

Interestingly, there is no evidence to support this argument. As Kymlicka (1998) has noted, available empirical evidence suggest precisely the opposite: multiculturalism and multicultural education help promote integration into the broader parameters of Canadian society. Compared to other countries having no such policy, Canada fares much better in terms of naturalization rates, political participation rates, residential segregation rates, and official languages acquisition. What might be at issue, however, is not so much the degree of integration into Canadian society as the type of society into which immigrants are integrating. Much of the opposition to multicultural citizenship possibly comes from the fact it suggests a very different conception of the Canadian nation than the older ideal common before World War II. In this sense, the matter at hand is not so much integration but the character of Canada and the meaning of Canadian citizenship.
This point might even be truer with regard to Québec. Québécois claim to have a distinct national language and culture, political institutions, and collective rights which seem alien to many English-Canadians. The multicultural citizenship promoted in English-Canadian schools has done little to alter the sense of national difference of Québécois or to win their sympathy for Canada. The results of the Québec Referendum of October 30, 1995 were so close (50.6 percent voted *Non* and 49.4 percent voted *Oui*) that many Canadians realized how necessary it was to do something to keep the country together. Having long assumed that the *Non* forces would win easily, as prime minister Chrétien implied, many English-Canadians were shocked by the results. This referendum, says Beiner (1998), “was profoundly traumatizing for English Canada […] [It is] like learning that the country has just had a death sentence passed upon it” (p. 193).

Moreover, McRoberts (1997) notes that most English-Canadians did not understand why so many Québécois favoured the sovereignist option. But almost 50 percent of Québécois (over 60 percent of francophones) were so dissatisfied with the reactions of English-Canadians to constitutional changes that they were prepared to leave the country. For Ignatieff (1993), most Québécois have never needed Canada as a nation. Many of them are now convinced they do not even need it as a state.

In this context, several organizations such as the Dominion Institute and Celebration Canada were created by English-Canadians to analyze ‘what went wrong’ and foster a greater sense of belonging to Canada. The Dominion Institute, for example, has sponsored several pan-Canadian surveys in 1997, 1998, and 1999 that revealed a large number of English-Canadians and Québécois students (and adults) lack both civic and historical knowledge of their country.¹⁰

**1.4 Two views of Canada and Canadian citizenship**

Since its creation as a state in 1867, Canada has experienced different types of nationalism and federalism largely because of the historical tensions between English and
French-Canadians. At the time of Confederation, francophones, mainly but not exclusively found in the province of Québec, identified with a Canadien nationality dating back to New France. This nationality relied heavily on the survivance of the French language, Catholic religion, and a rural environment and economy. As Martel (1998) puts it in his historical analysis of French Canada:

The accent [of the French-Canadian identity] was on cultural and religious dimensions, that is the French language and the Catholic faith. These elements were associated with an idealized lifestyle in a rural environment and an agricultural vocation thought most likely to guarantee the survival of French Canada. (p. 6)

The British Conquest of 1759 did not produce this Canadien nationality but it contributed to the attachment of francophones to their distinct religion, culture, and language. The 1774 Québec Act, which recognized the seigneurial system, Catholic religion and the French legal system (Code Napoléon) of Canadiens, and the 1791 Constitutional Act, which established representative democracy and the creation of Lower Canada (Québec), formalized the link between francophones and their distinct nationality. As two Canadien delegates sent to London in 1784 to propose the creation of two Canadas put it in a letter to their compatriotes:

Le gouvernement [britannique] conçoit aisément que nous formons la généralité des individus de notre province. La disproportion de dix-neuf à un est trop frappante pour n'être pas observée par la partie généreuse et impartiale du reste de la nation [...] Nous sommes donc, ainsi que vous le voyez, suffisamment encouragés à croire que, si nous désirons fortement un amendement du bill de Québec, nous l'obtiendrons et que, si nous croyons que l'établissement d'une maison d'assemblée dans laquelle nous serions
After 1791, several French/English conflicts erupted in Lower Canada on linguistic, religious, and cultural grounds. The most significant one was the Rebellion of the Patriotes in 1837-1838, which led to Lord Durham's report. For Durham, French/English dualism was the heart of the problems in the colony. In one passage of his famous report he declared: "I expected to find a contest between a government and a people, I found two nations warring in the bosom of a single state" (Durham as quoted in McRoberts, 1997, p. 5). The solution, for Lord Durham, needed to bring peace and order was the amalgamation of the two Canadas to assimilate the Canadien nation; a nation, according to him, with no history, no literature, and accordingly, no future. But even with the Act of Union of 1840, which abolished the two Canadas and placed francophones in a precarious situation of assimilation, the Canadiens maintained even more ardently a distinct nationality that frustrated the British-Canadian settlers.

Indeed, at the time of Confederation most English-Canadians did not have a typically Canadian nationality. Unlike French-Canadians, their national identity transcended the boundaries of Canada. They saw themselves as members of a British nationality established in a new colony, and later Dominion. This British-Canadian nationality referred essentially to white, anglophone Protestants, loyal to the British Empire. With time, the term Canadien was appropriated to designate all residents of Canada, francophone and anglophone. To distinguish themselves from anglophones, francophones then began to adopt a Canadiens français identity.

In his analysis of Québec history, Lacoursière (1995) comments on this situation in Lower Canada: "Ceux qui, depuis 1760, ont choisi de venir s'établir dans la province de Québec, portent toujours le nom d'Anglais ou d'anciens sujets. Quelques-uns commencent à s'appeler
Canadiens, appelation réservée jusqu’ici aux nouveaux sujets d’origine française” (p. 461). Yet, as Brunet (1954) has noted, many francophones continued to called themselves Canadien and assumed that the term designated their own distinct nationality.

In the late 19th and early 20th century, a number of factors contributed to the elaboration of various identities within the Canadian federation. Not only English-Canadians started to adopt a purely Canadian identity, especially after World War I, but within the French-Canadian nation differences emerged between Québec and francophones communities outside Québec (Martel, 1998). A whole series of events led French-Canadian political élites to question the foundation and viability of a single nation canadienne-française. Among these was the hanging of Louis Riel in 1885, the abolition of the dual school system in Manitoba in 1890, the inability of the federal government to guarantee the rights of French-Canadian Catholics in Alberta and Saskatchewan in 1905, as well as in B.C. since 1871 and, finally, the controversial Regulation 17 adopted by the government of Ontario in 1912 which prohibited French-language instruction beyond the first two years of schooling. To preserve the rights of all French-Canadians and assure their survival, the politician and founder of Le Devoir newspaper, Henri Bourassa, proposed to his compatriotes in English Canada a different framework for understanding the Canadian federation. Instead of viewing Confederation as a pact between colonies, he offered the notion of a ‘double compact,’ a pact between two peoples: French and English. In 1903, Bourassa explained his views in the Nationaliste newspaper:

Notre nationalisme à nous est le nationalisme canadien fondé sur la dualité des races et sur les traditions particulières que cette dualité comporte. Nous travaillons au développement du patriotisme canadien qui est à nos yeux la meilleure garantie de l’existence des deux races et du respect mutuel qu’elles se doivent. (as quoted in Lacoursière, 1997, p. 42)
But the recognition and survival of this political concept of a French-Canadian nation could only be achieved through concerted actions by the federal and all provincial governments. Leaders of all French-Canadian institutional networks had to cooperate more closely to create a sense of solidarity and form a unit of collective decision and action. Despite the good will of many French-Canadian politicians, clergy, and laymen in the first half of the 20th century to create a national institutional network (the *Ordre de Jacques-Cartier* also known as 'La Patente'), a major split occurred between Québec and the francophone communities outside Québec in the second half of the 20th century.

In the late 1950s, various modernization factors contributed to the development of different forms of nationalism in Canada. In the heart of French Canada (Québec), some scholars in academic circles reconceptualized the notion of *la nation canadienne-française*. Historians like Frégaught, Séguin, and Brunet proposed a definition of national identity in Québec that differed significantly from the one echoed by historians of earlier generations such as Groulx. For Brunet (1954), non-territorial national duality was doomed. He proposed, therefore, a vision of Canadian duality based on territorial national entity. Québec would become the central agent of collective action and identification for French-Canadians. In this view, francophone minorities in English Canada were inevitably destined to be assimilated into the English-Canadian (or American) nation.

In the 1960s, the notion of a French-Canadian nation was gradually replaced by a Québec nation — and even the 'state of Québec' (*L'État québécois*) — for francophone Québécois (see Martel, 1998). Initiated by the Liberal government of Lesage, with the slogan *il faut que ça change* in 1960, the Quiet Revolution (*La Révolution tranquille*) led to long needed social, political, and economic reforms that contributed to the emergence of a new modern identity connected to a liberal political ideology. In their analysis of the premises of the Quiet Revolution, Linteau et al. (1989) note that this key period is characterized by:
Des intellectuels, des artistes, des syndicalistes et des hommes politiques [qui] contestent ouvertement le duplessisme. Ils dénoncent le climat idéologique étouffant, qualifié de “grande noirceur”. S’inspirant tantôt de personnalisme chrétien, tantôt du keynésianisme, tantôt de l’internationalisme qui fleurit après la guerre, ils réclament une modernisation de la société, de ses valeurs et de ses institutions. Ils veulent plus de justice sociale et une large ouverture sur le monde. (p. 210)

In focusing exclusively on the province of Québec, francophone Québécois could think of themselves less as a minority in Canada and more as a Québec collectivity within their “territorial network” (Balthazar, 1996, p. 82). With the historical assault of English-Canadians on French language and education outside Québec, French-Canadians in Québec realized that if they were to survive, it would be as a society within their own province. Only in Québec, where French-Canadians were the overwhelming majority, was it possible to imagine “the full economic, social, and cultural institutions of a modern society functioning in the French language” (McRoberts, 1997, p. 32).

In the 1970s, René Lévesque and the members of the Parti Québécois (PQ) argued that full sovereignty was necessary to shape the province into a secure French-speaking nation-state, while agreeing to respect minority rights for anglophones. O’Keefe (1998) suggests that the historical pattern of assimilation among francophones outside Québec has increased dramatically over the last 30 years making some Québécois fear they could face a similar situation.¹¹

In this context, for Québécois the Québec government came to be the primary tool for collective actions. The new ‘state of Québec’ became a ‘good’ in itself. For Fortin, writing about the proponents of a modern Québec nationalism during the Quiet Revolution, “leur idéologie du progrès et du développement s’appuie sur une conception égalitaire de la société et sur l’idée
qu’il faut donner à l’État [québécois] un rôle prédominant” (Fortin as quoted in Resnick, 1990, p. 65). The strategy was, therefore, to make Québécois maîtres chez nous, and only through the intervention of the provincial government could Québec promote its modern ‘common good.’

The originality of the strategy was the combination of Québec nationalism with liberalism. As noted by several observers (McRoberts, 1997, Dion, 1975), the Quiet Revolution can only be seen as an expression of liberal ideals. The government replaced the Catholic clergy as the leading institution in the collective lives of Québécois. Francophone ownership of the economy increased drastically as salaries caught up with those of anglophones, a confident new bourgeoisie emerged, French became the official language of the province (Bill 101), and finally Québécois, moving from la survivance to l’épanouissement, recognized the pluralistic nature of modern Québec. Crown corporations such as Hydro-Québec, the Société Générale de Financement, the Caisse de Dépôts, and a growing number of Québec private firms like Bombardier, Lavalin, Québecor, and Power Corporation came to symbolize the new industrial, modern Québec.

In education, the Liberal government honoured one of its campaign promises by initiating in 1961 a Royal Commission of Inquiry on Education with an extremely broad mandate authorizing a complete examination of all types and levels of education in Québec. The Parent Commission — in the name of its chair Monseigneur Parent, vice-rector of Laval University — spent seven months in public hearings and several others collecting extensive data on education in North America and Europe. In 1963, the Commission published its first report dealing primarily with the control and organization of the education system (see Stevenson, 1970). It recommended the creation of a secular Ministry of Education which would be the source of authority for both private and public education (francophone and anglophone). It also recommended the appointment of a Superior Council of Education to advise the Minister of Education and to act as a means of communication between the public and the government.
Following most recommendations of the Parent Commission, the government passed in 1964 the famous Bill 60 which established for the first time since 1875 a Ministry of Education. "Bill 60," claims Stevenson (1970), "represented the heart of the education revolution in Québec" (p. 476). More importantly, one member of the Commission, Rocher (1989), argues that Bill 60 and the reform of education that followed constituted nothing less than the core of the whole Quiet Revolution. As he puts it:

A cette époque-là, la réflexion sur la réforme de l’enseignement se trouvait à toucher la fine pointe du changement social, économique et culturel qui marquait ce qu’on appelait déjà "la Révolution tranquille". C’est vers l’enseignement que l’on se tournait surtout, parce qu’on croyait que pour changer la société, édifier un Québec nouveau, il fallait rebâtir le système d’enseignement de nouvelles assises. On croyait volontiers que le système d’enseignement avait une grande influence sur l’avenir économique et culturel d’une nation. (Rocher, 1989, pp. 47-49)

Following Bill 60, the Parent Commission presented other recommendations (in its volumes II, III, IV, V, and Report) dealing with the programmes of studies, the organization of public and private schools, and post-secondary education. According to the Parent Commission, education and more specifically teaching was to aim at individual instruction, overall development of the child, and the stimulation of creativity among students. Overall, the Parent Commission typically adopted the features of neo-progressive educational reforms taking place in English Canada and the United States at the time.

Despite some controversies (especially with the clergy), and slowdowns in the implementation of the recommendations after 1966, the reform of education represented a revolutionary project for the modernization of Québec society. Not only did it lead to the
creation of a secular Ministry of Education, but to the birth of a complete public education system, from kindergarten to university, with serious concern for social equality. Even today, Québec continues to be one of the provinces with the most generous system of student loans (for Québécois) and with the lowest fees for post-secondary education.

In this context, the government of Québec came to be “the moteur principal of the new Quebec nation” (McRoberts, 1997, p. 32). With the death of French Canada, Québécois, particularly francophones, feel the Québec government looks after their interests better than the federal government. As a result, they are correspondingly more attached and loyal to the former. Pinard (1978), supporting this view, once argued that “if there is a system of dual loyalties, loyalty to Québec nevertheless seems often much stronger than loyalty to Ottawa” (p. 12). With such a set of dual loyalties, patriotism for Canada never spread to the whole Canadian population as in traditional nation-states, even after the liberalization of Québec society. What this means is that Québécois have adopted a conception of Canadian citizenship which sustains their national culture and identity while allowing them to remain officially Canadian. Their sense of belonging to the sovereign state (Canada) is, thus, combined with a strong attachment to and participation in what might be called their ‘national province,’ Québec.

For their part, English-Canadians also developed a liberal-civic nationalism in the 1950s and 1960s. But, unlike Québec nationalism, Canadian nationalism, is closely tied to the federal state and has evolved differently. With a population less and less British, repetitive waves of immigrants coming from all over the world (not exclusively from the Western Europe), and the increasing importance of Canada internationally, the sense of a British nationality (already in serious decline) atrophied among English-Canadians during the second half of 20th century. Following World War II, the federal government adopted the Canadian Citizenship Act in 1946, appeals to the Privy Council in London were abolished in 1949, and for the first time in Canadian history a Canadian, Vincent Massey, was appointed governor-general in 1952. The
British term ‘Dominion’ was quickly discarded and replaced by the ‘Government of Canada’ as the federal government started to play a more active (and national) role not only in Canadian politics and social affairs but also in international relations (see Resnick, 1990).

By and large, the old British-Canadian nationalism — clearly expressed by the first prime minister Macdonald who once proudly claimed ‘A British subject I was born, a British subject I shall die’ — was replaced with a new conception of Canadian nationalism directly attached to the development of the Canadian state and pan-Canadian social programs and policies. As Resnick (1990) puts it in his study of nationalism and federalism in Canada:

[I]n English Canada, nationalism remains closely tied to the federal state […]

[It] remains linked to governmental programs and policies, and the key debates — from free trade to foreign policy to public v. private ownership — typically revolve around the use (or misuse) of state power. (p. 220)

In the early 1960s, despite the massive post-war expansion of the federal government, the Liberal federal government of prime minister Lester B. Pearson tried to accommodate Québec nationalism. Unlike his predecessor, prime minister Louis St-Laurent, Pearson’s political strategy was to adopt a vision of Canada that would respect the dualistic view held by French-Canadians. As he stated in Québec city in 1963, right in the middle of the Quiet Revolution:

“While Quebec is a province in this national confederation, it is more than a province because it is the heartland of a people: in a very real sense it is a nation within a nation” (Pearson as quoted in McRoberts, 1997, p. 40). The same year, he established a Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, originally suggested by a leading Québec intellectual and editor of Le Devoir newspaper, André Laurendeau. The mandate of the so-called ‘B and B Commission’ was to inquire into and report on the steps that should be taken “to develop the Canadian Confederation on the basis of an equal partnership between the two founding races […]” (Royal Commission
In its first volume, the Commission suggested that bilingualism was necessary for all the institutions shared by Canadians. Official bilingualism was essential to the 'equal partnership' between the founding peoples. Similarly, it recommended that Canada be organized on the principle of biculturalism, defining culture as "a driving force animating a significant group of individuals united by a common tongue, and sharing the same customs, habits, and experiences" (Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission, 1967, p. xxxi). For the Commission, the equal partnership meant not only the equality of citizens but also the equality between the founding national communities.

Yet, the arrival in 1967 of a young French-Canadian intellectual and founder of the magazine *Cité Libre*, Pierre E. Trudeau, changed the dualist approach of the Liberal government of Pearson. First as minister of justice, and then as the successor of prime minister Pearson, Trudeau — apparently speaking for all French-Canadians — offered a vision of Canada radically different from his predecessor. Rejecting the principles of the Quiet Revolution in Québec, he presented a set of ideological views not just on Québec and Canada, but on politics in general. At the center of his ideology was the supremacy of the individual in liberal democracy. For him, Canada could not be understood as a pact between nations because certain groups of people would get a special role or status within the federation; something unacceptable at the individual level. "Seule la personne humaine," he once claimed, "est porteuse de droits; la collectivité peut seulement détener ces droits, qu'elle exerce en fiducie, pour ces membres et à certaines conditions" (1998, p. 92). Prime minister Trudeau was explicitly opposed to Québec nationalism. A nationalist movement, according to him, not only opposed his understanding of liberal democracy but offered only a limited future to French-Canadians. As he put it in 1968, "the people of Quebec don't want special status, treatment or privilege. They don't need a wheelchair or a crutch to get along" (Trudeau as quoted McRoberts, 1997, p. 74).
Prime minister Trudeau offered all Canadians a vision of their country based upon panCanadian bilingualism, a sense of justice, individual rights, and respect of diversity. To achieve his goal, he first contributed to the adoption of the Official Languages Act in 1969, he then opposed biculturalism by adopting a policy of multiculturalism in 1971, which recognized all cultures not only the two historical ones. As he stated in 1971, “toute personne qui habite au Canada fait maintenant partie d’un groupe minoritaire […]. Nous n’avons pas d’autre choix que de tolérer nos différences respectives […]. Notre société est aussi nuancée que colorée. Elle est multiculturelle” (Trudeau, 1998, p. 152). But his central achievement was the patriation of the Constitution in 1982 and the adoption of a Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Clearly, the Trudeau’s strategy was to create a pan-Canadian identity through official bilingualism, respect of diversity, and a constitutional charter. In this context, Quebec would be treated just like any other province, a province of multilingual and multicultural Canadian citizens. In his analysis of prime minister Trudeau, McRoberts (1997) rightly argues:

[T]he Trudeau government tried to confront Québec nationalism head on and to replace it with a Canadian identity. By and large the federal government acted as if Quebec were simply a province like others, and avoided policies that threatened to suggest otherwise. (p. 76)

In Québec, this new pan-Canadian strategy has not gone uncontested. Multiculturalism was denounced from the outset because it represented a negation of the ‘two nations’ suggested by the ‘B and B Commission’ and central to the Québécois conception of Canada. As Rocher put it in 1976:

French-Canadians have struggled for generations to have bilingualism accepted […] By separating bilingualism from biculturalism, the Trudeau government is betraying all the hopes French-Canadians might have placed in
bilingualism, as they conceived it — that is, clearly tied to its symbol and essential condition, biculturalism. (p. 52)

Similarly, in protecting individual rights and official languages throughout Canada, prime minister Trudeau thought Québécois would cease looking to the Québec government as the only protector of their national interests, and start placing their confidence in the federal government, their ‘national’ government. If minority language rights were protected throughout the country, then “the French-Canadian nation would stretch from Maillardville in British Columbia to the Acadian community on the Atlantic coast” (McRoberts, 1997, p. 65). But this ‘national unity’ strategy designed to transform how Québécois see their country and themselves has largely failed. Ironically, this strategy initiated by a French-Canadian has gained strong adherents outside Québec, especially among the Canadians of neither British nor French origin. But many Québécois have systematically rejected this multicultural strategy with two official languages as a definition of their place in the federation.

For Québécois, Canadian federalism is understood as a way for accommodating the national aspirations of a people composing the state, while providing the economic, military, and sociopolitical benefits of participation in a sovereign state (Kymlicka, 1998, p. 135). In this sense, many Québécois (a majority so far) think that Canadian federalism allows them enough ‘self-realization,’ that they do not need an independent state in order to rule themselves and protect their societal culture. For them, federalism is a way of guaranteeing equality of peoples, d’égal à égal, without being fully sovereign. Canadian federalism has, so far, allowed Québécois substantial powers regarding education, language, culture, manpower, and immigration to sustain their national culture and promote solidarity and equality of opportunity in the public and private sectors, while allowing Québécois to preserve their historical attachment to Canada and Canadian institutions.
Consequently, for Québécois a federal state refers to "a form of political organization in which [federal] governmental institutions are capable of maintaining order and implementing rules or laws (through coercion if necessary) over a given population and within a given territory" (Jackson & Jackson, 1998, p. 16). States are, therefore, defined in terms of their relation to power and sovereignty. So, Canada is clearly a state but not necessarily a nation because the population forming the state lacks group affinity and a single national culture. As Resnick (1994) points out, "[t]he evolution of Canada since 1867 has been not from colony to nation but from dominion to state" (p. 70). So, for Québécois, Canada is sociologically speaking a 'multinational' federation, that is, a federal state made up of various national communities.

On the other hand, most English-Canadians have a "territorial conception of the federation" (Kymlicka, 1998, p. 136). Federalism is adopted because it provides a means by which a single national community (Canadian) can divide and diffuse power to the territorial entities (provinces). As I have argued, the federal system is very useful in the case of a population resident on a large territory, and with strong regional affiliation, because it reduces the 'danger of tyranny,' and provides greater room for provincial or regional accommodations. In this sense, English-Canadians conceptions of national identity included all Canadian members, whatever their language or culture, from sea to sea. Their loyalty to Canada is premised on the view that "all Canadians form a single nation, and that the federal government should act to express and promote this common national identity [and citizenship]" (Kymlicka, 1998, p. 141). They reject asymmetrical federalism, that is, the idea of a special status for Québec, because it is contrary to the equality of individuals and provinces, and, more importantly, it threatens their conception of a pan-Canadian national identity which includes all Québécois despite their different languages or cultural identities. Because of this view, many English-Canadians do not understand or recognize that Québécois have a distinct national identity related to their history, language, culture, and institutions. As Webber (1993) concludes,
to have a real country for English-Canadians implies that people “should not be treated as
French-Canadians or English-Canadians, or even aboriginal or non-aboriginal Canadians [...].
They must be Canadian first, each treated, under the constitution, simply as Canadian” (p. 142).

This is the reason why many English-Canadians claim that the federal government should
enforce ‘national standards’ for social programs and public services, including public education.
They view support for national standards as a basis for a pan-Canadian citizenship. Francis
(1997) notes that national standards and national programs have replaced the railway (Canadian
Pacific Railway) in the imagination of English-Canadians as a symbol of Canadian unity.

But, as McRoberts (1997) observes, this pan-Canadian vision of nationalism and
federalism does not really help the debate. On the contrary, it may just contribute to the
destruction of the ‘two solitudes.’ As prime minister Pearson put it in his Memoirs: “By forcing a
— centralism perhaps acceptable to some provinces but not to Québec, and by insisting that Quebec
must be like the others, we could destroy Canada” (Pearson, 1975, p. 239).

1.5 The purpose of this study

The survival and flourishing of a democratic state is a complicate matter. As Canadians
know, democracy is not a natural form of political association. It requires various civic
competencies from its citizens: the literacy required to understand the different communities and
state in which citizens live, the ability to think critically and address upcoming issues, the sense
of solidarity necessary to act collectively as free, democratic citizens, and the empathy that
permits people to accommodate others, these are not innate human properties. They must be
learned. Citizenship education provides a means to prepare students for their future lives as
democratic citizens. As Audigier (1999a) rightly notes:

[Les] jeunes qui sont aujourd’hui [en l’an 2000] à l’École auront le monde en
charge entre 2010-2015 et 2050-2060 […]; nous ne les formons pas pour
répondre aux questions d’hier, mais à celles qu’ils auront à résoudre demain,
nous les formons pour que ces réponses respectent un ensemble de principes et
de valeurs autour de la citoyenneté démocratique et des droits de l’homme
[sic]. (p. 6)

Public schools have historically been considered as places where young people formally
learn about citizenship and, in so doing, construct both their personal and collective identities.
By the 20th century, Osborne argues (1999), it had been clear to democratic governments that
public school systems “were intended above all to turn children into useful citizens” (p. 9). “De
Condorcet à Jefferson, en passant par une quantité de penseurs et d’éducateurs,” Audigier
(1999a) adds, “le lien École, citoyenneté, démocratique est fondateur. L’École et, en son sein,
l’éducation à la citoyenneté ont pour finalité la formation d’un ‘bon citoyen’” (p. 6).

The Canadian experiment I presented in the introduction of this chapter suggests that both
brothers had legally the same citizenship. Even if one brother was from Montréal and the other
from Vancouver, they were both legally members of the same state: Canada. However, their
understandings of the concept seemed quite different at first sight. Although they were relatively
young, their values, knowledge, and representations of society, as well as their collective
memory, had been greatly influenced by several agencies such as the family, peers, media, and
schools. For Sigel and Hoskin (1981), adolescence is not likely to be a ‘peak period’ for political
engagement. But, it is the period when democratic beliefs become firmly anchored, when
political awareness acquires structure, and when political preferences are developed to enhance
the likelihood of active, informed adult citizenship. This significance is eloquently described by
Adelson: “Adolescence is where serious politics begins and where, in many cases, it ends” (as
insisted that this relationship between citizenship and education is historical. Following Plato and
Aristotle, they have affirmed principles embodied in the phrases ‘As is the state, so is the school,’ or ‘What you want in the state, you must put into the school.’

Research in the area of political socialization, that is, the study of political learning, confirms that schools greatly influence the political orientations and attitudes of students (see Easton & Dennis, 1969). Hess and Torney (1970), determined that the school “stands out as the central, salient, and dominant force in the political socialization of the young child” (p. 74). The influence of family is, of course, considerable but, in their opinion, much less than it has been assumed by many researchers. Gellner (1994) concludes that if the family facilitates the task of education, it is public schooling and its medium of instruction, that is, a common public language, that create citizens. For Postman (1996), what makes public schooling important for the state is not so much that it is publicly funded or that schools serve a public, but rather it establishes us as a ‘public.’ By trying to build the right kind of public, schools contribute toward strengthening the virtues necessary for the survival and health of our democratic societies. In many ways, the school engenders the civic competencies indispensable for democratic citizens. Barber (1992) argues that “formal schooling [is] our sole public resource: the only place where, as a collective, self-conscious public pursuing common goods, we try to shape our children to live in a democratic world” (pp. 14-15).

Since the introduction of public schooling over a century ago, Canadians have consistently perceived schools as a “powerful shaper of citizenship” (Osborne, 1996, p. 31). As the Manitoba Minister of Education put it in 1916:

The reason why the state assumes to interfere is two-fold. First, it does so for its own protection. Boys and girls, the citizens of the future, must be qualified to discharge the duties of citizenship. Second, the state interferes in education for the benefit of the children themselves, who must [be] fitted to aid
themselves so that they may not become a charge on the public. (as quoted in Osborne, 1996, p. 33)

This concern with citizenship in public schools, particularly in Western provinces with their more heterogeneous population, was, until the 1960s, directly connected to the perceived necessity of assimilating everyone into ethnic definitions of Canadian citizenship, modelled on the majority anglophone population (so-called 'Anglo-conformity') for English-Canadians and on French, Catholic and rural-agricultural traditions for French-Canadians in Québec. School subjects such as history, civics, and social studies were assigned a prominent role in this enterprise (see Clark, 1997). All these subjects were designed, not only to convey knowledge, but to create a sense of national identity and patriotism (Osborne, 1997b). As Stearns, Seixas, and Wineburg (2000) put it: “Given the inherent moral implications of any historical narrative, insofar as school history engages with and shapes a collective memory, it is inherently political [...]” (p. 9).

If school history was — and continues to be — a tool for nation-building, Western provinces (including B.C.), influenced by the creation of the discipline of 'social studies' in the United States in the 1920s and 1930s, decided to combine material from history, geography, and other social sciences into a single subject area (see Davis, 1995). Other provinces, including Québec and Ontario, have preferred to maintain the tradition of distinct school subjects such as history and geography. But whether it is through history or social studies, all provincial governments, including Québec, have considered these schools subjects as central to the formation of 'good' citizens.

On the one hand, history and social studies programs, in all provinces have moved away from the earlier rhetoric of British-Canadian or French-Canadian nationalism and have accepted that Canada is a country of cultural, religious, and regional differences. Human rights and law-
related education have also received more attention in the official curriculum (Tomkins, 1986). These subjects are seen as new elements in the definition of citizenship and citizenship education.

On the other hand, Sears and Hughes (1996) argued that the concept of citizenship is presented in uniform terms in citizenship education. The country continues to be viewed as a nation made up of ten equal provinces having no need to recognize the special demands of Québécois and aboriginal peoples (see Sears, Clarke & Hughes, 1998). For them, Canadians and Canada are still presented in ‘conservative terms’ in citizenship education. For example, until very recently, British Columbia’s social studies curricula presented Canadian history as “the development of Canada as a nation” (B.C. Ministry of Education, 1988, p. 53). Similarly, the Alberta social studies curriculum (grade 8) states in its rationale that “the study of history and geography in the Western Hemisphere will provide students with an increased understanding of Canada as a North American nation and contribute to the requirements of citizenship” (Alberta Department of Learning, 1989, p. 14). More interestingly, in the section on issues and inquiry questions, the same curriculum encourages teachers to ask students “How did Canada become a nation?” (ibid, p. 17). This means that in the curriculum all Canadians are seen as equal members of the same nation, despite their different languages and cultures. Many of these recent documents give a greater place to French-Canadians in the building of Canada. For example, the Ontario Canadian and World Studies curriculum (1999), recommends a better “understanding of the main steps in the development of French-English relations” (p. 25).

None of these official documents encourages English-speaking teachers or students to reconsider their understandings of Canada as a multicultural nation-state. Rather, they obscure the tensions between Québec and English Canada in discussions about cultural pluralism and diversity (see Lévesque, 2001). Similarly, in these documents the term ‘nation’ has often been replaced with ‘community,’ ‘society,’ or ‘democracy.’
Unfortunately, recent studies in citizenship education discuss the issue only in terms of policy statements and curricula. Since the publication of Hodgetts’ report on civic education 30 years ago (Hodgetts, 1968), “we have very little information on what is actually going on in [English-Canadian and Québec] classrooms, or on how students or teachers see things” (Osborne, 1994, p. 27). Studies conducted in the 1980s and 1990s are concerned with official curricula, policy statements, and textbooks, which often convey to students some forms of ideal citizenship. Few scholars in the last two decades have spent time in English-Canadian and Québec classrooms studying citizenship education, and more importantly, how these ideas become part of students’ lives.

Studies have attempted to reduce the problem to content analysis and to equate official curricula with the taught and the learned curricula (Cuban, 1993). For Sears (1996b), there is some indication that classroom practice may not be consistent with policy in citizenship education. Literature in this area confirms that there is a gap between ‘policy’ and ‘practice.’ As a result, what happens in classrooms with regard to citizenship education “is an area in which extensive study is needed” (Sears, 1996b, p. 125).

The purpose of this dissertation is to describe and understand (1) what teachers formally and informally present to high school students in citizenship education, and, more importantly (2) what students learn from these classes in B.C. and Québec. More specifically, the research theory and the model of analysis for the study are based on both the literature in political theory and citizenship education. In reviewing literature in these areas, particular attention is given to that dealing with the relationship of citizenship to the Canadian state and to Canadian education, in both English Canada and Québec.

This research is a qualitative inquiry (Eisner, 1998; Glesne & Peshkin, 1992), using a multiple-case study design (Yin, 1994). Two multi-ethnic high schools, one in Québec and one in B.C., will provide a window into history and social studies classrooms. These classes will be
used to examine how students construct and understand their citizenship in light of their experience in school. The choice of multi-ethnic schools is clearly related to my interest in pluralism and nationalism in public education. In this study, ‘multi-ethnic’ refers to schools where the dominant language spoken is either French or English, and the student population represents the cultural diversity of our Canadian urban centers. The classrooms are chosen since much of the burden of Canadian citizenship has officially been assigned to history (grade 10) in Québec and social studies (grade 11) classes in B.C. (see Osborne, 1996; Laville, 1997).

In Québec, Montréal was chosen because it is the most multi-ethnic and predominantly francophone city in North America. Founded by Paul de Chomedey de Maisonneuve in 1642 (as Ville-Marie), it was until the 1980s, the economic heart of the country and the place of grandiose national projects (Expo 67) (see Morton, 1997). Today, the Montréal region receives the greatest majority of Québec immigrants. Ethnocultural and linguistic diversity now characterizes the Montréal public school system. In 1996-1997, 38.3 percent of students in this region reported a mother tongue other than French, English or an Aboriginal language, compared to 8.2 percent of students in Québec generally (MEQ, 1998a, p. 3). The Ministry of Education has adopted in 1998 a plan of action to support actively all Montréal schools and provide more resources to schools with a high percentage of students with cultural, language, and learning difficulties.

For English Canada, the reasons for choosing B.C. as the English-Canadian province are both personal and political. Having spent over three years in this Western province, I have had the opportunity to meet people, establish links, and exchange various ideas and point of views on many topics such as politics, race relations, environmental issues, and (the lack of a common) history. All these formal and informal discussions gave me a valuable experience of how British Columbians think and live in their day-to-day life. B.C. is the largest western province. Though slightly smaller in area and population than Quebec and Ontario, it has emerged in recent years as a third force in Confederation (Friesen, 1999, p. 67). In the last fifteen years the population
and economy of B.C. have grown constantly, making Vancouver, its metropolis, the most prominent multi-ethnic urban center west of Toronto (Friesen, 1999). The Lower Mainland, for which Vancouver serves as the urban core, accounts for greater than half of the 4 million of B.C. residents and offers a vibrant mixture of ethnic groups\textsuperscript{16}, around 25 percent of the province’s population is of foreign origin, and this percentage doubles in some areas of the Lower Mainland (see Jackson & Jackson, 1998, p. 102). Although English Canada embraces several regions, B.C. offers an interesting ‘regional culture.’ Many English-Canadians, particularly on the West Coast, strongly oppose special status for Québec. They are asking for better representation in the federal system, as well as an equality of all provinces, including Québec.\textsuperscript{17} For Jackson and Jackson (1997):

A dominant perception of Canada’s national needs has been built around the concept of two founding peoples because of the long historical relationships between French and English-Canadians. This is not, however, the western vision of Canada. Since the population is ethnically varied and relatively new to the West, the people do not tend to state their interests in terms of early history of central and eastern Canada. (p. 103)

Based on his recent analysis of B.C. regionalism and Canadian politics, Resnick (2000) adds that this Western province has clearly developed a strong sense of regional distinctiveness flowing from “its geographical position, its resource economy, its historical development, and its idiosyncratic political traditions” (p. 20). While a small minority supports a sovereignist option for B.C., most British Columbians assume they are first and foremost Canadian citizens. Their regional culture, although distinct, is part of English-Canadians’ imagined community that they call Canada.


1.6 Review

This study deals with the question of the understandings of citizenship education in English-Canadian and Québec high schools. Citizenship has many different moral and practical meanings for citizens. Consequently, when we speak of education for citizenship, misunderstandings often arise, particularly between our two historical national groups.

I assume that if Canadian schools have to teach about citizenship, we must urgently reconsider our conceptions of citizenship based on the nation-state model. Citizenship has to be viewed as a unifying democratic force, not a divisive element for citizens forming the state. This means adapting our public schools and citizenship education programs and practices to both the multicultural and multinational realities of Canada.

But, to do so, we must first have a clearer sense of both the actual citizenship education practices and students' understandings in both English Canada and Québec. “By neglecting the slow process of formal education,” Hodgetts (1968) claims, “a society can fail to provide the public support, the basic consensus, needed to ensure its stability. In other words, it can fail, as we seem to have in the relations between our two major linguistic communities, to encourage the skilled and contemporary public opinion needed to resolve deep-seated differences [...]” (p. 14). I hope this thesis has the potential to further our understanding of citizenship education as found in history and social studies classrooms in Québec and B.C.

1 Many critics of nationalism strongly oppose the principle that if citizens have multiple identities, national identity should take priority over the others. They argue that such a belief implies (1) that one’s nation is superior to others; and (2) that one’s own nation enjoy greater benefits than other nations. Nathanson (1993, p. 189) argues, however, that the claim of anti-nationalists is hard to accept today. On the one hand, many of the ‘goods’ that citizens experience appear to have meaning apart from their connection to the larger community. For instance, the love of children for parents appears to be a ‘good’ independent of its contribution or connection to the well-being of the nation. The same is true of the ‘good’ of friendship and compassion. On the other hand, one could argue for the priority of national identity because the nation provides a framework within which conflict between individuals and between groups can be resolved. If everyone puts family loyalty first, for example, and refuses to defer to the
judgement of the nation, there could be no social order. No one could live securely in their national community. This last argument for national ‘supremacy’ has some force especially in traditional nation-states. In multinational states, it is possible that the security of national members depends also on the authority of a ‘supranational’ entity, namely the state. In this case, national feelings must be coupled with a sense of belonging to the state. This is the reason why Taylor argues that Québécois have dual allegiances. They belong to both a nation (Québec) and a state (Canada), but not necessarily to a nation-state. They have some sort of transnational allegiances which bind them to Canada and Canadians.

2 This is not to say, however, that nations are ‘masquerades,’ or collectivities based on falsity and invention. As Anderson notes, all communities should not be distinguished by their falsity/genuineness but by their style in which they are imagined. After all, communities, whether they are nations or villages of face-to-face contacts, are imagined or mentally constructed. The contacts people have with outsiders, or their relations and connections to people they do not know, are all based on people’s imaginings.

3 Kymlicka (1995) argues that the United States could also be included since there are some small ‘isolated’ national minorities (e.g., Puerto Ricans, Native Americans, native Hawaiians) found within the limits of the state. He adds, however, that most American political theorists treat their country as a ‘polyethnic’ state rather than a truly ‘multinational’ state.

4 I have drawn freely from Robert Dahl’s discussion of democracy and citizenship for this section (see Dahl, 1998, pp. 26-32).

5 I use the term ‘commitment’ rather than duty or obligation since it refers to a moral engagement of citizens to assume particular roles or functions in a democracy. Duties and obligations often invoke the spectre of coercion and totalitarianism because they are viewed as imposed by the state and, thus, do not allow for assent and dissent.

6 In this research, I refer to the ‘public sphere’ in relation to the ‘private sphere.’ The public sphere represents a realm of dynamic and responsive public discourse and actions between the state and individuals. It includes also voluntary organizations, political parties, interest groups, and the market. In contrast, the private sphere, which relies on the right to privacy, consists of family life, networks of friends, and personal properties. As Janoski (1998) indicates, in many countries these two spheres tend to overlap so that the state is involved in some aspects of the private sphere (e.g., preventing child abuse, education), while parts of the state are sometimes treated as ‘private’ (e.g., intelligence agency, secret police, military units).

7 For instance, Delli Carpini and Keeter (1996) in What Americans Know About Politics And Why It Matters argue that a democratic system based on civic participation requires “underestimated amount of citizen input” (p. 3), and that factual knowledge about politics is a “critical component of citizenship” (p. 3), one that is essential if citizens are to take advantage of the civic opportunities afforded to them.

8 To this, one could add the Fall 2000 issue of Education Canada on democracy and education, as well as the November/December 1998 issue of Vie pédagogique on citizenship education.

9 For a good discussion of pluralism and race relations in the Canadian context, see the dissertation of Puttagunta (1998).

10 The Dominion Institute is an advocacy group created in 1997. It is committed to foster awareness of the links between civic, history and Canadian identity. The Fall 1997 Angus Reid survey, commissioned by the Institute,
concluded that 45 percent of respondents failed the exam immigrants have to pass to become Canadian citizens. As an example, one in three did not know that the Charter of Rights and Freedoms is the constitutional document that protects Canadian individual rights. Similarly, for the Canada Day celebration of 1998, an Angus Reid survey concluded that only one in two Canadian respondents could answer a list of 20 ‘basic’ historical and political questions about their country. For more information, see Kennedy (1997), Campbell (1997), and Bauch (1998).

11 The results of the 1996 census show that outside Québec, the francophone population declined 0.6 % (to 970,000) between 1991 and 1996. More than three-quarters (76 %) of francophones outside Québec lived in New Brunswick and Ontario. In both provinces, the proportion of francophones declined during the last five years (see Statistics Canada, 1997). Only in Québec did the proportion of francophones increase (2.8%) during that period.

12 In 1993, the Conseil Supérieur de l’Éducation (CSE) of Québec presented an extensive report on the integration of immigrants in Québec schools in which the CSE states that Québec has a distinct ‘common culture’ based on: French as the official language; a Judeo-Christian cultural tradition; a legal system based on British common law and French civil law along with a charter of rights; a parliamentary democracy based on freedom and equality of citizens; and, an economic system that includes private enterprise but also state-operated companies (see CSE, 1993, p. 72).

13 Following this line of argument, Ignatieff (1993) concluded in his analysis of Québec nationalism that “[the] Canadian federation’s essential problem has always been that Francophone Québécois identify Quebec as their nation and Canada as their state, while English-speaking Canadians identity Canada both as their nation and as their state” (p. 148).

14 Obviously not only democratic regimes have understood this principle. Autocratic countries around the world continue to teach their young members to become compliant and loyal ‘subjects’ of the state, undermining all chances of a democratic revolution. See the discussion of Gutmann (1989) on Undemocratic Education.

15 Davis (1995) notes, however, that Ontario was also influenced by the American social studies movement between 1937 and 1957, particularly at the elementary levels.

16 In this thesis, I use the terms ‘ethnic groups,’ ‘ethnocultural groups,’ and ‘immigrant groups’ interchangeably to refer to the (minority) groups of people formed through individual acts of immigration to Canada. As it is commonly accepted in the literature, these minority groups do not include aboriginal and French-Canadian ‘national’ groups which have always rejected such a classification for them because of their distinct collective goals and aspirations. For a more extensive discussion between ‘ethnic’ and ‘national’ groups, see Kymlicka (1998, pp. 6-8).

17 As an example of this anti-Québec sentiment on the West Coast, 68 percent of B.C. residents (one of the strongest oppositions) voted ‘No’ in the 1992 referendum on the Charlottetown Accord, which recognized in part the particular status of Québec (Resnick, 2000, p. 16).
II. THE ORIGINS OF MODERN CITIZENSHIP

In this chapter, I will discuss the origins of modern citizenship and the influence of liberalism on the evolution of the concept (section 1). Modern citizenship, I will argue, necessarily implies a direct relationship between citizens, community, and state (section 2). This direct-access relationship leads me to a discussion on the importance of legitimacy for the survival and stability of democratic regimes (section 3), and the conception of freedom necessary for such communities to develop and flourish (section 4). However, if self-government implies rights, freedom, and autonomy, a democratic state also requires a certain degree of commitment on the part of its citizens (section 5). The demands of commitment imply another notion, recognition, essential to individuals and collectivities, particularly in states with more than one national group (section 6).

2.1 The roots of 'liberal' citizenship

Philosophers agree that first conceptions of democratic citizenship began with the Greeks and their notion of the polis, about twenty-five hundred years ago. Classical Greece was not a country as we understand it today. The sovereign states of Greece (because there were many) were essentially 'city-states,' the most famous being Athens. These city-states were governed by an 'assembly' in which all citizens were entitled to participate. As Dahl (1998) suggests, it is the Greeks, probably the Athenians, who coined the term 'democracy,' or demokratia, from the Greek demos, the people, and kratos, to rule.¹

The current conception of citizenship, as we understand it today in our democracies, is bound up with the development of 'modern social conditions' (Sears, 1996b). The British theorist Marshall (1965) was one of the first post-war scholars to offer an articulated liberal
theory of citizenship. In his analysis of the United Kingdom, Marshall proposed a typology of citizenship rights (and obligations) that, he claimed, were necessary to the full and equal treatment of every member of a liberal society, the so-called ‘logic of equality.’ This treatment embodies an ideal of social justice where everyone is to enjoy redistributive entitlements, such as free health care and public schooling. The way to ensure this equality (and the integration) of citizens into a liberal society is through according all individuals a set of rights. In Marshall’s analysis, citizenship rights are divided into three categories: civil, political, and social. Civil rights arose in the 18th century and provided individuals protection from such things as arbitrary arrest and imprisonment. They also gave individuals the entitlement to a fair trial and due process if charged with a crime. Political rights arose in the 19th century. They accorded primarily the right to vote, to run for office, and to participate in public affairs (to men only at first). Social rights were established in the 20th century with the emergence of the welfare state. They embody the right to organize unions, to attend public school, to obtain social security and compensatory treatments like insurance and pension. Marshall (1965) argued that when any of these rights are violated, people will be marginalized and unable to participate fully in society. The extension of these rights to a wider range of people in western democracies has been a long and difficult process involving sometimes violent struggles.

The liberal theory of citizenship elaborated by Marshall has sparked debates in many countries around the world. Commenting on Marshall’s theory, Bottomore (1992) argues that political and civil rights have long been established only for adult, white males living in western societies. In Canada, for example, half of the population, that is, women, were deprived of political rights until the 20th century (see Strong-Boag, 1996). Racism was also another important barrier to full citizenship rights. In The Vertical Mosaic, Porter (1965) exposed the problem that some groups, like ethnic minorities, were systematically excluded from a full recognition and participation in the Canadian society.
Another concern for the development of liberal citizenship has been the connection with capitalism. Some contemporary liberals (Friedman, 1962; Hayek, 1960) have argued that respect for private property and very limited government actions are prerequisites for citizenship. Hayek (1960) argues that “all coercive action of government must be unambiguously determined by a permanent legal framework which enables the individual to plan with a degree of confidence which reduces human uncertainty as much as possible” (p.222). For Hayek (1960), governments are dangerous coercive institutions because they intervene in the economy.

Other scholars (Carnoy & Levin, 1985; Bowles & Gintis, 1976) suggest that “capitalism allows some individuals to gain economic power over others unfettered by democratic authority and that it creates a sector of society that operates nondemocratically” (Strike, 1991, p. 418). For them, capitalism is inconsistent with democracy because it perpetuates economical inequalities (see Dougherty & Hammack, 1990). As a result, some liberal thinkers like Rawls (1971) and Dworkin (1984) advocate certain welfare rights that Hayek opposes.

We see that the terms ‘equality’ and ‘inequality’ as well as ‘liberty’ may take a variety of forms when discussing citizenship depending on the perspective adopted. This is one reason why Resnick (1990) suggests that one must go back to political theory to come to terms with the modern nature of citizenship (and the state). Resnick discusses five theories of the state, aspects of which he argues are present in modern democracies. He labels these (1) aristocratic, (2) republican, (3) the philosophy of order, (4) liberal, and (5) democratic. Each of the five theories includes a conception of the citizen’s place and role within the state. The aristocratic theory of the state assumes that “there is a small group of people, by reason of birth or training, [that] is especially fit for the business of rule” (Resnick, 1990, p. 13). Plato is a good example of this approach, arguing that those with the necessary knowledge and quality of character, namely the philosopher-kings, are fit or destined to rule over others. Republican theory looks to “some balance or mixture in the state, as between social classes or political institutions” (Resnick, 1990,
p. 17). Classical Republicans, such as Cicero and Montesquieu, speak the language of a mixed constitution where the power of the legislative, executive, and judicial are separated from each other. For the philosophers of order, Bodin, Hobbes, and Thucydides, the state is “the incarnation of a supreme temporal or moral authority, which forces potentially recalcitrant citizens or subjects to obey its higher commands” (Resnick, 1990, p. 19). The liberal theory of the state emphasizes “the representative and limited character of state authority and the existence of a significant sphere of individual liberty — political, economical, and religious — for the citizens” (Resnick, 1990, p. 23). Theorists like Locke emphasize the importance of private property and strongly defend the notion of limited government and individual rights. Finally, the democratic theorists of the state emphasize “economic and political equality, significant citizen participation in the political sphere, and popular sovereignty as the source of state authority” (Resnick, 1990, p. 29). There are, according to Resnick, two figures who are representative of democratic theory: Rousseau and Marx.

For Resnick (1990), all five theories contribute to our understanding of modern citizenship. He argues that from aristocratic theory, we learn about the importance of leadership; from republicanism comes the importance of separation of power; from the theory of order comes a sobering reminder that democratic dreams or ideas alone may not always allow for effective decision-making; from liberalism we learn the importance of individual rights and the inevitability of representation, and finally from democratic theory comes the sense of community and participation of citizens in collective affairs.

2.2 Citizenship, state, and community

For Taylor (1997), the key element in the development of modern citizenship is the shift from “hierarchical, mediated-access societies to horizontal, direct-access societies” (p. 36). The modern notion of citizenship implies a direct relationship between individuals and the state. The
fundamental way of belonging to the state is not dependent on or mediated by any organizations such as the kingdom. While in ‘societies of orders,’ to use Tocqueville’s expression, individuals belonged to the society via belonging to some components such as the fief, modern individuals stand, alongside their fellow-citizens, in direct relationship with the state that is “the object of our common allegiance” (Taylor, 1997, p. 36). The directness of access to the state abolished the heterogeneity of hierarchical belonging typical of monarchies, despotisms, and aristocracies; it made everyone equal. It substituted the *homo hierarchicus* with the *homo aequalis*.

Williams (1961) in *The Long Revolution* traces the outlines of this shift in terms of vocabulary used for describing the ‘experience of membership,’ which he related to the connection between individuals and their national community. In hierarchical societies, individuals were represented by the role of ‘subjects.’ As he states:

> The *subject*, at whatever violence to himself, has to accept the way of life of his society, and his own indicated place in it, because there is no other way in which he can maintain himself at all [...] It is not *his* way of life, in any sense that matters, but he must conform to it to survive [italics in the original].

(Williams, 1961, p. 87).

By contrast, individuals in direct-access societies are described as members. In its modern sense, it is a useful way of describing individuals’ positive identification with the community in which they live. As Williams (1961) puts it: “[t]he member of a society feels himself to belong to it, in an essential way: its values are his values, its purposes his purposes, to such an extent that he is proud to describe himself in its terms” (p. 85). The individual is, therefore, conscious of himself as a member of a community to which he belongs. If changes are necessary, he will contribute to its discussion and coming into effect. To the member, society is his own political community, while to the subject, society is an imposed system in which his place is determined.
Barber (1984) offers an interesting point of view on the roles of members in such a community. He argues that individual members are transformed, through their participation in common work, into 'citizens of the community.'

A community of citizens owes the character of its existence to what its constituent members have in common and therefore cannot be treated as a mere aggregation of individuals. The strong democratic community is not (at least initially) an association of friends, because the civic tie is a product of conflict and inadequacy rather than of consensus. But that community cannot remain an association of strangers because its activities transform men and their interest. (Barber, 1984, p. 232)

For Barber, citizenship and community are therefore two aspects of a single political reality. "Men [sic] can only overcome their insufficiency and legitimize their dependency by forging a common consciousness" (Barber, 1984, pp. 216-217). A community is more than a mere association of individuals or strangers; it constitutes a common culture, which is for him the precondition of our moral autonomy, that is, our capacity to form independent moral convictions. The term community describes therefore "a desired level of human relationships. The community, as a body with some common values, norms, and goals, in which each member regards the common goals as her own, is a good in itself" (Avineri & De-Shalit, 1992, p. 7). Walzer (1992) adds that membership is a "social good" (p. 66) because all of us have goals that we cannot attain by ourselves, but only by cooperating with others who share similar aims.

Similarly, the identity of each person — the personhood or the 'self' — has to find its moral identity in and through its membership in the community. What I am, therefore, is in key part influenced by my family, my surroundings, and my community. As a result, if the community is part of the shaping of our individual lives, then, it cannot be removed from our
existences. Personal and social identities in modern democracies are chosen by individuals, but they are greatly influenced by the communities people inhabit. These communities, in Taylor’s words, correspond to the ‘horizon within which one is capable of taking a stand.’ For him, the identity of a person is defined by the commitments and identifications which provide a framework within which one determines what is good, valuable, or what he/she can endorse or oppose. Identity and community membership are, thus, two sides of the same coin.6

In the same way, Touraine (1994) argues that modern citizenship, stemming from the French Revolution, is inextricably related to community membership. In this sense, community, as a substitute for the French word communauté, is represented by a sense of membership, that is a common identification with fellow-members of a defined territory and a willingness to participate actively in building that collectivity. Belonging, as he clearly states, may have little to do with democracy. There is little ‘democratic consciousness’ in the way a soldier strongly belongs to his regiment. However, community membership implies more than belonging. It favours a due respect for individual rights and the equality of members, and envisages a common future in terms of genuine common participation. He states, “la défense de la communauté contre un pouvoir autoritaire peut être un agent de démocratisation si elle se combine avec l’œuvre de modernisation au lieu de considérer celle-ci comme une menace pour elle” (Touraine, 1994, p. 31). All members should be treated as if they possess equal opportunities to participate in governing the community.

Coll (1994) adds that modern individuals, unlike members, do not necessarily belong and participate actively in the community. They only possess personal rights and freedoms that they wish to secure. For him, “l’individu, comme être autonome, n’est pas tenu de faire partie d’une communauté, mais d’être un de plus, de façon anonyme, dans l’ensemble de la collectivité” (Coll, 1994, p. 189). In this sense, being a member of a democratic community means more than
being subject to the laws of a state or being a 'free rider' only benefiting from the community.

As Miller (1992) puts it:

The citizen has to see himself as playing an active role in determining his society’s future, and as taking responsibility for the collective decisions that are made. He must be politically active, both in the sense of informing himself about the issues currently under discussion and in the sense of participating in decision-making itself. Moreover, he cannot regard politics merely as an arena in which to pursue his private interest. He must act as a citizen, that is a member of a collectivity who is committed to advancing its common good [italics in the original]. (p. 96)

Being a citizen means, therefore, being committed to participate actively (and having equal opportunities beforehand) for personal and common purposes. If citizenship is invoked in the defence of rights and freedoms, Marshall (1965) reminds us that the corresponding ‘duties’ cannot be ignored. Unfortunately, the ways in which authoritarian regimes have utilized state commitments in the past have led many (liberal) people to suspect their duties or commitments to democracy preferring to emphasize individual rights. For example, patriotism, or the attachment of people to their patria (nation), is necessary to a stable democracy, but the concept has become a taboo topic after the totalitarian regimes of the inter-war years. More recently, in light of what happened in countries like the former Yugoslavia, critics have reaffirmed that patriotism is nothing more than an impediment to liberal democracy since it would presuppose a blind love of state domination, a belief in the superiority of one’s country, and an automatic support for military actions and racist behaviors toward others. Put differently, patriotism goes against the independent critical thinking skills necessary to democratic citizenship.
Most scholars prefer to use expressions such as ‘community membership’ ‘belonging’ and ‘allegiance,’ which they think do not have unwelcome allusions to some forms of extreme patriotism. In this thesis, patriotism is not understood as a passive acceptance of state actions. On the contrary, it a positive commitment of citizens which binds them to their national community and state and reinforces communal actions. I concur with Nathanson (1993) who proposes that citizens in democratic states (nation-states or multinational states) view the concept of patriotism on a continuum (from weak to strong) and adopt moderate forms of ‘responsible patriotism,’ which respect and even encourage a critical attitude of citizens. Responsible patriotism allows for both assent and dissent, dropping by the same token aspects of negative or extreme nationalism. This form of belonging also respects fundamental individual rights necessary to liberal democracy. In short, as Nathanson asserts, a moderate patriotism is morally defensible since a sense of personal identification with the community, a special concern for its well-being, and a willingness to sacrifice to promote the common good are part of any democratic ideal.

Considering the relevance of community membership for liberalism, Callan (1997) proposes a form of ‘liberal patriotism’ in order to promote the ties of solidarity necessary for a pluralistic, just democracy. Callan offers an original construction of a personal attachment to political community on Rawls’ principles of rational pursuit of individual good and the reasonable pursuit of justice. Callan makes the distinction between sentimentality, which he links to a patriotic emotion imposed (or ‘not paid for’), and liberal patriotism. The latter refers to a personal sense of belonging to the polity based on critical reasoning, autonomy, and acceptance of justice. Endorsing the necessity of some political structures and associations for the survival of liberalism, Callan implicitly accepts the modern state and patriotic loyalty as important elements of liberal democracy: “a state-centred patriotism might continue to be an important ideal to perpetuate in our public cultures [...]” (Callan, 1997, p. 129).
Not everyone agrees with this understanding of community membership, even in its liberal form. Most liberal thinkers argue that this communitarian approach to community membership, and the moral particularity it affirms, opens the way to prejudice and intolerance. Furthermore, they think that such a community goes against “the idea that government must not take sides on moral issues” (Dworkin, 1985, p. 205). Based on the premise that liberal societies are founded on individual autonomy, they propose communities and institutions that will assure “the protections and benefits one needs in order to have the freedom to both define and to pursue that form of life one determines is best for oneself” (DeLue, 1989, pp. 48-49). For these liberals, a community must be governed by principles that ultimately do not presuppose any particular conception of the ‘good life’ so as to leave its members as free as possible to choose their own values and ends, even if this implies letting people choose a passive way of life, such as being a ‘free rider’ (see Kymlicka, 1999). For Kant, shared institutions and procedures, such as the separation of powers and a fair justice system, allow individuals to pursue their own interest, while resolving the problem of state oppression. As cultures and communities around the world seem to ‘liberalize,’ Kantian liberals argue that community membership is either a element of the private sphere or something in the process of being replaced by more universal communities. As Kymlicka (1995) notes, “many liberals believe that people’s interest in cultural membership is adequately protected by the common rights of citizenship, and that any further measure to protect this interest are illegitimate” (p. 107).

But, communitarians reply that we cannot justify political arrangements and create allegiance (patriotism) without reference to common purposes or goals. We cannot, in democratic societies, conceive ourselves without reference to our role as citizens, that is, as members in a common life (Taylor, 1989). If communities are more liberal than they used to be, most community members around the world continue to value their cultural and national
membership. Far from displacing national allegiance, liberalism has, in many ways, increased the sense of community membership among people.

Furthermore, I think it is totally incoherent to believe that state decisions on national/cultural issues such as language, public holidays, state symbols, and so forth do not involve the recognition and support of particular communities. Relying on Gellner, Taylor argues that states are inescapably involved in a nation-building process:

If a modern society has an "official" language, in the fullest sense of the term — that is, a state-sponsored, -inculcated, and -defined language and culture, in which both economy and state function — then it is obviously an immense advantage to people if this language and culture are theirs. (p. 34)

2.3 Citizenship and legitimacy

A direct-access relationship also implies another central concept of democracy, namely: legitimacy. Since Weber's delineation of three types of legitimacy (traditional, bureaucratic and charismatic) several scholars (Taylor, 1993; Resnick, 1990; Carnoy, 1984; Williams, 1961) who have discussed theories of the state argue that legitimacy is especially relevant for modern societies. Although the term was first used in the 17th century to assess regimes, it is clear, for Taylor (1993), that modern industrial societies are not only the fruit of an unprecedented degree of disciplined, dedicated, innovative productive activity, but also the result of effort of their members. Legitimacy is more than mere recognized legality; in fact, legitimacy can occur in the absence of legal authority. De Gaulle had legitimacy without legality. For Resnick (1990), relying on Norberto Bobbio and Sergio Cotta, one element in definitions of legitimacy bears particular attention: "Whatever is founded on values and recognized as such by public opinion is legitimate" (p. 121).
Citizens have beliefs and attitudes toward the community they make up. The society has legitimacy when members so understand and value it that they are willing to assume the disciplines and burdens which membership entails. Legitimacy declines when this willingness fails. In this sense, the danger of instability and breakdown arises when there is a risk of "legitimation crisis" (Taylor, 1993, p. 64). Several modern states have suffered from a legitimation crisis. For example, the German thinker Habermas (1973) — 'traumatized' like many German scholars by the crisis of legitimacy of the 1930s — makes it central to his analysis of the state and his conception of 'constitutional' patriotism.

To illustrate, Bergeron (1990) cites a conversation between General Ludendorff and Weber in 1919. To the question 'what do you mean by democracy?,' Weber in a humorous way responded that "[d]ans une démocratie, le peuple élit son chef auquel il accorde sa confiance. Ensuite, l'élu dit au peuple de fermer sa gueule et d'obéir. Peuple et parti n'ont plus à intervenir" (as quoted in Bergeron, 1990, p. 244). For Bergeron, force and authority, like tradition, might create its own legitimacy without any measure of popular support. But in the long run, the support of the population is essential to the stability of any democracy. As Resnick (1990) argues:

All states, in the long run, like to consider their authority as grounded in popular support. It is when such support is put into question by elements of the military, the working class, the peasantry, student movements, or the bourgeoisie — in short, by important social forces — that one can speak of a crisis of legitimacy [...]. (Resnick, 1990, p. 121)

In Liberal Dialogue Versus a Critical Theory of Discursive Legitimation, Benhabib (1989) discusses legitimacy in terms of 'public conversation.' She suggests that we cease thinking of the public realm in terms of the domain of legislative state activity. For her, we must
consider the res publica as a ‘public thing’ that can be shared by all citizens. Sharing by all, for her, means that certain issues become matters of public conversation. While respecting the limit between the public and the private sphere, she thinks every citizen can engage in a deliberative process about what they think is good for them. All communication action “entails symmetry and reciprocity of normative expectations from group members” (Benhabib, 1989, p. 152). To become a member of the group or the community involves our being treated in accordance with such reciprocity. Respect is an attitude and a moral feeling acquired through the process of public deliberation. When respect ceases to be an aspect of our life experience and leads to the breakdown of mutuality, a society runs the risk of a legitimation crisis. In Canada, Webber (1993) has offered a similar argument. In talking about English, French, and Aboriginal peoples, he claims that “[w]e value our country because we value the particular character of its public debate” (p. 192).

The point of Weber, Resnick, and Benhabib is that in despotism, legitimacy carries less important weight — at least until the point where oppression drives subjects to revolt — while in democracy, the everyday political operations must call on an ‘ever-present fund’ of positive identification (Taylor, 1993). The laws have to be seen as reflective and entrenching the dignity of citizens, to be in a sense “extensions of themselves” (Taylor, 1989, p. 165).

Furthermore, with the establishment of the welfare state, democratic states have increasingly been perceived by citizens as ultimately responsible for social exchange. Legitimacy rests on a widespread belief among citizens that the exchange system is working properly and provides benefits to all its members. ‘Ideological factors’ such as the role of public education, Resnick (1990) adds, play an important role in this political process of positive identification with the state. Through the teaching of a national history and a national language, schools implicitly help create various forms of legitimacy. They may even, in the long run, contribute to a crisis of legitimation in questioning values, traditions, and institutions that are in place. But if
we want to go deeper into the bases of legitimacy, it is necessary to understand more about the modern conception of freedom.

2.4 The modern conception of freedom

In a democracy, we accept that citizens ought to enjoy an extensive array of ‘liberties’ or ‘freedoms,’ such as the freedom of expression and the freedom of thought. Most people agree that citizens ought to exercise some control over their destiny. This conception of freedom that emerged in the 17th and 18th centuries — and clearly expressed by Rousseau — implies that “the free subject becomes someone who follows an internal purpose and who owes no a priori allegiance to a pre-existing order but gives it only to structures that were created by his or her own consent” (Taylor, 1993, p. 69). When people can do that which nature inclines them to do and when they live together under the assistance of institutions that they create, they experience themselves as free. Rousseau’s assertion in Du contrat social is that people need “une forme d’association qui défende et protège de toute la force commune la personne et les biens de chaque associé, et par laquelle chacun, s’unissant à tous, n’obéisse pourtant qu’à lui-même et reste aussi libre qu’auparavant” (as quoted in Touraine, 1994, p. 61). For him, men are born free but are everywhere in chains by autocratic states. People can protect their rights and freedoms from state abuse only if they participate fully in determining the conduct of their governments. Freedom is sustained only by hard work from citizens.

Some quickly conclude that freedom means ‘doing anything I want or choose as I please.’ Actions should not be impeded by anything external to the individual. But, as Barber (1992) argues, freedom in a democracy is relational and depends on a nexus of social linkages. When it is contextualized as a feature of identity, it implies having a voice in the community’s political life, which shapes one’s and others’ lives. It is also connected with common possibility and self-realization. In his analysis of American education, Barber (1992) puts it this way:
[I]t has been easy to think of freedom in theory as freedom from somebody or something and to conclude that that is all there is to freedom [...] Yet in the setting of human development and civil society, freedom is closely connected with community, with common possibility, and with self-realization in contexts that are inevitably social. (p. 25)

Following this line of argument, freedom is applicable to individuals and groups of individuals as a whole (communities) which give them a sort of collective liberty. The community is justified because it fulfils people's needs, desires and purposes. In this sense, the community protects members from insecurity, intolerance and even dictatorship since these 'evils' tend to flourish mostly “where forms of life are dislocated, roots unsettled, traditions undone” (Sandel, 1984, p. 7).

For Mill (1972), writing in the 19th century, individual freedom is tied to membership in one's national community. For him, free democratic institutions are, therefore, to be found in nation-states. As he puts it, “[it] is in general a necessary condition of free institutions that the boundaries of governments should coincide in the main with those of nationalities” (Mill, 1972, p. 233). A similar approach was adopted by his compatriot, Lord Durham, who came to Canada during the Rebellion of 1837-1838. Durham wrongfully thought that the only way to ‘free’ the Canadiens was to assimilate them, so as to give all Canadiens the British ‘virtues’ and, thus, create a more homogeneous and liberal British Canadian nation.

But, as Rousseau intended, a free society also recognizes and protects the ‘dignity’ of the citizen; that is, the ability of a person to affect his or her own condition. Otherwise, the community could lead — as we saw in Canada with the Report of Lord Durham — to “a slippery slope to totalitarian temptations” (Sandel, 1984, p. 7). Freedom involves, therefore, a notion of citizen capacity to act both individually and collectively.
Several features flow from this definition of freedom, including the equality of individuals, fundamental individual rights, and popular sovereignty. The American and French Revolutions invoked the idea that a nation could exist prior to and independently of its political entity, the state. In that sense, free people came to be self-governing people; people who can affect their destiny, their condition. We pass from *L'État c'est moi* of Louis XIV to *L'État c'est le peuple* (see Conner, 1978). But even before these two historical revolutions, Rousseau had provided important arguments for the inalienability of popular sovereignty. In his words, "[s]overeignty cannot be represented for the same reason that it cannot be alienated; its essence is the general will[…]. Any law which the people has not ratified in person is void; it is not law at all" (as quoted in Resnick, 1990, p. 89). Unlike Burke (and others), who rooted political sovereignty in the hands of 'King/Queen-in-Parliament,' Rousseau and his followers rooted sovereignty more directly in the people. Freedom of citizens led to popular sovereignty. Governmental authority became subordinate to the overriding 'will of the people.' Such a democratic system helped people to protect their own fundamental interests and freedoms from state abuse. More importantly, it provides the maximum opportunity for people to exercise moral responsibility, to adopt moral principles and personal conceptions of the good life after reflection, deliberation, and consideration of the alternatives and their consequences.

2.5 The commitments to democracy

For Taylor, this vision of the free individual goes back to the Renaissance in Italy and Machiavelli’s tradition of civic humanism. He notes that the nature of free, democratic society requires a certain degree of engagement or more precisely commitment on the part of its citizens. Traditional despotism asked people only to obey the law without any allegiance to the political entity. But a democratic state has to ask for more. “For a democratic polity to exist,” Pateman (1970) notes, “it is necessary for a participatory democracy society to exist, i.e. a society where
all political systems have been democratised and socialisation through participation can take place in all areas” (p. 43). What commitments do citizens have in democracy? This is a very difficult question to answer since commitments are sometimes vague, or applied differently by different societies.

Political and citizenship theorists, as Janoski (1998) notes, have been inclined to ignore the roles and functions of citizens, preferring to concentrate on citizenship rights. Certain communitarians (Pateman, 1970; Taylor, 1989; Janoski, 1998), however, have addressed the question of balancing rights with commitments. Taylor (1989), for instance, argues that a ‘participatory’ democracy requires that its members be motivated to make the necessary contributions: of wealth (in taxes), sometimes blood (in war), and it expects always some degree of participation in the process of governance. For example, a democratic society where the level of participation falls below a certain point ceases to be legitimate in the eyes of their members. So when beliefs in legitimacy are not widely shared, social benefits weaken, and regimes lose stability or simply break down.

Janoski (1998) suggests that the three different types of rights described by Marshall can correspond to civil (or ‘legal’ for him), political, and social commitments of citizens. The legal commitments include the respect of law duly made by government, the respect of other’s rights, and the respect and cooperation with legal authorities (police, courts). The political commitments refer to the participation of citizens in politics, the necessity of being informed and critical, the protection of the state and the common good from (internal and external) threats, and the commitment to protest against governments that violate citizenship rights. Finally, social commitments include pursuing education to the best of one’s ability, pursuing a career to the benefit of both the individual and the society, and helping the less fortunate. By linking rights with commitments (or ‘obligations’ for him), Janoski (1998) does not suggest that the existence of particular rights is predicated on the simultaneous presence of commitments, nor that
commitments are related to rights in a one-to-one contractual manner. He only argues that commitments, like rights, should not be vague feelings but clear responsibilities.

Hence, a participatory democracy requires relatively strong commitments on the part of its members to survive and flourish. The roots of totalitarianism, for Avineri and De-Shalit (1992) and Janoski (1998), lie in limiting access to civil society, in alienating people from public debate and public activity. For them, the ‘malaise’ of modern societies is the atrophying of citizens’ power. In the same way, Barber (1984) argues that action in common is the unique province of citizens. Democracy is neither government by the majority nor representative rule. It is citizen self-government.

Participation is less a way of linking previously or ‘naturally’ autonomous persons to an artificial and sovereign collectivity than it is of characterizing and legitimizing the provisional autonomy that real men and women living under conditions of actual dependency can elicit from the social milieus in which they are embedded. (Barber, 1989, p. 63)

This view of democracy sees the task of creating free citizens as a matter of building harmony between individual aspirations and autonomy, social and collective responsibility. Modern citizenship implies, therefore, an understanding of the ‘good life’ that goes beyond the thought of Kant, that is, the ability of each person to decide for him or herself a view of the ‘good life.’ Kantian liberals are often blamed, not without reason, for their imbalance between individual rights and socio-political commitment. As Miller (1995b) notes, such liberals are inclined “to see little intrinsic value in public life and political participation. They attach most value to individuals pursuing their aims in private or in voluntary associations with others” (p. 194).

Unlike Kant’s view, the nature of the ‘good’ in a participatory democratic society requires that it be sought in common. Following Hegel, Sandel (1984) argues that people cannot justify political
arrangements without reference to common purposes and ends. Moreover, people cannot conceive their personhood (the self) without reference to a common life. From this view, the common good is not constituted out of individual goods, but as something that no individual could accomplish or attain alone. Not only is it secured collectively, but people could not produce it any other way. Friendship is an example of a common good that is shared by people, but cannot be gained individually. Put differently, the common good is what we value and share collectively like language.

2.6 The nature of a multinational state

Many political theorists have argued that states should, as far as possible, be organized in such a way that their members share a common identity and societal culture which binds them together despite their diverse private or ethnic allegiances. Miller (1995b) argues that there are good ethical reasons to believe that individuals must owe respect and commitments to their national compatriots that are more extensive than those they owe to mankind in general. Seeing myself as a member of a family or nation, I feel a loyalty to the group, and this expresses itself in my giving special weight to the interest of fellow-members. These loyalties and responsibilities are seen as mutual. I expect other members of my community to give special weight to my interest in the same way as I give special weight to theirs. But this does not imply that the relation between members is one of strict reciprocity. For various reasons, it may be impossible for an individual in the community to return the favour. The point is that obligation of “ethical reciprocity” arises from the practices of “mutual aid” (Miller, 1995b, p. 105).

The argument raised by Miller (1995b) is that national communities form socio-political sites on which more formal systems of reciprocity and loyalties can be established. They trace out the socio-geographical limits of people who are well disposed to one another, and this makes it easier to create a civil society and practices of mutual obligation, and responsibilities. For him,
as well as for many other nationalists, democracy is government 'by the people, for the people,'
and this is possible if the people is a 'people,' or a nation. Free peoples are to be found in nation-
states.

However, what happens if the limits of the state do not correspond to the limits of the
nation? In other words, how should we respond to multiple national communities within a single
state? Historically, minorities (ethnic or national) were dealt with by coercive assimilation
measures or by segregation or deportation by the state such as the deportation of over 7000
French Acadiens in 1755 by the British (commonly known as Le Grand Dérangelement) or, more
recently, Kosovo Albanians from Serbia in 1999.

If it is next to impossible to eliminate the sense of community membership among
national members — especially when they are annexed — it is imperative to find political
arrangements that go beyond assimilation or simply imposing common citizenship rights on
national groups, which would only perpetuate their feeling of collective marginalization. As the
nineteenth-century British writer, Lord Acton (1922) suggested in his critique of Mill’s theory of
the nation-state, multinational states, through political arrangements like federalism, are
democratically preferable to nation-states since they embody more skeptical and perhaps less
patriotic citizens who will check more carefully the abuse of state power, particularly in terms of
culture and language. Because multinational states embody multiple political communities
fighting for their own survival and their political autonomy, these states need to acknowledge in
one way or another the existence of counter-traditions to survive and to avoid constant civic
wars. This helps prevent the tyranny of the majority. A multinational state, then, provides — at
least theoretically — a better framework than the nation-state for managing diversity and
sustaining liberal democracy.

But the cohabitation of multiple national communities within in a single state, as
Canadians know, is far from being an easy enterprise. It requires cooperation, dialogue, and
accommodation. The threat of secession seems to be always present. National groups, unlike immigrants or ethnic minorities, demand not only rights to preserve their heritage, but claim to have inherent rights to self-government. They want to rule themselves on a given territory, without being necessarily fully sovereign. This situation sometimes creates tensions between the federal (or central) government and the provincial ones. While the former wishes to use its power to preserve unity, equality, and stability, the latter claims to have the necessary means to achieve its national and democratic goals if the interference is minimal.

Countries with more than one national group cannot be understood as nation-states since ‘nation’ and ‘state’ are both conceptually distinct (see chapter 1). With the rise of nationalism in the 19th century, the term nation-state has come to be applied indiscriminately to all states. In his survey of 132 countries (as of 1971), Connor (1994) found that only 12 of them (9.1 percent) could justifiably be described as nation-states. In this context, he notes that the terms ‘nation’ and ‘national’ have been equated to ‘state’ and ‘statal’ affairs, as found in expressions like the ‘United Nations’ and ‘international relations.’ “Where nation and state coincide,” he notes, “their verbal interutilization is inconsequential because the two are indistinguishably merged in popular perception” (Connor, 1994, p. 39). In reality, we cannot substitute the word ‘nation’ for ‘state,’ particularly in countries with groups of people who see themselves as distinct communities and want to be recognized as such.

Ignatieff (1993) notes that belonging to a national group also means being understood (inside) and recognized (outside). To belong is to understand the tacit codes of the people you live with, and it is to know that, in return, you will be understood without having to explain yourself. People, in short, “speak your language” (Ignatieff, 1993, p. 10). This is the reason why the protection of a nation’s language is such a deeply emotional nationalist cause. It provides the essential form of belonging, which is to be understood by others. In his analysis of pluralism and multi-ethnicity in Canada, Driedger (1996) points out that collective identification can be a
positive attachment to a group with whom the individuals believe they have shared characteristics related to factors such as territory, culture, institutions, historical symbols, ideology, or charismatic leadership. In the case of Québec, he concludes that Québécois have maintained a distinct language and culture; they have definitely remained a 'distinct people' with the will to fight for their identity, and to think of themselves as a nation.

Taylor (1993), more explicitly than Driedger (1996), identifies culture and as essential elements for our identity. It becomes very important that we be recognized for what we are, not only as individuals but also as collectivities. For him, recognition (including self-recognition) is a *sine qua non* of flourishing in a participatory democracy. He argues, "[d]ue recognition is not just a courtesy we owe people. It is a vital human need" (Taylor, 1992, p. 26). If this is denied or set at naught by those who surround us, it is extremely difficult to maintain an horizon of meaning by which to identify ourselves. Similarly, for people to be responsible for the future of their country and participate in it, they must be recognized for who they are. The discourse of recognition has, therefore, become familiar on two levels: in the private sphere, where we understand our own personal identities; and in the public sphere, where politics of equal recognition play a greater role for communities.

Taylor (1992) concentrates on one aspect of this: the public recognition of national communities. He says that mutual recognition between groups has come to be a crucial issue in modern politics because of the nature of modern democratic societies. They are ultimately ruled by the citizens who are equal and autonomous. Our identity is what defines us as human agents. The recognition is the acceptance of ourselves by others in our identity. We may be recognized as 'equal citizens' and still be unrecognized in our identity. In other words, what is important to us in defining who we are may be quite unacknowledged in the public life, in our society, even though we have the same citizenship rights.
In the case of groups viewing themselves as ‘nations,’ the recognition they are seeking is of ‘peoples.’ For other groups, like women and gays/lesbians, the demand is “to recognize a category of citizens with a particular life-situation” (Taylor, 1993, p. 191). Some of them increasingly see themselves as having not only common interests or biological dispositions but a quasi-common way of life. In all these cases the issue to be dealt with is one of justice denied. For Canadian women and gays/lesbians, the Charter of Rights and Freedoms guaranteed equality between individuals and gave the assurance that they would no longer be marginalized. But for Québec nationalists, says Taylor (1993), the real fuel for independence is the discourse of recognition and the rhetoric, where words like fierté and humiliation have a big place. The denial of recognition is, therefore, a key issue, which may lead to instability and disunity.

If democracy requires a respect of citizenship rights and a commitment to the principle of political equality, a democratic state having more than one national group also demands a system of adequate powers and recognition for each community so as to respect the principle of self-government so crucial to national minorities. Kymlicka (1998) argues that Québécois feel attached to their country because they helped to build the country, from sea to sea, and because they have continued to play an active role in the governing of Canada as a whole. “They are proud to be Canadians because they have played a visible, often decisive, role in making Canada the country it is today” (Kymlicka, 1998, p. 178).

More importantly, Létourneau (2000b) argues that Québécois, who have adopted a collective identity derived from diverse cultures, feel Canadian because of one aspect of their double-sided identity he calls ‘the canadianness’ (la canadienité) of Québécois. According to him, this aspect is defined in terms of the positive and unique historical experiences of Québécois in the development of a liberal, democratic binational state based on representation, dialogue, accommodation, conciliation. Indeed, to say that Québécois are part of a distinct nation is not to
deny that they are also Canadian citizens, with a sense of belonging to their federal state. As Létourneau puts it:

La canadianité renvoie au potentiel de régénération du pays par usage, emprunt ou exploitation des propensions, des inclinations et des obligations à la conciliation des contraires contenues dans le processus de sa formation historique. [Elle] est en quelque sorte cette disposition à l’accueil des discordances et à la médiation manifestée dans l’histoire du Canada par ses acteurs [...] [L]a canadianité apparaît comme se qui ressort aux possibilités d’avenir du Canada dans la reconnaissance du caractère mélodieux de ses dissonances — et dans l’assomption aussi de sa dualité structurante.

(Létourneau, 2000b, p. 118)

As an example of this dual allegiance expressed by Létourneau, on the eve of the 1995 referendum, a survey conducted in Québec showed that 49 percent of Québécois who said they would vote Oui to sovereignty wished to remain Canadian citizens. More importantly, two Québécois out of three wanted to keep the Canadian dollar in an independent Québec (see Paré, 1995, p. 51). In 1999, another Québec survey revealed that 63 percent of respondents declared they would remain in Canada if they had to choose between status quo and independence (see Létourneau, 2000b, p. 112). Clearly, the great majority of Québécois are not ready to quit their country and abandon, by the same occasion, the historical links they have with Canada. However, recent events in Canadian politics, such as Meech Lake and Charlottetown Accords, have led many of them to believe they are not adequately recognized for who they are as a ‘people,’ which reinforces their sentiment of alienation. As Derriennic (1995) puts it:
What is the real basis for democratic stability, and perhaps unity, in a multinational state?

In a nation-state, the answer is relatively simple. In our multinational state, stability and unity cannot be based on a shared identity, derived from commonality of history, language, or ancestry. Stability and unity, for Kymlicka (1998) and other Canadian scholars, have to be based on accommodation. The fact we have commitments to our fellow-national members that are more extensive than those they have to others does not imply that we cannot share a state with others who have different national allegiances. It only suggests that national groups must have the necessary powers and recognition for the survival and flourishing of their societal culture. Kymlicka (1995) notes that “people from different national groups will only share an allegiance to the larger polity if they see it as the context within which their national identity is nurtured, rather than subordinated” (p. 189). Citizens can share a state in this sense, and yet share very little in term of ethnicity, religion or language. Political arrangements, such as federalism, can provide a framework for the coexistence of multiple nations within a common state. Following the resignation of premier Bouchard in January 2001 (and his constat d’échec), the Québec Liberal Party (QLP) presented its preliminary report Québec’s Choice: Affirmation, Autonomy, and Leadership in which the committee members argue:

A universal aspect of federalism is that it allows distinct communities or specificities that exist in only one part of a state to be respected and recognized. Thus, it is possible to affirm Canada’s identity while leaving
Quebec’s intact: these two identities are perfectly reconcilable, compatible and complementary in a federal context. (QLP, 2001, p. 20)

For Kymlicka (1998), if Canada is to survive, we all need to take nationalism more seriously, especially the Québec one. Trying to ignore or downplay the reality of Québécois national identity can only intensify our constitutional problems, fuel rivalries, and give rise to detrimental movements like ‘partition.’ One way to help create a more cohesive and stable democracy in Canada is to adopt forms of citizenship which take into consideration both our cultural and national differences. According to certain Canadian scholars (see Kymlicka, 1998; Resnick, 1997b; McRoberts, 1997; Balthazar, 1997; Taylor, 1993), this is perhaps the only possible way to preserve our pluralistic and liberal democracy while giving Québécois a fair national place in the Canadian federation. Canada, McRoberts (1997) argues, “contains distinct collectivities that see themselves as nations and possess the institutional and cultural distinctiveness usually implied by the term. Canada might be better understood as a ‘multinational’ entity” (p. 161).

Kymlicka (1998) adds that the first step in applying this conception of multinational citizenship implies that English Canadians cease to promote a ‘pan-Canadian identity’ based essentially on equal citizenship rights and freedoms and multiculturalism. Similarly, they must cease to think that the federation is made up of ten equal provinces and three territories and start to recognize officially that Québec needs a ‘special status’ to preserve and promote its national distinctiveness. In short, this model implies that we reorganize our state to better reflect both the multicultural and multinational character of Canada. If democracy requires a commitment to the principle of equality of individuals and respect for difference, a democratic multinational state also demands a system of adequate powers for each national entity so as to respect the principle of self-government. According to Kymlicka (1998), Canadians have shown, in the last years, a
greater willingness to consider ‘special status’ for First Nations than for Québec for reasons he links to Canadians’ strong sense of being guilty for the historical mistreatment of aboriginal peoples. But this sense of guilt should not hide the fact that other Canadians also feel as distinct national communities and want to be recognized as such in the federation.

The second step in applying a multinational conception of citizenship is to provide Québécois with enough autonomy and self-realization necessary for their national and political survival. According to Resnick (1997b), Balthazar (1997), and McRoberts (1997), federalism can meet the needs of multiple national communities. For McRoberts (1997), the needs of Québécois “can be met through arrangements that give them autonomy for certain purposes — in other words, federalism” (p. 261). So for him, if we are to adopt a multinational conception of Canadian citizenship, we must show Québécois that they do not need to become a sovereign entity in order to rule themselves. For political, cross-cultural, historical, and economical reasons, it might be more appropriate to maintain and adapt socio-political structures that favour cooperation and accommodation rather than confrontation and disintegration. Federalism offers a political framework that favours, at least theoretically, respect of diversity and shared autonomy (and sovereignty) rather than conformity and exclusion.

Following this line of argument, Resnick (1997b) assumes that Canadians must reconsider their traditional conception of citizenship based on the nation-state model. If Québécois and English Canadians are members of different nations, citizenship must necessarily recognize not only cultural but also national identities. This implies that Canadians would have a shared citizenship, with common rights and commitments, but distinct national or cultural allegiances. Increasingly, we need to think of ourselves as “bearers of multiple identities” (Resnick, 1997b, p. 129). This conception implies accepting that not all Canadians share either one conception of belonging (patriotism) or the same attitudes toward their country. There must be a way of acknowledging and recognizing that Québécois think of themselves as Canadian and
participate in the public life of their nation and their state because they are members of an entity contributing to the whole. For him, what Canadians need is to make these principles more explicit, particularly in education.

2.8 Review

In this chapter, I traced the modern conception of citizenship. I have argued that a ‘free’ democratic society requires the respect of various (civic, political, social) rights, a certain degree of commitment on the part of its citizens, and a sense of community membership. The demands of community membership, I asserted, raises concerns about the roles of the state, and more precisely, the importance of legitimacy in participatory democracy.

I concluded this chapter by analyzing the nature of citizenship in a multinational state. I showed that it is imperative for the stability and unity of such a state to find socio-political arrangements, such as asymmetrical federalism, that favour cooperation, dialogue, respect, and accommodation rather than confrontation. If Canada is to survive, we urgently need to recognize non-traditional forms of citizenship which better reflect both the multicultural and multinational character of Canada. “[T]oo often,” Kymlicka (1998) concludes, “we have adopted the wrong standard for measuring unity and allegiance. We have defined unity and loyalty as the elimination of the very idea of secession. This is not a reasonable or realistic standard for any multinational state, including Canada” (p. 180).

1 About the time demokratia was introduced in Greece, it also made its appearance in the city of Rome. Romans, however, chose to call their political system a ‘republica,’ from res, meaning affairs in Latin, and publicus, for public. A republic was the ‘affairs’ that belong to the people of Rome. For a better discussion of the origins of citizenship and democracy, see Adcock (1959).

2 What I call ‘liberal’ or ‘liberalism’ in this section has little to do with any political party that operates under that name. Liberalism is understood as political theory, largely inspired by Locke and Kant, of limited government providing institutional entitlements (rights) for personal freedom, autonomy, and membership (see Kymlicka &
Norman, 1994; Rosenblum, 1989). For various reasons, liberalism has taken different forms over time. For a better discussion of liberalism, see Dworkin (1984) and Kymlicka (1989).

3 The situation of Canada is not at all a particular case. In the United States, for instance, slaves, ‘free blacks,’ and Native Americans were for centuries deprived of many of the ‘inalienable rights’ essential to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Thomas Jefferson, one of the authors of the Declaration of Independence, himself owned slaves. See Dahl (1998, pp. 62-63).

4 Many ‘neo-Marxists’ (Bowles & Gintis, 1976; Carnoy & Levin, 1985; Baudelot & Establet, 1971) also critique public schooling in capitalist societies. Bowles and Gintis (1976), for instance, have argued that despite the rhetoric of public education, schools in capitalist society reflect the hierarchical structure of the capitalist firm and reproduce the inequalities of a capitalist class system (theory of reproduction). Opposing the democratic citizenship theory of Dewey, they argue “in promoting what John Dewey once called the ‘social continuity of life,’ by integrating new generations into the social order, the schools are constrained to justify and reproduce inequality rather than correct it” (Bowles & Gintis, 1976, p. 102). However, much of the critique of neo-Marxists has been abandoned in recent years. Although the reasons are complex, Strike (1991) argues that one central factor is that the critique came to be seen as “too firmly embedded in a kind of Marxist determinism that left the revolution to the laws of history and that provided little space for human agency and comprehending resistance” (p. 455).

5 Since no single meaning is attached to the term ‘community,’ I should mention that, unless specified otherwise, this term refers to a group of people, also called a nation, who have a common societal culture and identity.

6 For a better analysis of the interpretation of modern identity, see the collection of Laforest and De Lara (1998).

7 Kymlicka (1999) is careful, however, to mention that community membership is central to the survival of democracy. But, he is not sure to what extent a liberal democracy should impose on its members a sense of common membership while respecting the principles of personal autonomy.

8 This comment gives rise to a discussion on the role of language. This element is often neglected in political theory. The need for common deliberation implies that people can communicate and be understood, and this requires a common language. It is not surprising that imposing an official language on people (including immigrants) has always been one of the first tasks of the state. As Deutsch (1994) claims, membership in a community consists in wide complementarity of social communication. “It consists,” he notes, “in the ability to communicate more effectively, and over a wide range of subjects, with members of one large group than with outsiders” (p. 27).

9 There does not seem to exist any distinction in meaning between the words ‘freedom’ and ‘liberty’. Both refer to the French word ‘liberté’ (liber, in Latin, means free), so we can use them interchangeably. For a good discussion of the two concepts, see ‘Liberty and Liberties’ in Hayek (1960).

10 As an example, Resnick (1990) suggests that Canadian society suffers from a surfeit of institutional legitimacy. “Canada,” he argues, “has had an overdose of Burkean-type legitimacy, stemming from our political leaders’ unwillingness to risk turning over some power to the people in whose name they rule” (Resnick, 1990, p. 105).

11 Janoski (1998) defines civil society as “a sphere of dynamic and responsive public discourse between the state, the public sphere consisting of voluntary organizations, and the market sphere concerning private firms and unions” (p. 12). This conception of civil society, applicable to all countries, is divided into four interactive components: the state sphere, the private sphere, the public sphere, and the market sphere.
This is not to say, however, that all women, gays/lesbians, or other non-ethnic groups are fully satisfied with the provisions of the Charter. As noted by Kymlicka (1998), some of these groups (like ethnic groups) now seek group-specific form of recognition, affirmation, and political participation.

For a critical analysis of Québec nationalism and the dual allegiance of francophone Québécois, see Delisle (1998).
III. CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION IN CANADA: A REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The analysis of the nature of citizenship opens the door to a discussion on the implications for public education, and more precisely for citizenship education. In light of the discussions and debates around the nature of citizenship and citizenship education, it is important to understand if ideologies, found in the literature in citizenship education, recognize the unique features of our multinational state.

In this chapter, I will review the evidence that our two historical communities have had different conceptions of citizenship and citizenship education. To do so, I first need to present and discuss the nature and meaning of citizenship education in democracy (section 1) and the various meanings and interpretations of curriculum in education, explaining the relations between these different interpretations (section 2). In section 3, I will present the studies I review in this chapter and explain why I chose them. This will lead me to review the works in citizenship education as found in Québec and English Canada, including two international case studies. Finally, I will provide a brief critical analysis of both the conclusions and the methodology of the studies under consideration.

3.1 Citizenship education in democracy

Researchers in the area of political socialization have long been interested in political education (see Hyman, 1959). Political research in the 1960s and 1970s leaves little doubt that schools greatly influence the political orientation and attitudes of students (Easton & Dennis, 1969). As the final report of the Commission for the Estates General on Education in Québec reaffirmed in 1996, socialization is an 'overall goal of public schooling.' It is in school that students learn how to exercise their citizenship (see Commission for the Estate General on
Education, 1996, p. 5). Such statements derive from research that has established that there is a
link connecting adults’ political attitudes to attitudes and behaviours formed early in life. Adult
attitudes, including civic dispositions and commitments, were found to be related to attitudes and
experiences in childhood and youth (see Almond & Verba, 1963).

Weissberg (1974) considers that there are four distinct aspects of the school experience
that help students to develop into democratic citizens. First, there are the explicit — and
sometimes not so explicit — messages directly conveyed to students. Schools disciplines (more
commonly known in English as ‘subjects’) have historically played a central role in this
enterprise. In this thesis, I refer to a school discipline/subject as a “cohesive set of goals, content,
methods, and practices” (Audigier, 1999b, p. 105). For Audigier, relying on Chervel (1988), a
school subject is directly associated with the school culture, which is the culture developed by
the school system to fulfil the missions and goals with which a given society entrusts it. Subjects
have four components related to the school culture: shared knowledge, standard exercises,
motivational procedures, and assessment devices. What is taught in school are subjects created
by the school system to fulfil its missions, not academic disciplines as found in universities.
These should be understood and examined as such. As Chervel (1988) puts it:

La discipline scolaire est donc constituée par un assortiment à proportions
variables suivant les cas, de plusieurs constituants, un enseignement
d’exposition, des exercices, des pratiques d’incitation et de motivation et un
appareil docimologique, lesquels dans chaque état de la discipline,
fonctionnent évidemment en étroite collaboration, de même que chacun d’eux,
à sa manière, en liaison directe avec les finalités. (pp. 99-100)

Social studies, history, and civics are all citizenship education disciplines having for their
mission the creation of democratic citizens. They are, for Weissberg, the most prominent
example of this mode of attempted influence. Sears (1994) argues that citizenship education remains, rhetorically at least, an important role of public schooling in Canada, and the primary focus of social studies and school history in particular. Analysis of these subjects confirms that their primary goal is to provide students with an education for democratic citizenship (see Sears & Hughes, 1996; Lévesque, 2001).

Second, the nature of the authority relationship within the classroom and school can influence political orientations. The way the subject-matter is presented to students conveys powerful messages about the kind of citizenship that is valued inside and outside the classroom. As suggested by Cuban (1993), students are greatly influenced by teaching styles. They “imitate teachers’ humor or sarcasm, or strive to be as autocratic or democratic as those adults are” (Cuban, 1993, p. 184). Pedagogy and the authority relationship are not simply an ‘add-on to content,’ to use Osborne’s expression, but powerful instruments that reflect our underlying conceptions of citizenship. This is the reason why some progressive educators, relying on Dewey, have suggested recently that if schools are not democratic institutions, students will not adequately learn democracy (van Neste, 1999; Levin, 1998; Freie, 1997; Berthelot, 1994).

Third, the social composition of the school environment is also a potential means of influence. As frequently advanced in discussions of racial or ethnic integration (see Levin, 1961), informal contact among students can be an important part of the educational process. Students can learn as much from one another as from teachers or textbooks. They can understand, for instance, why students in our multi-ethnic societies have different value systems, religions, or aspirations, and learn how to engage in deliberation and respect other points of view. This mode of learning is implicit in communities favouring the integration of ethnic minorities and lower-class citizens into ‘neighbourhood schools,’ that is, schools where all students from particular geographical areas (neighbourhoods) have to go.
Finally, Weissberg notes that student councils, extracurricular activities or clubs, such as the 4-H, Boy Scouts, Girl Guides, and YM/YWCA are usually justified in terms of their 'manipulative potential,' and training for democracy through participation, decision-making, and group allegiance. Sears et al. (1998) have recently suggested that most of these organizations remain active in the field of citizenship education in Canada, although only a small margin of the student population participates in them.

Weissberg (1974) concludes that schools, as public agencies, do provide a tool for structuring the political orientations and attitudes of young citizens in democratic societies. Whether the attempt at influence is through direct teaching, the nature of authority relationships, the political and social mixture of a student body, or the network of extracurricular activities, the school, says Weissberg (1974), has the potential to educate students to be informed and active citizens.

Political socialization research of the 1960s and 1970s (little was done afterward) was not restricted to the United States. In Canada, several researchers have conducted studies of students' political learning in the same period. The 'B and B Commission' in the mid-1960s, the growth of Québec nationalism coupled with the Quiet Revolution, Centennial Year, the perceived 'Americanization' of Canadian society, and the rise of neo-progressive theory in Canadian education had deep effects for the study of political learning. Many scholars presented studies illuminating "many of the important problems in the study of Canadian political socialization" (Pammett & Whittington, 1976, p. ix). Hodgetts' 1968 study of civic education struck a 'whole series of sensitive nerves.' Studying the teaching of Canadian history, he found a marked ignorance of Canadian culture and institutions. Trudel and Jain (1970) found similar conclusions two years later. Other studies, in the 1970s, addressed the question of political socialization in Canada. Zureik and Pike (1975) edited two volumes on the socialization and values of Canadian society, covering a variety of topics such as political socialization among students, nationalism,
ethnicity, and images of Canadian identity as found in documents, and so forth. One year later, Higgins (1976) looked at Canadian children’s attitudes toward Canadian institutions and authority roles relative to American ones. During the same year, Forbes (1976) studied the differences which existed between French and English-Canadians in their perceptions of national identities. In 1977, Stamp touched the question of nationalism in Canadian education. He wrongly concluded that, unlike the United States, civic education in Canadian provinces never contributed “to feelings of national pride and national understanding among Canadian youth” (Stamp, 1977, p. 29). His definitions of ‘nationalism’ and ‘national identity’ were so narrowly constructed that he could not verify that English-Canadians, for instance, had a very strong national identity related to the British Empire.

Finally, others have focused their studies on the nature of political socialization and its impact on schooling (see Pammett & Whittington, 1976). Oliver (1976) suggested that political education needs to make clear distinctions between ‘socialization,’ that is, the process which transmits the dominant culture from one generation to another, and ‘politicalization,’ the process which induces active discontent with the political system, urging reform and transformation through political action. In the same vein, Tomkins (1977) argued that if civic education in Canada is a process of socialization, the school clearly has a responsibility for promoting greater mutual understanding, civic awareness, and participation skills and attitudes.

As Osborne (1996) has noted, by the 1980s it had become widely accepted in educational circles that true citizenship had to be ‘activist.’ Allegiance and respect for democratic institutions were no longer enough; citizens “had to be involved in the issues confronting them” (Osborne, 1996, p. 52). While Canadian education has not entirely followed Bruner’s notion of progressivism, Osborne (1996) argues that some teachers incorporated some ideas of discovery teaching, inquiry, and concern for dealing with public issues.
But saying citizenship education has to be activist is not to say that we no longer expect students to hold values and commitments that are generally similar to those of the community at large. Certain conditions, Pateman (1970) indicates, are necessary if the democratic system is to remain stable. Without community membership, for instance, there is no participation and no involved communication/deliberation. And, without this participation and communication/deliberation, there is no possible stable democracy. Quigley et al. (1991) refer to this willingness of citizens to set aside personal concerns or private interests for the sake of the common good in terms of 'civic virtue,' that is, those attitudes, values, and reasoned commitments of the citizen that are conducive to the healthy functioning and common good of the democratic system. Civic virtue, they note, is identified as the ultimate goal of civic education since civic dispositions and commitments of citizens are central to the nurture and strengthening of the ideals of democracy (see also Galston, 1991). One of the chief goals of school subjects, such as history and social studies, has been to transmit to students a socially shared conception of the world and history, allotting a privileged place to the study of 'their' nation and country (see Audigier, 1999).

However, several scholars have questioned the importance of socialization in school, viewing it as a mechanism of 'social control,' a tool by which those in power (the political élite) successfully maintained their position by teaching children to accept the world as it was, so there was no point in trying to change or modify it. Liberal social reformers, feminists, trade unionists, and other marginalized groups saw in education a possible vehicle of social change, a way of favouring the critical development of students' minds (see Osborne, 1999). They have argued that if democratic societies need to socialize students into the prevailing social norms, values and attitudes, they must avoid accusations of being engaged in an indoctrination process. Unlike totalitarian regimes, democracies are much more limited in the educational methods that can be used to influence the views of their young citizens. Indoctrination denies students the right to construct their own interpretations, knowledge, and way of life, develop their personal autonomy.
and, more importantly, violates fundamental democratic values such as freedom of thought. So, it was argued that a democracy needs to fulfill, as much as possible, the potential of each individual, according to his/her natural development; to help the student to develop in a critical way his/her social, political, and historical orientations. Otherwise, citizenship education is likely to promote an 'unreflective' patriotism, "one which glorifies the past history and current political system of the country, and which vilifies opponents of that political system [...]" (Kymlicka, 1999, p. 13).

Taking a neo-progressive stand, many scholars claim that education should help students “to think critically about events and institutions” (Egan, 1992, p. 134). It should teach them what some have called the notion of 'good judgement,' that is the ability to make an intelligent judgement about what it would be sensible or reasonable to believe or do (see Case & Wright, 1997). While Galston (1991) calls this 'philosophical education,' Engle and Ochoa (1988) refer to this notion as 'countersocialization,' that is, the ability of developing independent critical thinking, and individual autonomy and responsibility. Educators need to engage students in the rigorous intellectual and political process of grappling with public (and often controversial) issues. In order to develop these capacities, recent research in cognitive development have suggested that children must learn to distance themselves from beliefs they take from granted and accept to view things from other viewpoints (empathy).

Egan (1992) sums up the role of education in our democratic societies. Schools should initiate students into the prevailing social norms and values of the community, that is, aiming toward a certain 'homogenization' of children as equal members, while ensuring that students graduate with a better-informed and critical understanding of the nature of the world in which they live, that is, to make students critical about prevailing norms and conventions. As he puts it:

Schools today try to implement a concept of education that has so far accumulated two distinct constituents. They strive to make students share
prevailing values, norms, beliefs, and commitments, and they also strive to make students skeptical about prevailing values, norms, beliefs, and commitments. Put a bit tendentiously schools strive both to make students more alike and to make them more distinct. (Egan, 1992, p. 644)

In this sense, we can argue that schools are “legitimate intrusive state powers” (Galston, 1989, p. 100), but limited by their own inner logic, that is the respect of democratic principles (the rule of law, the dignity of citizens, individual rights and freedoms) on which they must rely to survive. In An Aristocracy of Everyone, Barber (1992) rightly contends that one educational paradox in democracy is to place schools as much as possible within the ‘real world’ so as to prepare the young to be literate, responsible, and ultimately free citizens while “stand[ing] apart from society in order to give students room to breathe and grow free from a too-insistent reality” (p. 209). Because schools by definition have to protect students’ own not yet mature selves, they must be seen by society as ‘guardians’ of democracy; and, this implies teaching them to be citizens. To do this, schools do not necessarily have be democracies in themselves. Schools cannot legitimately force someone to love the nation and the state or to volunteer, but they surely can teach him/her what citizenship entails and requires from citizens, and thus perhaps turn a complacent or selfish cynic into an active citizen. The ways to achieve this remarkable goal in school go beyond the purpose of this section. But, for Eisner (1992), if we want to know more about what schools should teach and how, we need to consider what he calls “curriculum ideologies;” what provides direction to the functions of schools in a democratic society (see Eisner, 1992, p. 302). It should be noted, however, that there is little consensus in the literature on the meaning of curriculum in education.
3.2 The meanings of curriculum

Miller and Seller (1990) note that the definition of ‘curriculum’ in education offers a very wide spectrum. At one end, curriculum is seen merely as “a course of study” (p. 3), while at the other end, curriculum is more broadly defined as “everything that occurs under the auspices of the school” (p. 3).

According to Cuban (1993), there are four conceptions of curriculum in education: the official curriculum, the taught curriculum, the learned curriculum, and the tested curriculum. He says that the most common strategy that policy-makers and scholars have used in the 20th century to understand what students know and do is to focus on the curriculum. But Cuban argues that curricular reforms have largely failed to transform our schools, which remain largely conservative, because the official curriculum — which is for them what state and district officials set forth — is only one of the four curricula present in schools, and for students, it may be the least influential.

Cuban (1979) describes the influence of curriculum on schools and students by making an analogy between the operations of the schools and a storm at sea. Although the storm might wreak havoc on the surface of the water, at the bottom of the sea the waters remain calm and quiet. Similarly, although scholars, bureaucrats and media might be animated by new, or even radical, ideas about educational practices, teachers working alone in their classrooms quietly go about business as usual. The most important lesson to be learned from Cuban's example, says Eisner (1992), is that it is unwise to confuse the ‘official curriculum’ with the reality of the classroom. Thus, for Cuban (1979), if we want to know more about what schools are like, what students know and understand, we need to get closer to the phenomena.

The first conception of curriculum, the ‘official curriculum,’ is essentially what state and district officials set forth in curricular framework and courses of study (Cuban, 1993). They expect teachers to teach it, and they assume that students will learn it. Official curricula are also
aligned with state-approved textbooks that teachers are directed to use. This is the curriculum that most people examine and fiddle with because they think that "teachers and students will simply fall into line" (p. 184). Studying the official curriculum is often commensurate with studying teachers' practices or students' understandings of the curriculum.

However, many scholars (Eisner, 1992; Clandinin & Connelly, 1992; Miller & Seller, 1990; Freire, 1972; Dewey, 1897) have argued that teachers do not simply transmit, implement, or teach a curriculum and its objectives, nor are students only influenced by the content of the curriculum or the textbooks. Clandinin and Connelly (1992) mention that "teachers and students live out a curriculum" (p. 365). Teachers present material to the student and, when successful, make it so clear and interesting that students learn. This is why Cuban (1993) suggests that teachers, working alone in their classrooms, choose what to teach, and how to present it, that is, the 'pedagogy' (from the Greek paidagógia, raising or teaching the child). Their choices derive from their knowledge of the subject, their experiences, from their affection or distaste of the topic and from their attitudes toward students. As a result, the model of teaching (Joyce & Weil, 1980) or the 'taught curriculum,' in Cuban's terms, differs from the official curriculum. They may overlap in certain key areas, but they may also differ substantially.

Similarly, the taught curriculum also overlaps with, but differs significantly from, the "learned curriculum" (Cuban, 1993, p. 184). What students learn goes far beyond what teachers intend. Collateral learnings, in Dewey's terms, may also occur when children pick up ideas from classmates, copy their teachers' habits, or strive to be as autocratic or democratic as those adults around them are. Osborne (1991) argues that "students can learn from how we teach as well as from what we teach. [They] do learn crucial lessons from how we teach that have lasting effects" (p. 10). Recent research in cognitive development have transformed the way educators understand teaching and learning. Proponents of socio-constructivism, for instance, have questioned the traditional behaviourist approaches to education. They argue that acquiring or
developing new knowledge is far more complex than reproducing what is taught. Learning
cannot simply be reduced to a transmission process from one person to another. Learning implies
thinking, understanding, and reconstructing. Students do not simply absorb or ‘record’ in a
passive mode what is presented in class; they are intellectually active. They reconstruct
knowledge for themselves in light of their past experiences, understandings, and representations.
As clearly expressed by Saint-Onge (1993), “l’activité d’apprentissage est une activité
intelligente car elle ne consiste pas à enregistrer le discours d’un professeur, mais à construire
pour soi une représentation utile de réalités et d’activités […]” (p. 23).

This role of the learners in constructing their competencies has been recognized by
scholars in history and citizenship education (see Audigier, 1999b; Seixas, 1999b, 2000). These
scholars argue that students construct their own understandings and interpretations of the official
and taught curricula based on their ability both to process what they receive (and perceive) and to
make links between new competencies, past experiences, and social representations.

Audigier (1999b) combines with the constructivist paradigm the concept of ‘social
representation’ developed in social psychology. Students already have ideas, knowledge, and
even theories that play an important role in their education. These ‘representations’ are not
constructed in a vacuum. They are constructed according to groups in which we live. The
concept of social representation implies that what students learn, reinterpret, and reconstruct is
largely influenced by the social space they inhabit, so that knowing about students’
representations can help understanding the ways of thinking of particular communities. As
Audigier (1999b) puts it:

[T]he competencies transmitted and acquired in history, geography, and civics
must be studied in terms of representations. The conceptions of the world, of
society, and society’s relationship with nature that are taught are all collective
theories, socially shared constructs, whose function is to transmit and disseminate a shared culture to a social whole. (p. 98)

Finally, for Cuban, what students learn in the classroom does not exactly match what is in the “tested curriculum” (Cuban, 1992, p. 184). Schools, districts and states often use tests, like provincial or national exams, to capture what students should learn from the official curriculum. For example, teachers generally take into consideration what is in the official curriculum to prepare their lessons, so the students can learn what might be asked in the exams. But, again, what is tested is only a limited part of what is intended by policy makers, taught by teachers, and, of course, learned by students. For Bloom (1981), the use of exams is essential to indicate how students have mastered or understood a particular subject. Exams, in the case of formative evaluation, are also useful to identify deficiencies in student learnings (of the official and taught curricula) that need to be corrected by the teacher.

3.3 Selection of studies

The studies selected for this review are divided into three categories: (1) studies having direct bearing on citizenship education (social studies, history, civics) in English Canada only; (2) studies on citizenship education conducted in Québec or in both English Canada and Québec; and (3) recent case studies on citizenship education from an international perspective (one including Canada).

The first category relies on Sears’ review of literature in citizenship education in English Canada (as of 1994), and includes more recent studies conducted in English-Canadian education. The second category covers research in citizenship education focusing on Québec or on both English Canada and Québec education. Finally, the last category presents two international case studies (one including Canada) on citizenship education since no recent case study has been
conducted in Québec or in English Canada in the field of citizenship education. Two comparative case studies on citizenship education were however being conducted in Québec when this research was written. The first one, led by Shiose focuses on how students become citizens in Québec and Japan public schools (see Hauenschild, 1998). The second one directed by Pagé, McAndrew, and Tessier focuses on citizenship education practices as found in Québec and Ontario.

3.4 Review of research

3.4.1 Studies conducted in English Canada

In his review of research on citizenship education in English Canada, Sears (1994) notes that overall 24 studies, focused on students' knowledge, skills and attitudes, as well as on policies, curricula, and instructional approaches to citizenship education, were conducted between 1968 and 1990. To this list, I have added two other studies conducted in the 1990s.

Sears (1994) notes in his review of literature that citizenship education is clearly seen as the central focus for the social studies curriculum in Canada (Davis, 1992; Masemann, 1989; Tomkins, 1983; Troper, 1978). Several studies (Tarrow, 1990; Masemann, 1989; McLeod, 1989; Conley & Osborne, 1983; Tomkins, 1983) show that from the 1960s to the 1980s the (official) curriculum in citizenship education in English-Canadian provinces has moved away from the “transmission of an essential British culture to the recognition of the multicultural, pluralistic nature of Canada and a focus on the skills and attitudes necessary to develop active, participating citizens” (Sears, 1994, p. 33). Other studies (Osborne & Seymour, 1988; Hodgetts, 1968), however, indicate that despite official curricular emphasis on contemporary issues, most teachers continue to teach in 'traditional ways,' emphasizing static content, the rote learning of political and historical events, and avoiding debates about contemporary controversial issues. While no direct link has been established between the research reviewed on the teaching methods and
student attitudes toward citizenship, the studies of Osborne and Seymour (1988) and Chamberlin (1991) suggest that students think about Canadian citizenship in activist terms. Other studies (Curtis et al., 1992; Simon, 1992; Brookes, 1990; Cummings & Danesi, 1990; Osborne, 1990; Gaskell et al, 1989; Curtis, 1988; Troper, 1978,) indicate that the way education is practised in Canadian schools (taught curriculum) continues to divide students by gender, class, and race and provide them with unequal opportunities to become active citizens in their community.

In terms of student attitudes, Sears (1994) notes that research indicates “moderate support for human rights, although not at a level that researchers feel is adequate” (p. 34). Some studies (see Hodgetts, 1968) suggest that students, particularly in Québec, tend to identify less with their Canadian nation than they do with their province or region. But, these studies are 30 years old, and were largely conducted before the increase of Canadian content in the curriculum in the 1970s and 1980s, influenced by organizations such as the Canada Studies Foundation.

Finally, some studies (Kirlcwood et al, 1987; Bowd, 1978) on student attitudes and knowledge suggest that Canadian students in the 1980s had increased their knowledge of Canada’s history and political institutions since the 1960s. But, as the researchers mention, it is extremely difficult to draw any definitive conclusions with these results since they did not consider the content of new curricular resources used in Canadian schools. Any number of external variables (e.g., the media) could have had an effect on the attitudes of students with regard to Canada and Canadian institutions.

At least two other studies of citizenship education in English Canada can be added to the English-Canadian studies reviewed by Sears (1994). The first study, "Scarcely yet a people" State policy in citizenship education 1947-1982, was conducted in 1994-1996 by Sears (1996) and focuses on the state’s involvement (federal) in citizenship education between 1947 (the Canadian Citizenship Act) and 1982 (the patriation of the Constitution). Three questions are addressed in the research: (1) what conception of citizenship formed the basis for state policy in
citizenship education?; (2) how did the state formulate citizenship education policy?; and (3) what means did the federal state use to implement citizenship education policy given that education is an area of provincial jurisdiction?

Although many departments of the Canadian state have been involved in education, and in citizenship education in particular, the Secretary of State’s Department (and its citizenship branch) is acknowledged as the most active. According to Sears, this department represents the ‘unofficial’ federal Minister of Education. Based on the premise that training for citizenship has always been a function of states and public schools, Sears analyzed how the federal state, through the Department of the Secretary of State, influenced provincial ministries of education and schools during this period to create a ‘new’ Canadian identity that was neither British nor American. The author shows that the policy of the federal state was a policy of assimilation and accommodation as a way of ensuring social stability and unity. The means the state used to implement its policy in citizenship education, according to Sears’ investigation, were both official (financial inducements and bilateral agreements) and unofficial (surrogates and direct programs) (Sears, 1996, p. 20). Sears suggests that the federal involvement in citizenship education overrode the constitutional recognition of education as a provincial jurisdiction on the basis of ‘national interest.’ In addition to direct sponsorship of particular programs (such as French immersion), the Canadian state sought to build the capacity for carrying out its policies in the future by developing pedagogical materials, institutional infrastructure and a cadre of trained teachers, despite provincial control of education.

For Sears, there is considerable evidence to indicate that citizenship education, as viewed by the Canadian state, reinforced an ‘elitist’ conception of citizenship, which does not favour wide participation of citizens and provides a narrow view of political culture, knowledge and skills. Accent was placed on loyalty to the nation, obedience to law and to political institutions. Politics was presented as a realm for well-educated ‘experts.’
Sears concludes that the attempts to construct a single national identity in education has been unsuccessful. The idea of forming a 'nation-state' largely failed because of the nature of the Canadian federation. Finally, the policy making process was not only elitist in nature, but it was also formed and implemented in an elitist fashion. The Canadian state carefully limited the involvement of citizens, private organizations, and the provincial governments in the making and implementation of their policies.

During the same period, Clark (1995) conducted an historical study of citizenship education using B.C. textbooks. The study 'Take it away youth! Visions of Canadian identity in British Columbia social studies textbooks, 1925-1989 analyzed the 169 social studies textbooks, approved for use in British Columbia schools from 1925 to 1989, following three turning points in education: the Putman-Weir Report (1925), the Chant Report (1960), and the establishment of the Canada Studies Foundation (in 1970). The goal of the study was to examine the different views of Canadian identity in the textbooks and how these views were redefined over time (in the three periods). A profile was created for each textbook based on eleven selected aspects of Canadian identity, regrouped under three themes: the conception of the ideal Canadian in the texts; the conception of Canada as a nation in the texts; and the conception of the student reader.

Clark found that the vision of Canadian identity inherent in the textbooks changed dramatically over the period, in terms of each of the themes explored. In the Putnam-Weir era, Canadian identity involved a sense of increasing independence with an enveloping allegiance to Great Britain and its Empire. Textbooks encouraged the adoption of characteristics of good Canadian citizenship such as loyalty to both Canada and the British Empire through the use of heroic figures. The concept of Canadian identity was also gendered, in that it excluded women, but inclusive of most immigrants since they were needed to people the land. But it was exclusive of particular ethnic groups, such as Oriental immigrants, because they were viewed by the
majority as unable to assimilate into the mainstream. The concept also excluded aboriginal peoples, seen as unable to contribute to the progress of Canada.

In the Chant era, Canada’s independence from Great Britain began to be taken for granted. Textbooks were more concerned with Canada’s relationship to the United States and its role on the world stage. Textbooks, she notes, saw ‘anti-Americanism’ as an important part of what made people ‘Canadian.’ But ‘Canadianness,’ in the texts, was inclusive of women, but only in peripheral roles (childcare, household duties). Immigrants, other than Orientals, received greater consideration. These ‘new’ Canadians were expected to contribute actively to the progress of their nation. Native peoples are presented in a negative way (‘veritable demons’), or simply discarded from Canadian history.

Finally, the Canada Studies period was characterized by two dominant movements: the promotion of Canadian nationhood, and a greater inclusiveness. Women, native peoples, immigrants of various origins, and disabled people and the elderly were included in the texts, and were generally presented positively. The Canada Studies era textbooks were ‘much blander’ than previous texts. She presents some explanations such as the reluctance of writers to make what could be construed as negative statements about certain groups of people, and the fact textbooks writers had many stakeholders to please, including strict provincial government textbook guidelines designed to overcome the use of prejudicial statements.

3.3.2 Studies conducted in Québec or in both Québec and English Canada

In 1968, Hodgetts published a report of the National History Project, a two-year investigation of Canadian history, social studies, and civics in English and French-Canadian schools. These subjects, according to Hodgetts (1968), were “regarded in Canada as the traditional academic areas in which civic education takes place” (p. 1). The study investigated various areas related to citizenship education such as student knowledge, teaching practices, classroom structures, teacher training, and curricular activities. The collection of data for this Canadian project included: (1) student questionnaire administered to 10,000 students across the country; (2) open-ended essay on the topic “What do you think of Canada?” to 1,000 students in 5 provinces (Québec, Ontario, Saskatchewan, Alberta, B.C.); (3) an hour-long student interview administered a group of 72 students from Québec and Ontario; (4) one-and-one-half hour teacher interview of with 500 teachers of Canadian history/social studies in all 10 provinces; (5) student-teacher questionnaire administered to 14 faculties of education in both French and English Canada; (6) preliminary interview of two hours administered to 200 persons directly concerned with some aspects of Canadian studies; (7) school and classroom observations in 247 schools (951 classes) in 20 cities across the country; and, (8) examination of current literature (published articles or books) and materials from departments of education.

In all areas studied, Hodgetts paints a desolate picture of Canadian citizenship education. His study points to stultifying teaching methods, the boredom of students, a dearth of good published work on Canada, and a excess of textbooks that offered bland consensus versions of Canadian history. He found that “much of the standardized Canadian history taught in these schools [was] antiquated and fundamentally useless” (p. 19). Not only were the courses “trapped within the confines of political, constitutional or military history” (p. 20), but they did not make any attempt to relate the events of the past to the problems and concerns of the present time. Hodgetts also found a total absence of any conflicting or controversial material in Canada history courses. He states that teachers were “following the noncontroversial, noninterpretative factual
Perhaps the most problematic finding was that students in English and French Canada (Québec) were presented a totally different understanding of Canadian culture and heritage. He argues that “Canadian studies in the schools of both linguistic communities do so little to encourage a mutual understanding of their separate attitudes, aspirations and interest” (p. 34).

In terms of classroom observations and teacher practices, Hodgetts reports that it was the “most unique and important part of the National History Project” (p. 3). Only there it was possible to determine the extent to which theory and practices coincide. He found that 62 percent of the classrooms visited had no Canadian books other than prescribed texts, only 10 percent had Canadian historical maps on the walls. Around 50 percent of teachers observed had nothing for their work but blackboards, chalk and desks. Less than 13 percent of classrooms provided “the physical environment conducive to effective history or social studies teaching” (p. 42). Hodgetts found that 75 percent of classes observed were using one of the two traditional methods of teaching: the lecture and the assignment methods. Most of the time, he argues, students were “bench-bound listeners” (p. 44) with no chance to discuss the material. In the classes using the second method (assignment), students were involved only in the mechanical process of question-answer based on the factual recall of a few assigned pages in the textbook. Only 8.5 percent of classes observed were described as “student-centered”, that is, turned in one way or another over to the students (Hodgetts, 1968, p. 50); an essential component of progressive education for Hodgetts.

Students’ understandings of Canadian history or Canadian studies were very limited. Facts were ‘learned by rote’ and quickly forgotten. Students had very few chances to develop critical thinking skills needed to “encourage an understanding and appreciation of a great many aspects of our cultural heritage” (Hodgetts, 1968, p. 75). Students had little interest in or desire to keep up with Canadian affairs. And those who did take an interest mentioned that their
motivating force came not from the school but from home, friends and other agencies. Hodgetts (1968) concludes that "schools are not stimulating as many young Canadians as they should to take a responsible interest in the affairs of their own country" (p. 78). For him, one direct consequence of this situation was the great political indifference or cynicism of students with regard to Canadian politics. He notes that the apathy of the great majority of students regarding Canadian studies "[was] taken out of the classes, and adversely [affected] their involvement in Canadian affairs" (p. 77). Hodgetts' study finally found that "French-speaking students in Quebec and English-speaking students from the rest of Canada [were] living in two different worlds" (p. 81). French Québécois identified exclusively with historical figures of their own nationality, and almost totally neglected any others from English Canada. Québec students' answers to the questionnaire revealed that they could find no reason for pride in either wars or Confederation. They took pride only in their forefathers who fought to preserve their language, customs and religion. Similarly, English-Canadian students were not really concerned with the relation between French and English-Canadians. There was, Hodgetts found, a "surprising lack of awareness of the Quiet Revolution" (p. 82) when they conducted the investigation in 1967, the very decade of the Révolution tranquille.

Hodgetts looked beyond classroom teachers to Canadian universities. He stated that university professors, in faculties of education and arts, failed to adequately model appropriate teaching strategies. The major recommendation of the report called for a national initiative in curriculum development — led by the Council of Ministers of Education of Canada (CMEC) — and teacher in-service training to cope with the "rapidly changing nature of society" (p. 91). Hodgetts' report sparked a growth in interest in Canada. The federal government encouraged the creation of the Canada Studies Foundation (CSF) and offered generous funding to supplement the money available for foundations. Provincial governments began to stress Canadian studies,
and book publishing programs received a boost, at least until 1986 when the CSF was dismantled for funding and (perhaps) political reasons.

As Sears (1994) suggests, Hodgetts study was very comprehensive and his conclusions compelling. It is one of the few Canadian studies that examines not only the official curriculum, as described by curricular documents, but also the taught curriculum (experienced by teachers in their classrooms) and the learned curriculum (experienced by students). Hodgetts argued that the only way to determine the extent to which educational theory and practice coincide was through classroom observations and interviews with students and teachers. He notes:

Very few social scientists have investigated carefully what actually goes on in the classroom or lecture hall. Subject matter and teaching methods have been by-passed in favor of studies of the overall influence of the school system…
direct classroom observations have not yet become a major source of information in this kind of research. (Hodgetts, 1968, p. 4)

In 1968, Forbes conducted a survey (by questionnaire) on national identity in 23 schools of three provinces (Québec, Ontario, Manitoba). Respondents were students in grade 11 and grade 12 in public high schools. The sample of schools was drawn from five urban areas: Winnipeg, Oakville, Toronto, Montréal, and Québec City. Altogether 1825 students completed the questionnaires.

In his report *Conflicting National Identities Among Canadian Youth*, Forbes (1968) endorsed many points made by Hodgetts. He discovered that when asked to describe themselves from the standpoint of nationality, English students typically responded quite differently than the French students. English-Canadian students called themselves ‘Canadians,’ while the French preferred to set themselves apart as ‘French-Canadians’ or ‘Québécois,’ in the case of French-Canadians in Québec. Forbes suggests that French and English-Canadian students have different
interpretations of nationalism. English students recognize that they are Canadian first, and only secondarily members of a particular ethnolinguistic group. Overall, 86 percent agreed with the statement “it would be better if everyone in Canada called themselves simply Canadians, instead of saying English-Canadian or French-Canadian” (Forbes, 1976, p. 303). Forbes suggests that English students tended to deny that cultural differences have any political significance.

French-Canadians strongly believed, on the contrary, that they are members of one of the ‘founding nations’ composing the state. One of the most revealing questions of the study is about language. As Hodgetts notes, Forbes’ results show that there was a lack of understanding between the two linguistic communities. He mentions that the majority of English-speaking students believed that less than 10 percent of Canadians were able to speak only French. These students think “bilingualism is a big fuss about a small problem” (p. 304). He finally concludes that the ‘two solitudes’ still exist in Canadian schools (p. 311).

Forbes’ study presents compelling results similar to the findings of Hodgetts (1968) with regard to students’ knowledge and attitudes about Canada. However, unlike the research in What Culture? What Heritage?, the conclusions of this research are based exclusively on a ‘paper-and-pencil questionnaire’ given to 2000 students.

At the request of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism (the so-called ‘B and B Commission’), a study of history education in English Canada and Québec was undertaken by Trudel and Jain (1970). The original plan was to make a survey of the objectives of the various teaching institutions, as well as an analysis of official courses of study, including textbooks, evaluation, and teaching strategies. For various reasons, the study was restricted to “a comparative study of Canadian history textbooks in use across the country” (Trudel & Jain, 1970, p. xi). Again, the results support many of Hodgetts’ points. Each national group had a different aim assigned to the teaching of history. For English Canada, history textbooks were intended to give future citizens a political and social education and a sense of nation, while
Québec textbooks aimed at inculcating a moral education. For the former group, history was a lesson in Canadian citizenship. For the latter, it turned out to be a catechism lesson or a ‘grandiloquent sermon.’ History education in Québec — as for many other topics under the influence of the Catholic Clergy — was essentially preoccupied with aspects of moral education. The purpose of history was to favour the love of la patrie. Not surprisingly, English-Canadian and Québec textbooks had different understandings of the nation. English textbooks were totally dedicated to the nation as a whole, rather than to provinces. On the contrary, Québec textbooks gave priority to provincial loyalty (their ‘nation’) over the Canadian nation. From this view, Québécois could think of themselves less as a minority in Canada and more as a Québec majority within their province. The authors conclude that “[w]hen we consider that today’s French-speaking youth has received its historical education from these books, we can hardly wonder at the great vogue for the separatist movement among young people” (Trudel & Jain, 1970, p. 131).

In the 1980s, Kirkwood and Nediger (1983) addressed the findings of Hodgetts (1968) with regard to students’ knowledge and attitudes about Canada. The authors were interested to know if “elementary and secondary school children [knew] more about Canada than their peers in the Hodgetts’ study” (p. 4). The study is a large-scale survey (by questionnaire) of the knowledge and attitudes of seventh and tenth-grade students in all ten provinces and two territories with regard to Canada. The sample included 10,821 students drawn from a random selection: 3303 in grade seven and 6418 in grade ten.

The conclusions contrast with Hodgetts’ findings. The students do possess a basic level of knowledge about Canada, and do possess positive attitudes with regard to their country. The attitudes and opinions appeared to be very positive with the vast majority of students feeling “very proud to be Canadian” (p. 37). Both grade seven and grade ten students had a better understanding of their country, their culture and their heritage than at Hodgetts’ time. Kirkwood
and Nediger (1983) suggest that this change was caused by various factors. First, they argue that educators have made a concerted and successful effort at improving the quality of social studies programs. Second, the work of organizations, such as the Canada Studies Foundation, appeared to have made a positive contribution in enhancing the status of Canada studies. Finally, the contribution of various government agencies, both provincial and federal, helped to advance the cause of Canadian studies.

In 1986, Mercier and Beaudoin (1989) conducted a study in the Québec city region to assess the contemporary belief that youth are 'apolitical.' The study was based on an analysis of policy statements and curricula, interviews with 15 teachers, and questionnaires sent to 62 students from elementary, secondary and college degree (CEGEPS). Mercier and Beaudoin (1989) conclude that while there are no official citizenship education courses in Québec, many school subjects contribute to the formation of citizens (history, geography, social and personal education). A majority of teacher interviewees favoured the status quo. The existing courses, for them, were covering issues of citizenship. A majority of students claimed to be interested in politics (provincial and federal) but teachers claimed that student interest is not always sustained. They also found that many students did not know the Canadian political system. For example, less than 20 percent of students wrote in the questionnaire that the parliamentary system was from Britain, not from the United States. In terms of identity, six percent of students considered themselves as ‘Canadians,’ 45 percent as ‘French-Canadians,’ 45 percent as ‘Québécois,’ and finally three percent as ‘world citizens.’ Mercier and Beaudoin conclude that it is difficult, given the scale of the study, to know if citizenship education objectives found in Québec programs are achieved in Québec classrooms. They note that, “personne ne sait exactement ce qui ce fait en classe. Personne ne sait si les objectifs d’éducation politique identifiés dans les programmes sont véritablement rencontrés en classe” (p. 410).
In 1992, Roy, Gauthier and Tardif (1992) examined the evolution of history programs in Québec from 1861 to 1981. The longitudinal study is divided into three periods: 1861-1904, 1905-1966, and 1967-1981. The theoretical framework used has two central elements: the rationale and the objectives of programs. The authors found many changes in the development of programs over the three periods. In the period of 1861-1904, history was presented as a tool for inculcating both Catholic values and a sense of French-Canadian nationhood. Based on the memorization of facts and dates, the programs focused on patriotism, Catholic values and attitudes essential to the construction of the French-Canadian nation (la nation canadienne-française). Very little information on English Canada was provided in the documents.

History programs in the second period (1905-1964) centered even more clearly on French-Canadian nationalism, language, religion, and patriotic values. Programs had a mandate to favour la survivance of the French-Canadian 'race.' History is defined as a tool for creating 'good' patriotic and religious citizens usually through the teaching of French-Canadian heroes and martyrs who contributed to the building of the nation (or the 'race'). They mention: "ces programmes prendront la forme d'un projet de survivance de la race canadienne-française" (p. 12). Unlike the first period, history teachers were encouraged to help students develop capacities to apply knowledge, conduct projects, and do exercises (mostly written). Formal teaching remained the recommended approach for history teachers.

The third period (1965-1981), marked a turning point in the development of history programs. With the Quiet Revolution, and the creation of a Ministry of Education, history became less associated with patriotic and Catholic justifications and more connected with the study of the past, based on historical evidence. The goal was no longer the formation of patriotic and religious French-Canadians, but the whole development of the student. Teaching methods also changed from 'traditional' (centered on the memorization of facts) to 'progressive,' focusing on the interaction between the teacher, the learner and his/her educational environment. History
programs continued to be a central element for structuring both the personal and collective identities of students. For example, in their analysis of the program Histoire du Québec et du Canada (grade 10), they note that “[l’]histoire nationale répondra à ces besoins car elle ‘devrait l’aider à découvrir l’enracinement (de ses appartenances sociales) dans le temps et, graduellement, l’ouvrir à l’ensemble de la société à laquelle il appartient’” (p. 56). But unlike the other periods, programs offer an understanding of society which is based on modern, democratic, and pluralistic realities of Québec and Canada. The French-Canadian nation has been replaced by a more pluralistic and liberal national community found in that province.

In 1994, Guay and Nadeau (1994) published a historical study on young francophone Québécois attitudes toward politics from 1969 to 1989. Their research is based on various Québec surveys, as well studies in two college institutions of Québec. Results show that young Québécois have significantly changed their political orientations over the period. In the 1980s, say Guay and Nadeau, surveys demonstrate that students were more concerned with personal and individual matters than young Québécois of the 1970s. Québécois were more ‘pragmatic’ and less ‘utopian’ than the previous generation. They were more conscious of what could be done in terms of social programs and collective provisions, and what would never be achieved despite political influences. Guay and Nadeau argue also that in the 1980s, youth involvement in various public organizations, such as in the area of environment, was not only a political battle but also an individual and global one. In brief, there was more than one way to achieve the same goal, especially in terms of global issues. Finally, they suggested that Québec nationalism was no longer seen as a collective goal of the young generation, “un projet de génération,” as they put it (p. 247). With time, they think that nationalism became more associated with ‘baby-boomers’ than with the students of the generation under consideration.

In 1996, as part of a collection of articles on citizenship education in the journal Canadian and International Education, Osborne published a longitudinal study of history and
social studies programs in both English and French Canada (including Québec) from 1867 to the 1990s. Based on curricula, textbooks, policy statements and historical documents, Osborne (1996) “attempts to provide a historical survey of the development of citizenship education in Canadian schools over the twentieth century” (p. 31).

The study distinguishes four periods in the development of citizenship education programs in Canadian schools. The first period, 1867 to the 1920s, coincides with the enforcement of compulsory schooling. Programs emphasized Canadianization of children as a vehicle of assimilationist nation-building (based on British traditions). The one exception of this nation-building enthusiasm was Québec, which had its own understanding of the federation. This dual situation led Canadian provinces to present two different conceptions of history and citizenship. In English Canada, French was considered as a foreign language, while in French-Québec curricula reflected essentially the French Roman Catholic traditions.

The second period, 1920s to the 1950s, put more emphasis on preparation for “democratic living” (p. 32). Curricula and literature of the period were more concerned with technical questions of teaching strategies, and citizenship became one topic among many. It became not only a question of national identity, but also a matter of personal values. As Canada increased its autonomy from Britain, programs focused more on an awareness of Canadian distinctiveness. Osborne argues that “[h]istory textbooks displayed every confidence that Canada was a nation” (p. 45). Still, he notes that French and English Canada were still presenting two contrasting views of history. While French achievements and attributes were ignored in English curricula and textbooks, French Québec focused essentially on the French regime, the Plains of Abraham and the survival of the French-Canadian race.

The third period, from the 1960s to the 1980s, is characterized by a renewed concern for civic education in both English and French Canada. Inspired by the publication of Hodgetts (1968), schools, curricula and textbooks centered more on the nature of the Canadian
Confederation and the place of Québec in Canada. The period is marked by an emphasis on Canadian studies, biculturalism and bilingualism, ethnic minorities, as well as on an active participation of citizens in public affairs. Osborne mentions, however, that little was done to bring francophone and anglophone programs and teachers together.

Finally, the period corresponding to the 1990s is marked, according to Osborne, by a decrease of interest in citizenship in school. Schools and social studies programs were according a greater importance to global issues, the economy and multiculturalism, and less on national citizenship. He claims that “[i]n the face of accusations that students were illiterate and innumerate, could not compete with their peers in other countries, and lacked proper work habits, it seemed beside the point to talk about citizenship” (p. 53).

In 1996, Tessier prepared a report for the Center of Ethnic Studies of the Université de Montréal (CEETUM) on citizenship education in Canada, France, and the United States. Based on policy statements, curricula, and other official information, the paper is a descriptive study of the practice of citizenship education, in terms of knowledge, skills and attitudes, in those countries. After presenting a review of different understandings of citizenship, Tessier (1996) suggests that unlike France, citizenship education in Canada and the United States is very decentralized. Each province or state is responsible for the education of its inhabitants. While citizenship education is officially found in social studies, history and geography courses in Canada, the United States favours civic education and social studies courses. In both cases, she claims that there are no official standards in citizenship education. In France, the situation is quite different. The country has had civic education courses since the 1980s, as well as history and geography courses. Like many other aspects of the France school system, programs are highly centralized. In 1996, she adds, the French ministry of education was in the process of renewing its programs to accord a greater importance to democratic principles, French values, and European issues.
Tessier (1996) suggests that all three countries recognize officially the importance of creating active and responsible citizens engaged in their community. She claims that, "[o]n affirmé, dans tous les pays à l'étude, l'importance de former des citoyens informés, actifs et responsables en prônant un enseignement qui tient compte de la pluralité et des conflits de la condition moderne désormais mondialisée" (p. 50). Influenced by progressive theories of education, France, Canada and the United States did, according to her study, allow for student-centered methods of teaching, the development of critical thinking, and political participation skills. Different programs or initiatives have been developed, on a regional or local basis, to favour the participation of students in the affairs of the school or the local community. However, when it comes to the knowledge essential to create citizens, many disagreements are found even within one state. She suggests that these differences might be related to tensions between the transmission of a common body of knowledge essential to favour national identity and the awareness of pluralism as a feature of modern societies.

Tessier (1996) also provides an international perspective on citizenship education. In her description of citizenship education as found in the documents under consideration, she presents very interesting similarities and contrasts between France, Canada and the United States. Tessier (1996) also discusses several implications of the preliminary report of the commission on the Estates General on Education (1996), established in Québec in 1995-1996, which had the mandate to provide the Ministry of Education with recommendations for the renewal of the education system in the province.

In contrast to the study of Osborne (1996), Laville (1997) published, in a special edition of the journal Canadian Social Studies on citizenship education, a report in which he argues that history programs in Québec are not really different from the history programs found elsewhere in Canada. The main objective of teaching history in Québec, he says, is to prepare informed citizens who are capable of active and thoughtful participation in the democratic society to which
they belong. According to Laville, history programs in Québec are also presenting a multicultural perspective, taking into account the pluralist dimension of Québec’s past and present. French-Canadian ‘martyrs’ and ‘heroes’ such as Dollard Des Ormeaux have been replaced by numerous groups of people who were previously ignored. This means, for Laville (1997), that history programs are less preoccupied with “teaching pre-established knowledge — without excluding it — than with having students develop their capacity to learn information and eventually construct new knowledge” (p. 23). In terms of teaching strategies, he argues that history curricula favour learning practices, problem-solving skills and inductive capacities of the learner, rather than the recitation of historical facts and dates.

In brief, Québec history programs focus less on a static content to be delivered and more on complex problem-solving skills necessary for active citizenship, just as elsewhere in Canada. Laville claims, however, that history curricula should be considered as ‘suggestions for the teacher.’ The teaching of history, he argues, is largely left to the discretion of teachers working alone in their classrooms.

In 1998, 30 years after the publication of Hodgetts’ report, Granatstein (1998) in *Who Killed Canadian History?* analyzed the place of history in Canadian schools and universities. According to him, nothing much has changed in history over the last 30 years. Based on several recent public surveys conducted in Canada, by organizations such as the Dominion Institute (see Evenson, 1998; Campbell, 1997, and Kennedy, 1997), he suggests that Canadian students are lamentably ignorant of their past, and when they are not, they have different understandings of Canadian history. Granatstein, a strong Canadian nationalist, claims that history is essential to create good and aware citizens since it is the way a nation, a people, an individual can learn who they are, where they came from, and how and why their world has turned out as it has. Based on curricula, textbooks, historical documents and discussions with various people, he argues that public schools scarcely teach Canadian history, because too busy are they fighting racism,
sexism, and instructing recent immigrants English as a second language (ESL). Recent psychological analysis, he says, has suggested that teaching content, historical content, was too complicated for young minds. Progressive theories implemented in the last decades favour the development of the whole child, not to “stuff them full of knowledge” (p. 25). ‘Self-realization,’ he adds, has become the sacred goal of education. This attitude of educators is also coupled with a shift in programs from politics and community to individual rights and freedoms, and multiculturalism. He argues that for “educational theorists, history was boring, irrelevant, and fit only for the slag heap, except for small nuggets that could be pulled out of the past and made useful for current concerns about racism, gender equity, and the plight of native peoples” (p. 26).

For Granatstein, the consequences of progressive theory in education are that four provinces (Alberta, Saskatchewan, Nova Scotia, Newfoundland) require no Canadian history at all in high school. The teaching of Canadian history, he argues, is also regionalized, fragmented along geographical and political lines. Québec, for instance, presents Canadian history with an emphasis on the Québec society, and still propagates Québec nationalism not only in the classrooms, but also via textbooks (citing Nemni, 1996). He argues that Québec teachers (whose unions are heavily separatist supporters), because the CEQ union overtly supported the PQ’s option in the 1995 Referendum, “preach the party line that Quebec has a collective history and forms a nation” (p. 35).

Looking beyond primary and high school levels, Granatstein analyzed how universities and, especially faculties of education and departments of history prepare student-teachers and university graduates. University professors, he claims, mostly remain alone in their specialist ‘cubbyholes,’ rather then reaching out to treat subjects that tell Canadian students and citizens who they are, where they have come from, and where they are going. They write books and papers destined to remain unread on university library shelves instead of linking theory with practice.
According to him, the result is that students leave university "culturally illiterate, ignorant of the basic details about their nation and their society that every thinking citizen requires" (p. 66). University professors present so fragmented a history (ethnic, multicultural, feminist, postmodernist, and so forth) that students complete their degree without knowing anything about their nation and their culture. Granatstein argues that many history and social studies teachers are greatly influenced by universities. As a result, they teach kids what they have learnt in university, and, in too many cases, they know nothing about Canadian history. The consequence is that "[u]neducated teachers produce uneducated students" (p. 66).

In the same way, he argues that even if there was an increase of interest in Canadian studies in universities and schools in the 1970s, Canadian history and social studies have been devaluated in schools in the 1990s. Granatstein reports that the emergence of globalization, the role of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and the influence of multiculturalism have greatly contributed to the belief that Canadian citizenship is now 'obsolete.' Furthermore, he argues that committees of bureaucrats in all provinces demand politically correct language in the textbooks, insisting on adding this and deleting that, and, overall, "producing the blandest of mush" (p. 41) to reflect the multicultural mosaic of the Canadian society.

In his conclusion, Granatstein proposes solutions to 'resurrect' Canadian history in schools. Among other things, he mentions that parents, the taxpayers, must insist that their kids receive knowledge of Canadian history, not a history filtered through a provincial or a regional lens, or given a multicultural tilt. Canadian Ministries of Education must also welcome 'national standards' and compulsory history courses in their public schools. In brief, he says that ministries must give Canadian history the place that it deserves in school.
3.4.3 International case studies

Around the world, research in citizenship education has received increased attention in the 1990s. Globalization, increased social mobility, a feeling of civic apathy among youth, and the resurgence of nationalism in various democratic and post-communist countries invite a redefinition of the mission of the school and, more specifically, of citizenship education courses. The International Bureau of Education (IBE) of the UNESCO in Geneva launched in the mid-1990s several international research actions to contribute to increasing the social efficiency of education: *What Education for What Citizenship?* is a project that was created to identify research and information needs with a view to educational decision-making and a comparative study of history and geography textbooks (see IBE, 2001). Similarly, the Council of Europe has commissioned various studies on education and democratic citizenship in the context of an interdependent Europe (see Audigier, 1991). In the United States, many studies on civic education, law-related education, and comparative education have been undertaken by scholars and/or organizations such as The Center for Civic Education (2001), CIVITAS: An International Civic Education Exchange Program (2001), The National Council for the Social Studies (2001), and the United States Department of Education.9

In this last section, I present two international case studies conducted in the 1990s, one including Canada, having direct bearing on this thesis (Cogan & Derricott, 1998; Hahn, 1998). The first study (Cogan & Derricott, 1998) is an international comparative study on citizenship education for the 21st century including nine countries (England, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Netherlands, Canada, Japan, Thailand, and the United States). The intent was to understand how the educational systems of the nine participating countries respond to the challenges, issues and problems including the globalization of the economy, the deterioration of the global environment, changing technologies, and the social and ethnic issues.
The first part of the study ‘Citizenship for the 21st Century’ contains case studies of the position of citizenship education in the nine countries. Each team (made up of scholars and teachers from the country under study) presents how citizenship education is carried out in school and through what kind of courses. Case studies are based on policy statements, official documents, curricula, and studies conducted on the subject. What emerges from the studies is that some of the issues are universal (human rights, globalization) and some local or regional (national identity). More specifically, the five European countries sampled in the study face many common problems and some distinct and unique national ones. In terms of curriculum in three of the countries (England, Hungary, Netherlands) there have been important reforms in the 1980s and 1990s that have laid down clear signposts for how citizenship education in those countries should develop on a ‘national’ and ‘European’ level in keeping with the expended membership of the European Union. While Germany has been preoccupied with the aftermath of reunification, Greece showed little sign of joining the curricular reform movement. Common in the three recent reforms is the need to develop a European perspective through citizenship education curriculum.

In the two Asian countries selected (Japan, Thailand), citizenship education is not given a high priority, although both ministries of education have indicated that education for citizenship is the instrument for human development. While there are some pressures in both countries for a more global perspective in citizenship education (awareness of global issues, peace education), life studies, social studies, or civic programs — generally very centralized — are highly focused on national identity, namely Japanese or Thai culture, family, and religious beliefs. Although student-teachers are introduced to human rights and global issues, teachers, as well as approved textbooks, continue to present a very conservative conception of citizenship.

In North America (Canada, the United States), there is a considerable activity in citizenship education even if many scholars and teachers criticize the actual programs as being
“too weak to amount to anything” (Parker in Cogan & Derricott, 1998, p. 72). In both Canada and the United States, citizenship education is presented through social studies, civics, history and geography courses, and programs are largely decentralized. The Canadian team (Case, Osborne, and Skau) shows that historically there has been a close link between schooling and citizenship in all provinces. The school has historically been perceived as a ‘prime promoter’ of Canadian citizens. Although early visions of citizenship were historically intensely ‘Anglocentric,’ today’s vision of Canadian citizenship is largely inspired by the principles of multiculturalism and bilingualism. Unlike the Americans, however, Canadians have never developed a strong sense of national identity. French-Canadians, and particularly those living in Québec, have systematically rejected (in school and in the population at large) the English-speaking majority’s conception of the nation. The authors conclude by suggesting that citizenship education in all provinces (including Québec) is influenced by law-related education, human rights, global and environmental issues, and finally multicultural education. Finally, there is an emerging interest in making community service a required part of the school curriculum.

The second part of the research presents the findings of a Delphi Cultural Futures research method utilized to get the opinions of a panel of 182 experts and scholars (from the nine countries) on a new multidimensional citizenship model for the 21st century. The Delphi method, which is an adaptation of an Ethnographic Delphi Futures Research (EDFR) model, is frequently used in order to develop appropriate policy directives by governments. The panel was asked to identify a pool of national experts (a final total of 264) for both the interview and survey rounds of the research. Three major questions were asked of these panelists in the initial interview round: what are the major global trends likely to have a significant impact upon the lives of their citizens in the next 25 years?; what will be the characteristics required of individuals in order to cope with and/or manage these trends?; and how might these characteristics be developed in education? Based on the results, a survey was constructed around the areas of global trends.
citizen characteristics, and the strategies, innovations, and approaches required to implement the development of the characteristics. The survey was sent to a total of 264 participants.

Overall, 19 global trends, 8 characteristics, and 16 strategies, approaches, or innovations achieved a consensus among the participants of the nine countries. Global trends rank from the economic gap among countries and between people within countries through to deforestation, access to water, and conflicts between developing and developed countries.

The eight citizen characteristics (obtained by consensus) for the competent citizens of the 21st century include: the ability to approach problems as members of a global society; the ability to work in cooperation with others; the ability to tolerate cultural differences; the capacity to think critically, the willingness to resolve conflict in a non-violent manner; the ability to defend human rights; and the willingness and ability to participate in politics at local, national, and international levels.

Finally, there was a consensus on 16 educational strategies and approaches highly recommended for policy makers during the next 25 years. There strategies rank from extensive international links among educational institutions through to increase attention to global issues and international conflicts in the school curriculum, community action and involvement, and cooperative learning activities.

The study concludes by focusing on the implications of the trends, characteristics, and strategies for teachers, classroom practices, and more globally for the whole structure and functions of schooling. No reference is, however, made to actual practices (taught curriculum) and students’ understandings of citizenship (learned curriculum) in the nine countries under analysis. When looking at the study, one wonders how this approach to citizenship in education is applicable to countries like Canada where people agree with the necessity of addressing global issues but question the principles according to which countries are defined essentially in terms of nation-state.
The second international case study research on citizenship education was conducted by Hahn (1998) in five Western democracies (England, Denmark, Germany, the Netherlands, and the United States). This is an extensive study of citizenship education practices and students’ political attitudes. The questions driving the research were: how are political attitudes similar and different among samples of adolescents in the five countries?; in what similar and different ways do adolescents describe their political attitudes, beliefs, and experiences and their social studies classroom experiences?; are there gender differences in student political attitudes; is there a relationship between classroom climate and adolescents’ political attitudes across the countries; and what differences and similarities occur across national context in citizenship education or ‘social studies’?

The sample of schools and students in the five countries includes teenagers from the age of fifteen to nineteen, in varied types of secondary schools. Schools were selected from diverse communities and regions within each country (eight local communities in England, six local communities in Germany, seven local communities in Denmark, four local communities in the Netherlands, and five local communities in the United States). For the most part, the 50 secondary schools selected were located in small cities or suburbs of large metropolitan areas predominantly composed of families in the lower to upper middle class. A few schools in each country contain a “relatively substantial portions of students who were members of ethnic minorities” (Hahn, 1998, p. 2). Because the author did not get national random samples of students in each country, Hahn (1998) warns that findings cannot be generalized to the wider population of adolescents in the five countries.

The methods for collecting data for the study include: two questionnaires (measuring political attitudes, efficacy, trust, confidence, political behaviors, beliefs in political rights, perceptions of classroom climate) distributed to 1400 students (for the first one) and to 4000 (for the second one); classroom observations in 1985-1986, 1992-1993, and 1994-1995 (in social
studies or other similar programs of citizenship education); and finally interviews with some teachers and students (using a semistructured interview format).

After describing citizenship education in the five countries, Hahn (1998) concentrates on adolescent political attitudes and behaviors, gender and political attitudes, freedom of expression and civic tolerance, classroom climate, and finally teaching strategies. Although the five countries are all democracies with many shared experiences and values, the study shows considerable differences in the ways they prepare their young citizens to participate as active members of their nation and state.

In terms of adolescent political attitudes, Danish and American students indicated high levels of political interest and efficacy, English students were generally interested in politics, while German and Dutch students indicated comparatively low levels of political interest (some even suggested in interview that they rarely discuss current political issues). There are also interesting differences in the way students support or view women in politics. For example, students in the United States suggested that they hear mixed messages in school. They are taught that anyone can become president (or can aspire to), yet they observe few female political leaders. Likewise, German students also hear that anyone can hold office but observe primarily male politicians. Students in the Netherlands received a more consistent message, which said women’s traditional place is in the home, not in politics. Finally, in Denmark, observations and comments suggest that female students appear to be as assertive as their male classmates (in all other countries male students seemed to dominate social studies discussions).

In terms of student attitudes toward free expression, responses in interviews and questionnaires clearly demonstrate that they all support free expression. Some students (especially in the United States, Germany, and England) said, however, they would deny these rights to people like communists. In Germany, for instance, students learn and accept that the speech and writing of antidemocratic groups are not protected. Similarly, many students
(including American as well as German students) expressed a dislike of racists. On the issue of classroom climate, overall, across countries, results suggest that students report remarkably similar perceptions of their classroom climate. Nonetheless, country differences are still evident. While students in Denmark perceive their classrooms as relatively 'open,' Dutch students perceive their classrooms as relatively 'closed.' That being said, Hahn suggests, however, that in every country some (but not all) teachers combine reflective pedagogy, issues content, and a supportive atmosphere to model democratic inquiry and discourse. Clearly, their socialization let them do that in distinctly Danish, English, German, Dutch, or American ways.

In conclusion, Hahn (1998) offers very useful information on the study, the results found in every country, and an agenda for future research in citizenship education. She suggests that particular attention should be given to Central and Eastern European societies and non-democratic states.

### 3.4.4 Critical analysis of studies

The studies presented in this section provide interesting findings on citizenship education in English Canada, Québec, and other countries around the world. Yet, from the point of view of this thesis, there are several limitations that I will review very briefly.

First, except for the study of Hodgetts (1968) and Hahn (1998), the learned and taught curricula have received marginal attention in the previous studies. We have very little information on what teachers teach in their citizenship education classes (history, social studies, civics) in Canada (or even elsewhere), or on how students construct and understand theoretical concepts such as citizenship, nationalism, participation, and pluralism. For example, how can Kirkwood and Nediger (1983) pretend that “educators have made a concerted and successful effort in improving the quality of social studies in schools” (p. 36) if the study did not analyze teaching practices (taught curriculum)? Similarly, how can Granatstein (1998) argue that “there
is little doubt that students come out of the public and high schools [...] less prepared in every respect than they were thirty years ago” (p. xv) if, like Neatby in 1953, he did not go to school to study and interview students in their history and social studies classrooms. I have shown that learning is a process far more complicated than ‘absorbing’ passively what is found in the curricula, textbooks, or exams. Even the taught curriculum cannot tell us exactly what students think. In this context, we can argue that despite the alarming conclusions of some (Trudel & Jain, 1970; Osborne, 1996; Granatstein, 1998) researchers know little of how Canadian students envisage their lives as citizens; how they will shape our country in the future.

Second, only a minority of studies reviewed (Hodgetts, 1968; Trudel & Jain, 1970; Forbes, 1976; Osborne, 1996; Tessier, 1996; Granatstein, 1998) provided a comparative analysis of citizenship education in Québec and English-Canadian provinces. When considering the historical divergent views French and English-Canadians have had of their country and its history — and the political/constitutional impasse in which Canadians find themselves — it is difficult to accept that most studies continue to have a naive pan-Canadian approach to citizenship education as if the country was a traditional ‘nation-state.’ Such studies do not reflect the diversity and complexities of our multi-ethnic and multinational state and, as such, do not inform Canadians adequately on citizenship education practices.

Finally, many of the studies dealing with English Canada and/or Québec have contradictory conclusions with regard to aspects of Canadian citizenship, such as identity, nationalism, pluralism, and even history (see Forbes, 1976; Guay & Nadeau, 1994; Laville, 1997; Granatstein 1998). In my opinion, much of the problem with those studies comes from the fact that researchers have difficulties in providing clear analytical arguments on those theoretical concepts. For some, the nation is wrongly synonymous to the state, while for others, the discourse around nationalism (in Québec) in the programs, textbooks and representations of teachers are confused with regionalism or provincial autonomy. Again, this situation is totally
lamentable in the Canadian context. Scholars, policy-makers, educators, and the public in general all need better articulated research in citizenship education to prepare Canadian students for this century. As Coulter and Wiens (1999) put it, “Canadians must decide what kind of society they want to create and what kind of education is consistent with that society” (p. 7). I think Canadians have not even agreed yet on the ‘kind of society’ we want for us and for our students.

4. Review

In this chapter, I have discussed the meaning of citizenship education in a democracy. When we look closely at the implications of the mandate of school, we run into a problem of mutual incompatibility. We try to make sure that students fit into the society in which they live, but we do not want to endanger the fulfilment of each student’s personal interest and orientations, essential to the development of thoughtful citizens capable of making lucid judgment about personal and public issues.

Similarly, the diverse nature of studies reviewed makes it difficult to come to any clear and firm conclusions about research in citizenship education in English Canada and Québec. However, some tentative conclusions can be drawn from the review.

As the studies reviewed have shown, citizenship education is a central focus for schools, and more precisely for social studies, history, and geography courses in Canadian provinces. Several studies suggest that, over the years, teaching practices have greatly evolved from the pure ‘transmission’ of a common body of knowledge to more progressive or ‘active methods’ which focus on students’ needs, and recognize the plurality of individuals composing our schools (and our country). Similarly, influenced by new teaching methods, knowledge has been viewed less as ‘content’ to be mastered, and more as an ongoing interaction between both content and process related to various modes of inquiry and to the scientific method (see Miller & Seller, 1990).
Despite these changes, certain studies (Forbes, 1968, Guay & Nadeau, 1994, Laville, 1997; Granatstein, 1998) present contradictory results. Guay and Nadeau (1994) suggest in their review that Québec students in the 1980s moved away from nationalism. Laville (1997) argues that history programs in Québec are similar to history programs of English Canada and do not favour Québec nationalism.

On the contrary, Granatstein (1998) assumes that Québécois, influenced by history programs and their school system, still understand Canadian history in totally different terms than do English-Canadians. The study of Mercier and Beaudoin (1989) also suggests that Quebec students have a different interpretation of national identity, considering themselves Québécois or French-Canadian first and foremost.

Similarly, while Kirkwood and Nediger (1983) argue that students appear to have higher levels of knowledge and better attitudes toward Canada compared to Hodgetts' study, Granatstein (1998) suggests that Canadians are becoming a nation without memory. Students are "wholly ignorant of their nation's past" (Granatstein, 1998, p. xvi); they think that nothing important ever happens here. He claims that Canada is one of the few nations in the Western industrialized world that does not make an effort to teach its history positively and thoroughly to its young people.

Finally, in terms of methodology, this review of literature clearly indicates that the majority of studies considered are based on content analysis, focused exclusively on one form of curricula, chiefly the official one. As Cuban (1993) suggests, scholars and reformers continue to 'fantasize' about the effects of the official curriculum as if they were convinced that teachers and students will simply fall into line. As Sears (1996) notes, very little is known about the practice of citizenship education in Canadian classrooms today.

I argued in the first chapter that the scarcity of research in citizenship education in English Canada and Québec, and on students' understandings of citizenship suggests that there is
a great need for further inquiry in citizenship education in the Canadian context. There is no recent study using ethnographic or case study research focusing on citizenship practices (Sears, 1994). Hammersley and Atkinson (1995) argue that these approaches are growing in popularity in social research, and would serve to complement other types of research (content analysis).

1 For an analysis of the distinctions between ‘democratic education’ and ‘education for democracy’, see Oldenquist (1996).
3 To this list, one could add nine historical studies of citizenship education in English Canada. For the purpose of this research, I have decided to focus exclusively on those having direct bearing on the topic of this dissertation.
4 A similar research was conducted one year later by Kirkwood, Khan and Anderson with grade 12 students, see Kirkwood, Khan & Anderson (1987).
5 This special edition presents various international studies dealing with topics such as Citizenship Education and Aboriginal peoples in Canada, Citizenship Education and Canadian Immigration, Citizenship Education and Feminist Movements in Canada, the Second IEA Civic Education Project, Human Rights Education in Canada, Civics Education in Australia, and Civic Education in the United States (see Canadian and International Education, 1996).
6 After revision, this paper was later published in Revue Française de Pédagogie (1997).
7 However, in 1994 the Center for Civic Education developed voluntary national standards for civics and government for students in kindergarten through grade 12. These standards, according to Cogan (1996), appear to have a great potential, but they are not compulsory.
8 In this special edition of Canadian Social Studies (1997), there are several articles dealing with the reform of history education in Québec, a review of literature on citizenship education (originally published in 1994 by Sears), and social studies education in English Canada. The article of Laville (1997) was the most relevant one for this review.
9 For a discussion on citizenship education in the United States and some research in the area, see Gossett (2000) and Miller (1999).
CHAPTER 4

IV. METHODOLOGY AND METHODS

In this chapter, I discuss the methodology for this study. As educators and others who conduct social research, it is necessary to define what constitutes a qualitative inquiry (section 1). I will first argue that the term 'qualitative inquiry' embodies various modes of inquiry and, then, define the principal features of a qualitative study. This will lead me to discuss more intensively one approach used in qualitative inquiry: case study (section 2). I will demonstrate that case studies draw from various disciplines and vary depending on the nature of the final report. In section 3, I will present the aim of this study, explain why I decided to choose a multiple-case study design, and discuss my position as a researcher, the selection of the cases, and the methods for collecting the data. Finally, I will talk about some concerns regarding validity, reliability and ethics in case studies (section 4).

4.1 On the nature of qualitative inquiry

Qualitative inquiry in education is an 'umbrella term' for various modes of learning about schools and classrooms (see Schwandt, 1997). For example, qualitative researchers might call their work ethnography, phenomenology, educational criticism, case study, or any other terms. As suggested by Eisner (1998), qualitative inquiry is a broader concept than research terms such as ethnography. If ethnographic studies are an example of qualitative inquiry, qualitative inquiry is not an example of ethnographic study. But all qualitative researchers in education are motivated by the same goal, that is to know what teachers and students do in the settings in which they work. Therefore, the key words associated with qualitative inquiry include 'contextual,' 'complexity,' 'exploration,' and 'discovery.' Unlike quantitative inquiry — some times called scientific or traditional research — qualitative inquiry does not rely on the use of
quantitative data. For some aspects of educational research, quantification may be appropriate, but it does not constitute the primary source of data (Schwandt, 1997). As a result, the difference is not that one addresses quantitative data and the other does not. Rather, it pertains mainly to the importance accorded to those data in presenting a body of work. In this sense, the ‘qualitateness’ of a study occurs in degree. Merriam (1988) adds that, unlike quantitative inquiry, qualitative inquiry assumes that there are multiple realities to be understood, that “the world is not an objective thing out there but a function of personal interaction and perception” (p. 17). In her view, beliefs rather than simply facts form the basis of perception.

Qualitative inquiry presupposes also that in order to understand social phenomena researchers must “immerse themselves in the settings or lives of others, and use multiple means [to] gather data” (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992, p. 7). This implies the necessity of ‘getting in touch’ with the schools and classrooms we care about, to see them, and to use what we see as sources for interpretation. In the words of Eisner (1981), to know a rose by its Latin name and yet to miss its fragrance is to miss much of the rose’s meaning.

According to Eisner (1998), there are six features of a qualitative study. These features contribute in different ways to the overall character of a qualitative inquiry. First, qualitative studies tend to be ‘field focused’ (see Burgess, 1984). As I have been arguing, qualitative researchers go out to schools, visit classrooms, interview and observe students and teachers. Not only do researchers observe and interact with people, but also study inanimate objects such as school architecture, textbooks, classroom design, and the location of maps, trophies, and so forth. In short, anything that has import for education is a ‘potential subject matter’ for qualitative researchers. Glesne and Peshkin (1992) argue that qualitative researchers depend on a variety of methods for gathering data: observation-participation, interviewing, and document collection. They add that writing memos to oneself, developing analytic files, applying rudimentary coding
schemes, and writing monthly reports also help researchers to learn from and manage the information they are receiving.

A second characteristic of qualitative studies relates to 'the self as an instrument.' Unlike most other modes of inquiry, qualitative studies view the self as an instrument to gather data, with or without the aid of an observation schedule. The researcher is, therefore, the “primary instrument for data collection and analysis and as such must possess certain characteristics in order to produce a good [study]” (Merriam, 1988, p. 52). So, for a qualitative researcher, it is not only a matter of checking behaviors, but rather of perceiving their presence and interpreting their significance. Indeed, qualitative researchers do not announce themselves or “wear their labels on their sleeves” (Eisner, 1998, p. 33). They must be sensitive to any particular context and see what counts for the study without being presented or even introduced to people. In brief, they must be highly sensitive to the context in which they work.

Related to the self as an instrument is the exploration of our own subjectivity. Because researchers are human beings, they are limited by their personal biases. What researchers see as significant (or irrelevant) has great impact on the interpretation of those events. The way in which we see and respond to a situation, that is, what we pay attention to, will bear ‘our signature.’ This signature will provide a personal insight into a specific situation. Unlike quantitative studies where conformity to a standard criterion is applied uniformly by all judges or researchers, qualitative studies regard the unique signature of the researcher as the ‘higher good’ to be achieved. It provides a specific way of looking at the world, in this case the educational world.

The third feature that makes a study qualitative is its “interpretative character” (Eisner, 1998, p. 35). Here, interpretative means that (1) inquirers try to account for what they have given an account of, that is, the ability to explain why something is taking place, and (2) to penetrate the surface, that is to make a ‘thick description’ (in Geertz’s terms), and explain the
meanings of events for those who experience them. In this sense, qualitative inquiry is a rich
description of the phenomenon under study. Peshkin (1991) in his study of ethnic minority
students in Riverview High School provides a good example of a ‘thick’ description that seeks to
present the meaning of events for those people.

A fourth feature closely related to the previous one is the use of expression and the
presence of ‘voice’ in text. Researchers need to display their ‘signatures,’ to show that a person,
not a machine, is behind the words presented in text. Although there are various styles of writing
(see Becker, 1986), the use of expressive language should put the reader there. To understand the
kind of place a school or a classroom is, people need to have the kind of account that will enable
them to know what it would feel and look like if they were there. In brief, the researcher needs to
use the language of people in the setting. Glesne and Peshkin (1992) identify several strategies
for presenting a good qualitative study: the natural history approach, the chronology technique,
the ‘zoom lens’ technique, and the narration and analysis approach.

For Hammersley and Atkinson (1995) whatever technique is used, qualitative inquirers
must have a ‘sense of the audience.’ They have to consider that reports, monographs, or
dissertations are read by people who have not done the work in the field. Eisner (1998) refers to
this as ‘empathy,’ that is, the ability to see and understand the world from a perspective not our
own. In this sense, empathy requires imagining ourselves in the position of someone else.
Empathy pertains, therefore, to feelings or to emotion. Readers must feel that they are in the
school or in the classrooms. In brief, good qualitative writers help readers to see the world as if
they were there, to experience ‘the heat of the classrooms.’ They are translators of culture. They
work “to understand the other’s world and then to translate the text of lived actions into a
meaningful account” (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992, p. 153).

The fifth feature of a qualitative inquiry is attention to particulars. Qualitative researchers
use particular cases to arrive at general statements. Since research situations are too vast to
interview or observe everyone, researchers need to choose events, times, people, and so forth. This selection is based on what the researcher sees as relevant for his or her study. In the words of Glesne and Peshkin (1992), qualitative researchers do not feel the need to ‘get in’ with everyone, everywhere. What is important is to pay attention to the behaviors of those under observation. In this way, the researcher is able to move from the individuals to their behaviors, and to thoughts about the more general behaviors of people within the classroom or the school. In brief, they need to transfer what has been learned from one situation to another. Eisner (1998) mentions that in writing a qualitative study, researchers always tell an incomplete story. They do not and cannot tell it all. Their narration is inherently selective but helps readers to learn and even generalize from it.

Finally, a sixth feature of qualitative studies pertains to the criteria for judging their success. Qualitative researchers become credible because of the coherence, insight, and instrumental utility of their study. Unlike fiction stories, qualitative studies employ multiple forms of evidence to seek to discover the truth, that is, to know things objectively. Although qualitative writers present their vision and their understanding of a specific context (usually by using the ‘I’ form in text), all qualitative researchers view objectivity as an ideal to achieve and subjectivity as the ‘prototypical orphan in the cinders,’ that is, “something to live with” (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992, p. 101). As Peshkin suggests (in Glesne & Peshkin, 1998, p. 104), if objectivity in qualitative inquiry is an ideal, subjectivity may become a virtue. Indeed, my subjectivity becomes the basis for the story I am able to tell people. It makes me who I am as a person (the self) and as a researcher, “equipping me with the perspectives and insights that shape all that I do as researcher, from the selection of topic clear through to the emphases I make in my writing” (in Glesne & Peshkin, 1992, p. 104).

Some might conclude that qualitative inquiry is not based on scientific methods, presenting only personal narratives. The point I want to make is rather that the unique
perspective of the inquirer helps her/him to see a situation from a different point of view instead of reducing all views to a single correct one. The goal of a qualitative inquiry is to enlarge our understanding of a topic by providing different points of view. In a clear example of ‘deer hunting,’ Eisner (1998) shows how various perspectives of a situation can be totally different but all valid. To the question of the teacher ‘why were the deer to die during the hunting season?’ one student said deer would die because of good hunters like his father. Another replied that they would die from blood loss and a shortage of oxygen to the brain. Finally, another one said that the real reason the deer would die was that the state legislature was pressed by the National Rifle Association to permit the hunting of deer. Each of students’ explanations is in some ways plausible and valid. No one of them is truer than another. It depends only on the perspective adopted.

4.2 Case study design

Qualitative studies in education typically use a case study design (see Stake, 1983). Although some authors view the case study as one type of ethnographic inquiry that involves intensive and detailed study of one individual or of a group through observation, self-report, and any other means, others like Merriam (1988), Yin (1994), and Mertens (1998) point out that case studies are not identical to ethnographic inquiry. The term ‘case study’, says Mertens, is familiar to most researchers, but there is little agreement on just what constitutes case study.

In this research, case study is defined and described from the perspective of the qualitative paradigm. It is an intensive, holistic description and analysis of “a specific phenomenon such as a program, an event, a person, a process, an institution, or a social group” (Merriam, 1988, p. 9). It is, therefore, characterized by a ‘bounded system’ since the ‘case’ is clearly identified and delimited. The case might be selected because it is an instance of some concern, issue, or hypothesis. Case study, for Yin (1994), is a type of inquiry that best answers
the 'how' and 'why' questions, while 'what' and 'how many' questions are best answered by survey research. In this sense, a case study is a direct and satisfying way of adding experience and improving understanding of social problems. Indeed, by concentrating on a single phenomenon or entity (the case), this approach aims “to uncover the interaction of significant factors characteristic of the phenomenon. The case seeks holistic description and explanation” (Merriam, 1988, p. 10).

Case studies in education are rooted in anthropology, historiography, and sociology. In anthropology, researchers tend to use ‘ethnographic case study.’ More specifically, ethnography is “a set of methods used to collect data, and it is the written record that is the product of using ethnographic technique” (Merriam, 1988, p. 23). As a result, ethnographic researchers view case studies as more than an intensive, holistic description and analysis of a social unit of phenomena. Concern with the whole cultural context is what defines this type of study. For example, an ethnographic case study of a primary school would take into account the neighbourhood at large and its sociocultural context. It would include interviews with parents and trustees, and analysis of documents from the community.

A second type of case study found in education is the ‘historical case study.’ Just as ethnographic case studies distinguish between technique and account, so do historical case studies. This type of study, for Merriam, employs techniques common to historiography, in particular the use of primary source material. In applied fields such as education, historical case studies have tended to be descriptions of institutions, programs, and practices as they evolved in time. Bogdan and Biklen (1982) list historical case studies as a form of inquiry focusing on specific organization and trace its development.

Finally, a third type of case study draws upon theory and technique of sociology and, to a certain extent, political science. Rather than focusing on a specific individual or on the whole culture as in an anthropological study, sociological case studies “attend to the constructs of
society and socialization in studying educational phenomena” (Merriam, 1988, p. 26). Researchers using ‘sociological case studies’ are interested in social life and the roles played by people in it, in the community, or in social institutions such as the school and the family. Educational case studies drawing upon sociology and political science have explored such topics as students peer interaction as a function of school organization, the effects and roles of teachers in the socialization process of students, the taught versus the hidden curriculum, and finally students’ understandings of the curriculum and of issues such as crime, racial prejudice, homophobia, sexual orientation, etc.

Thus, sociological, historical and anthropological case studies in education are all focused on questions, issues, and concerns broadly related to teaching and learning. The setting, delivery system, curriculum, student body, and theoretical orientation may vary widely, but the general arena of education remains central to these studies (Merriam, 1988).

Irrespective of disciplinary orientation, case studies can also be described by the nature of the final report. The end product of a case study, whether it is sociological, historical or anthropological, can be primarily descriptive, interpretative, or evaluative.

A descriptive case study in education is “one that presents a detailed account of the phenomenon under study” (Merriam, 1988, p. 27). Descriptive case studies are entirely descriptive and move in a theoretical vacuum. They are neither guided by established or hypothesized generalizations nor motivated by a desire to formulate general hypotheses. What counts is to enable the reader to visualize what a place or a process is like. It should help the reader ‘see’ the school or the classroom the inquirer is attempting to help him or her understand (Eisner, 1998). Moore (1986), for example, presents case studies of high school interns to find out how newcomers in organizations learn. He developed case studies of interns in diverse non-official school organization such as a furniture-making shop, a hospital, a speech clinic, a
museum, a cooperative, and a labor union. With these descriptive studies, he later devised a conceptual framework about learning in 'nonschool settings.'

Interpretative case studies (also called 'thick' description studies) use descriptive data, but in order to develop conceptual categories or to illustrate, support, or even challenge theoretical assumptions held prior to the data gathering. In this kind of study, the researcher gathers as much information as possible about the phenomenon with the intent of interpreting it. In the words of Eisner (1998), interpretative researchers “are interested not only in making vivid what they have experienced, but in explaining its meaning” (p. 95). A researcher might study how students come to an understanding of a concept, for example. Rather than just describing what was observed or what students reported in the interviews, the researcher might use the data to develop a typology, a continuum, or categories that conceptualize different approaches to the task. The interpretative case study wishes to illuminate the potential consequences of practices observed and to provide reasons that account for what has been seen. The interpretation is, therefore, to take place in context. It is a 'hermeneutic activity' of decoding the messages within a system or a case (Eisner, 1998). Hagberg (1975) in Where to Park provides an example of an interpretative case study. Not only does she vividly present what she lived, but also provides interpretations of her experience in Cox school, where the parking lot has been replaced by dozens of portable rooms.

Finally, evaluative case studies involve description, explanation, and judgement. The final goal is judging, that is, to make an evaluation of what was studied. These studies are often used in education because of their ability “to explain the causal links in real-life interventions that are too complex for the survey or experimental strategies” (Merriam, 1988, p. 29). For Yin (1994), the case study can be used also as a 'meta-evaluation', that is a study providing judgements on an evaluation study.
4.3 This study

As I noted in the first chapter, the purpose of this dissertation is to understand (1) what history/social teachers officially and unofficially present to high school students in citizenship education, and more importantly (2) what students learn from these classes in both B.C. and Québec. This research, I also argued, is a qualitative inquiry (Eisner, 1998; Glesne & Peshkin, 1992), using a case study design. The key concepts (citizenship rights, participation, pluralism, and collective identity) contained in the development of citizenship (chapter 2) and the literature review (chapter 3) will be used as “sensitizing concepts” (Blumer, 1954) in this research.³

Because ‘field study’ takes place in social institutions, research sites have to be selected. Here, it is important to consider and explain why one location is chosen rather than another. Research sites may be selected where individuals are willing to co-operate, where the situation is convenient for the researcher, and where the researcher has some contacts already established. Burgess (1984) suggests five criteria for selecting a research site (case): (1) simplicity, that is, the site allows the researcher to move from simple situations to those which are more complex; (2) accessibility, that is, the degree of access and entry that is given to the researcher; (3) unobtrusiveness, that is, situations that allow the researcher to take an unobtrusive role; (4) permissibleness, that is, situations that allow the researcher free, or limited, or restricted entry; and (5) participation, that is, the possibility for the researcher to participate in a series of ongoing activities. Since it is rare for researchers to be able to meet all these criteria, some compromise is essential. In this study, I chose a (multiple) case study method with three nested levels for each case: (1) the multi-ethnic school (in Québec and B.C.) as the first level; (2) citizenship education classes (grade 10 in Québec and grade 11 in B.C.) as the second level; and (3) grade 10 (in Québec) and grade 11 (in B.C.) students are the unit of analysis for the third level.

Two multi-ethnic high schools provide a window into history grade 10 classes (in Québec) and social studies grade 11 classes (in B.C.). After the analysis of Ministry documents
and discussion with some history teachers and my committee members, I decided to concentrate exclusively on grade 10 (in Québec) and grade 11 (in B.C.) citizenship education courses because much of the content on Canadian citizenship is essentially found in those two levels. As I mentioned earlier (chapter 1), the choice of multi-ethnic schools for this study is clearly related to my interest in pluralism and nationalism. In this study, ‘multi-ethnic’ refers to schools where the dominant language is either French or English (the official languages), and the student populations represent the cultural diversity of our main urban centers (Montréal, Vancouver, Toronto).

In this sense, the study uses a ‘multiple-case design’ (Yin, 1994) since it contains more than a single case. According to Yin (1994), the use of a multiple-case study design should follow the logic of replication. The cases should serve in a manner similar to multiple experiments, with similar or contrasting results. This implies, therefore, that the two schools have similar characteristics in terms of size, composition, funding, and so forth. For the results, it might be very difficult — and perhaps unrealistic — to predict what will come up in the analysis. As suggested by Merriam (1988), although research and discussion with members of the school prior to the investigation help to delineate the case to be studied, it is extremely difficult to predict the reaction of students and teachers once in the school.

Gaining access to a site is central to any qualitative inquiry since no one can take it for granted. The presence of a researcher, especially from a university, is often interpreted by teachers and administrators as an evaluation of their job. Moreover, the form in which reports are presented is frequently incomprehensible to practitioners unfamiliar with scientific jargon. As Eisner (1998) notes, for the most part, “teachers see researchers in their schools and classrooms as strangers in their midst rather than as colleagues with whom they can work” (p. 171). This is the reason why it is important to establish a good relationship with teachers and administrators prior to the investigation.
In B.C., the school selected for this study is situated in the middle of a large multi-ethnic suburb of Vancouver, one of the largest school districts in the Lower Mainland. The school is already involved in another ethnographic inquiry related to this research, led by a UBC professor for whom I have worked for over two years as a research assistant. More specifically, the actual school building was constructed in the 1950s for what was a 'senior high' (grade 11 and grade 12) with a population of less than 700 students (largely 'white' Canadian). Since 1996, the school is one of the largest district’s comprehensive ‘8 to 12’ high schools, with a population of about 1225: 67 teachers, 1 principal, 2 vice-principals. Around 40 percent of students (453 students) in the school are from immigrant backgrounds and have English as a second language (ESL). Over 18 different countries are represented in the school (mainly but not exclusively from Asia). The timetable of the school is conventional, with five blocks of one hour (45 minutes for lunch) during a year long schedule. Classes start at 8:30 am and end at 3:00 pm from September to June. Since 1988, the school has an active and well-known Alumni Association with the goals of developing scholarships for students planning to attend post-secondary education, mentoring, encouraging class reunions, supporting school activities, and acting as ‘ambassador’ for the school. The school’s motto *Fac Tuum Optimum* (Do Your Best) continues to be a living embodiment.

From January to June 1998, I spent weeks in the school, as a research assistant for another project, doing observation in the halls, the library, the cafeteria, and other public spaces where students spend their breaks and lunch times. I also participated in the many interviews with the students, teachers, and administrators of the school. In agreement with the principal investigator, I used this opportunity to collect data for my own doctoral research (observations and interviews).

The following year, I observed (from April to June 1999) all six (grade 11) social studies classes with three different teachers (two Canadian-born, including the head of the department,
and one immigrant). Two of these classes were part of the International Baccalaureate (IB) program offered in the school to all students of the district who wish to have an enriched academic program (for grade 11 and 12). More specifically, general observations in the school were conducted in April and May 1999 in the six social studies classes (gr. E, F, G, H, E(IB program), F(IB program)). Specific observations were conducted in the same six social studies classes (gr. E, F, G, H, E(IB program), F(IB program)) in May and June 1999 (see appendix A).

Twenty students (around 10 percent of all grade 11 students) volunteered for interview in May 1999 in agreement with the grade 11 social studies teachers. Of this number, 13 agreed and participated in the project in June 1999. The six other participants were not interviewed for divers personal reasons such as a lack of time (from students) to meet the interviewer and a refusal from parents to let students participate in this study. Another group of four students was interviewed during the winter of 1998 when I was research assistant. Overall, 17 students participated in the B.C. case study. Nine students were females, and eight males. Of these, nine were Canadian-born (five from B.C.), and eight immigrants: three from Taiwan, one from Singapore, one from Hong Kong, one from Kenya, one from Chile and one from Mexico. Out of these 17 students, one was in her fourth year in the school, six in their third year, four in their second year, and six in their first year. Because of school policies on ‘catchment areas,’ all students were either from the neighbourhood or the district (for the International Baccalaureate).

Each semi-structured interview (conducted in English) took between 30 to 45 minutes and was conducted individually, or in small group (two students) when it was not possible to do so individually, during lunch time or after class in a private room (library). After presentation of the study and the consent form, students were put as much as possible in a casual environment and invited to present their own views on the general questions of the interview without fears of being discriminated against or evaluated by the interviewer. All interviews were tape-recorded, transcribed, and coded according to a coding list based on the main topics of the interview:
information on participants, description of the school and social studies 11 program and teachers, understanding of Canada, rights, identity, participation, diversity, and nationalism.

Interviews were also conducted in June 1999 with two grade 11 social studies teachers (one male, one female), including the head of the department, and one administrator (female). The third social studies teacher, initially involved in the project, refused to participate formally in the interview, claiming that his teaching responsibilities—he was asked by the Ministry to be responsible for an evaluation project in the school—were too demanding to participate actively. Informal discussions (taken in a field book) with other staff people (principal, youth worker, librarian) were also included in the research. Appendix A provides a schematic detailed chart of the research process for the B.C case study. Appendix B offers a schematic description of the B.C. participants.

The other site in Québec (Montréal) is part of the largest school district in Québec, the Commission Scolaire de Montréal (CSM), formerly known as the Commission des Écoles Catholiques de Montréal (CECM). This high school (école secondaire) is situated on the south-central part of the island, known as the Plateau Mont-Royal. This quarter of Montréal is well-known for its particular socio-cultural, linguistic, and economic situation. Originally a white, francophone, and lower class quarter, the Plateau Mont-Royal is now characterized by a large and dynamic multi-ethnic and non-francophone population. In 1993-1994, the school participated to a pan-Canadian ethnographic research project conducted by one faculty member of McGill University, who was responsible for the Montréal case study. An unpublished report was written in 1995 on this school in terms of exemplary teaching practices, students services, inclusion, and community relationships.

More specifically, this francophone '7 to 11' secondary school, founded in 1970 as an all girls' school, has a rich mixture of cultures in a predominantly French-speaking environment. Overall, it has a population of 1273 students, two welcoming classes for allophone immigrants,
and 75 teachers. Around 60 percent of students were born in Québec and the remaining 40 percent from over 70 different countries. Included in the most important ethnic minorities are the Portuguese, the Hispanic, the Chinese, and the Vietnamese. The timetable of the school is conventional, with four blocks of 75 minutes (75 minutes for lunch) during a year long schedule. Classes start at 8:45 am and end at 3:40 pm from September to June.

Following the approval of the research project by the school board, I first met with the school administration and the head of the history department in December 1999 to present the project. From January to May 2000, I spent weeks in the school doing observations in the halls, the library, the cafeteria, the teachers' meeting room, and other public spaces inside and outside the main building. More specifically, I conducted general observations in the school and in all the six grade 10 history classes (gr. 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10) with three different teachers (all Canadian-born, including the head of the department) in February and March 2000. Specific observations were conducted in four history classes (gr. 5, 7, 9, 10) with two history teachers in April, May, and June 2000. One teacher, and her two history classes, were removed from the project in April for medical reasons. One history teacher-on-call, new to the school and the Québec school system, replaced the last teacher but legitimately refused to participate in the on-going project.

In terms of students, an initial number of 22 volunteer students (representing around 10 percent of grade 10 students) was selected in the four history (grade 10) classes for interview. Of this number, 19 students agreed and participated in the research project. The other three students could not be interviewed because they did not get formal approval (consent form) from their parents on time. Of the 19 volunteer participants, eight were female, and 11 males. Of these, ten were Canadian-born (all from Québec) and nine were immigrants: two from Haiti, two from Portugal, one from Morocco, one from France, one from Iran, one from Algeria, one from Zaire. Out of these 19 students, 16 were in their fourth year in the school, two in their third year, and one in her second year.
Each semi-structured interview (conducted in French) took about 30 to 45 minutes and was conducted individually or in small groups, when it was not possible to meet participants individually. All interviews were conducted in a small room next to their history classrooms during lunch time or class time when teachers agreed. As in the B.C. case study, after presentation of the study and the consent form, students were put as much as possible in a casual environment and invited to present their own views on the general questions of the interview without fears of being discriminated against or evaluated by the interviewer. Interviews were tape-recorded, transcribed, and coded (in French) according to a coding list based on the main topics of the interview.

Interviews were also conducted with two history teachers (one male, one female), including the head of the department, and two administrators (one male, one female) who agreed to participate in the study. As mentioned earlier, the third history teacher could not be interviewed for medical reasons. Informal discussions with staff people (librarian, security members) were recorded (in a field book) and are included in the research. Appendix C provides a schematic detailed chart of the research process for the Québec case study. Appendix D offers a schematic description of Québec participants.

As I have been arguing, in the course of most qualitative inquiry, researchers use a variety of methods of investigation that are related to each other (Burgess, 1984). These methods involve document analysis, participant observation, and interviews. Although these methods are usually applied chronologically, none is superior to any other, and they all need to be used in a flexible way.

One important source of information used for this study is the analysis of documentation (primary and secondary sources). Policy statements (from Ministries, districts, schools), board minutes, curricula (history and social studies), textbooks, records, pictures, articles, and artefacts, as well as life stories, and diaries provide a first-hand account of a situation. In some cases,
documents may be the only means of studying certain problems. Because these elements are produced for reasons other than the study at hand, some ingenuity is, therefore, needed in locating documents that bear on the problem. This is the reason why it is suggested to start from general documentary sources, such as Ministry policies, moving to more specific ones like handouts. However, documents relevant to the study are “potentially relevant resources for generating a context in which meaning can be deepened.” (Eisner, 1998, p. 185). Indeed, the value of documentary evidence is that it provides ‘nonreactive’ data, that is, data unaffected by the research process, which may be linked up with other data that are obtained in the conduct of the research.

This study also involves another method, that is direct observation of students and teachers in their classrooms. Observations give the researcher a chance to get closer to the phenomenon, to get at the participants’ own language. It is, according to Merriam (1988) “a firsthand account of the situation under study and, when combined with interviewing and document analysis, allows for a holistic interpretation of the phenomenon being investigated” (p. 102). Classroom observations, for instance, help us to understand how the programs (in history or social studies) are taught to students, the variety of forms employed to teach, the quality and form of student engagements, and more importantly, the ways students understand what is presented, that is, the learned curriculum (see Eisner, 1998, pp. 176-182).

In this sense, the researcher — in this case, a ‘participant observer’ (see Junker, 1960) — can construct an account of a social situation on the basis of the various accounts that are provided (consciously or not) by informants. Unlike document analysis, general observation (a class) and specific observation (a group of students, one teacher) allow the researcher to participate in the daily life of the people studied. Observations make it possible to record general and specific behaviors as they are happening in a particular setting. The participant observer can even enter into conversation — if not causing too much disruption — with some and discover
their interpretations of the events observed. But participation must remain secondary to the role of information gatherer. The researcher, then, is "the main instrument of social investigation" (Burgess, 1984, p. 70). Because one cannot observe everything, Merriam (1988) proposes a checklist of elements likely to be present in any setting (and providing a starting point in the activity): the physical setting; the participants; activities and interactions; conversation; subtle factors; and our own behavior. Written accounts of observation are generally presented in field notes, which are analogous to the interview transcripts I discuss below. Although they may vary, field notes usually begin with the time, the place, and purpose of the observation. A list of participants or the number of participants, as well as diagrams are also useful information for the researcher. Appendices E and F provide two examples of typical observations (general and specific) of one social studies grade 11 class (in B.C.) and one history grade 10 class (in Québec) taken from my field book, which was divided by teacher and, then, by class. In order to get closer to the phenomenon, and provide a 'thick description' of the environment and behaviors of participants, field notes were taken in the language of participants (English in B.C. and French in Québec). In all the cases, particular attention was given to the behaviors, comments, and attitudes of participants in relation to the purpose of this study: citizenship education.

Finally, related to direct observation of students and teachers is the use of interviews. Interviews are meaningful because researchers need to listen to what people under investigation have to say about their experiences, their feelings, and their understandings of a concept, an issue, and so forth. Interviews also help to circumscribe what is analyzed in the study. Although there are various types of interviews (unstructured, semistructured, standardized), I use in this research 'semistructured' interviews. According to Eisner (1998), this is the most common type of interview in education, guided by a set of themes, questions, and issues to be explored, but neither the exact wording nor the order of questions is predetermined. Since the success of an
interview depends on the interaction between the interviewer and the respondent, semistructured interviews allow for a less formal and more flexible type of conversation. In this sense, the interviewer should avoid multiple questions, leading questions, or ‘yes-or-no’ questions which either provide almost no information or confuse the respondent (see Merriam, 1988, pp. 77-79). More importantly, I have discovered, in conducting interviews as a research assistant, that well-prepared semistructured interviews give the respondents an excellent chance to express in their language (French in Québec and English in B.C.) what they consider meaningful for them in a relatively ‘relaxed’ environment, despite the fact the interview is tape-recorded. Appendix G provides a general list of questions for participants.

All interviews were recorded, transcribed, and transferred into a database. They were coded according to specific categories (so-called ‘nodes’) related to the key concepts (introduced in chapters 2 and 3). I have been using the software NUDIST for over three years, and find it very useful for qualitative data. Nonetheless, computer software, as Glesne and Peshkin (1992) note, “is a tool for executing the mechanical or clerical tasks of qualitative research. It can help to make the researcher’s work less tedious, more accurate, faster, and more thorough. It does not, however, think for the researcher.” (p. 145).

In this research, I have decided to present the quotations from participants in their language (French or English) because, in my opinion, language is much more than a means of expression. It is, in Berger’s words, “an immensely valuable depository of human experience, of joys, sorrows, and uniquely irreplaceable perceptions of the world” (Berger, 1977, p. 161). Language is the verbal code that links the individual, the cultural heritage, and the community. It is crucial in defining individual identity, culture, and community membership. “This is why,” Ignatieff (1993) notes, “the protection and defense of a nation’s language is such a deeply emotional nationalist cause, for it is language, more than land and history, that provides the essential form of belonging, which is to be understood” (p. 10). In this context, it is obvious to
me that this research, which is meant to understand more about B.C. and Québec students' understandings of citizenship, needs not only to respect the official language of each national community but to bring it alive in the comments of participants. In many ways, words and expressions used by participants, especially teenagers, do not have the same exact meanings or subtleties in the other language. This is the case, for example, with the English word 'premier,' which has no 'provincial' parallel in French. The word is translated into 'prime minister.' This subtlety implies for francophones that they have not only one but two prime ministers, one for the state (Canada) and one for the province (or nation).

How much data to include in support of a category or theme discussed in text is a judgement call (see Merriam, 1988, pp. 230-231). The reader needs enough information to be convinced, but not so much that he/she becomes buried. In this research, the findings are discussed in text (in English) along with several quotations from the participants (in their language).

Related to participants' quotations is the description of the participant in text. Because of the large number (over 40 participants) and the difficulty of creating different, not related pseudonyms in both French and English, I have decided to present only the gender (male, female) and birth place (immigrant, Canadian-born) of student participants. I think this minimal piece of information is sufficient for the reader to make sense of both my interpretations and students' quotations.

Appendix G provides the general list of questions given to participants for the interview. Appendices H, I, J, and K present the consent forms (English and French) given to participants prior to their interview.

Since most research situations are too vast to study everyone or to observe everything, a sample (for places, contexts and people) needs to be selected within each case under consideration. As I said earlier, the two schools are the general sites for the investigation (first
nested level). The ‘subsites’ (second nested level) of grade 10 history classes (in Québec) and grade 11 social studies classes (in B.C.) serve to examine Canadian citizenship education practices. Finally, students in those levels (representing about 10 percent of the grade 10 and grade 11 student-body) provide data on how they understand citizenship in the school context (third nested level). The research focuses primarily on classes and activities that are part of the daily routine of students (history or social studies classes, lunch time, assembly). But, it focuses also on special events taking place in the classroom or the school, related to the topic of the research (team-work, workshops). Finally, it includes school situations or activities which were not anticipated at all like a student discussion in the bus.

In terms of people, according to Burgess (1984) the best known approach for working with individuals in field research is “intensive work with informants” (p. 74). This nonprobability sampling, that is, there will be no way of estimating the probability that each element of the population has been included in the sample, has long been used by anthropologists. It involves the selection of key informants based on the researcher’s judgement. They can also be used to portray aspects of the social situation. As a result, key informants may be selected on the basis of ethnicity, age, sex, and size as these factors will influence relationships. The selection of individuals, then, is a different procedure from the selection procedures associated with statistical sampling in survey research, for example. In qualitative inquiry, informants are selected for their knowledge of a particular setting (citizenship, national identity) which may complement the researcher’s observations and point to further investigation.

For each case study, sampling is made up of volunteer participants in grade 10 (in Québec) and grade 11 (in B.C.), including a representation of the student-body based on ethnic origins and gender. The official language used (French in Québec and English in B.C.) is, of course, implicit for the sampling. The quantity of informants for each case depends of the school population (in those grades) and the suggestions provided by history and social studies teachers.
Glesne and Peshkin (1992) mention that there are no magic answers to the quantity that need to be included in the sampling. In this study about 10 percent of the school population, in grade 10 (in Québec) and grade 11 (in B.C.) was initially contacted and later interviewed. In addition, four teachers (two in B.C. and two in Québec) involved in the teaching of history or social studies in grade 10 (in Québec) and grade 11 (in B.C.), as well as three school administrators (one in B.C and two in Québec) were included in the interviews.

Finally, in terms class observations, I observed six different history and social studies classes in grade 10 (in Québec) and grade 11 (in B.C). These classes represent 100 percent of the student population in grade 10 (in Québec) and grade 11 (in B.C.). Three teachers, in each case study, were responsible for these classes. For reasons presented earlier, two teachers (one in each case study) did not participate in the study.

4.4 Validity, reliability, and ethics

All research is concerned with producing valid and reliable knowledge in an ethical manner. Case studies are no exception. They must be believed and trusted; they need to present insights and conclusions that 'ring true' to readers, educators, and other researchers. Below I address the specific concerns with respect to internal validity, reliability, and external validity related to my study.

The first element is the internal validity, that is, how one's findings match the reality. Some writers have argued that qualitative inquiry, because it is based on different assumptions about reality, does not really match the 'worldview.' Ratcliffe (1983) offers an interesting perspective on validity in qualitative research. He suggests that "data do not speak for themselves; there is always an interpreter, or a translator" (p. 149). One cannot observe or measure a phenomenon without changing it in his or her interpretation. Validity, then, must be
assessed in terms of interpreting the investigator’s experience, rather than reality itself (which, according to him, can never be grasped).

Another element underlying qualitative inquiry is that reality is holistic, multidimensional, and ever-changing. Reality is not single, fixed, and objective. What is being observed in school are people’s constructions of reality, how they understand the world in which they live. So qualitative researchers are interested in a perspective on reality rather than truth per se. When reality is viewed from this perspective, internal validity means therefore “to uncover the complexity of human behavior in a contextual framework, and to present a holistic interpretation of what is happening” (Merriam, 1988, p. 168). According to Merriam (1988), there are six basic strategies an investigator can use to increase internal validity: (1) triangulation or cross data sources; (2) member checks; (3) long-term observation at the research site; (4) peer examination of the findings; (5) participatory mode of research involving participants, and; (6) researcher’s biases, that is, to clarify the researcher’s assumptions at the outset of the study.

In this study, several strategies are used to verify the extent to which findings are congruent with reality. First, members participating in the study (students, teachers, administrators) had a say in the final report. They had a chance to read the document, express their opinions (or concerns), and clarify their views, if required. This is one reason why all quotations from participants are presented, in text, in their language (French for Québécois and English for British Columbians). Second, committee members provided comments throughout the research on merging findings, either during formal discussion meetings or personal discussions. Here, it is important to note that members were able to read and comment in both languages. Finally, I have expressed throughout the research my own assumptions and biases so as to help the reader know my own position as a qualitative researcher.

The second element of any scientific inquiry is reliability, that is, the extent to which one’s findings can be replicated. In other words, if the study is repeated will it yield the same
results? Reliability is problematic in social sciences as a whole simply because human behaviors are never static. Reliability in traditional research is based on the assumption that there is only one reality, which if studied repeatedly will give the same results. Because what is being studied in education is assumed to be in flux, multifaceted, and highly contextualized, “achieving reliability in the traditional sense is not only fanciful but impossible” (Merriam, 1988, p. 171).

As a result, Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggest thinking about the ‘dependability’ or ‘consistency’ of the results obtained from the data, rather than using reliability. Rather than demanding an outsider get the same results, one wishes to concur that, given the data collected, the results make sense or they are consistent and dependable. Merriam (1988) proposes three techniques to ensure that results are dependable: (1) investigator’s position: the investigator should explain the assumption and theory behind the study, his or her position, and the social context from which the data were collected (see Goetz & LeCompte, 1984); (2) triangulation: using multiple methods of data collection and analysis, and; (3) audit trail: independent judges can authenticate the finding of the study by following the trail of the researcher (see Guba & Lincoln, 1981).

In this study, the reliability, or more precisely the ‘dependability’ is built on the use of three different methods of data collection (observation, interviews, and document analysis). Appendixes A and B provide detailed charts of how methods of data collection were used for each case study. The researcher also provides the reader, when possible, with his own assumptions, biases, and positions with regard to each case study.

Finally, all studies are concerned with the extent to which the findings can be applied to other situations, that is, ‘external validity’ or ‘generalization.’ Generalization can be regarded as transferring what has been learned from one situation to another. However, in qualitative inquiry one selects a case study approach because one wishes to understand the case in depth, not because one wants to know what is ‘true’ of the many. As a result, the extent to which a case study can be generalized to other situations is the object of debate. Eisner (1998) suggests that in
conventional statistical studies generalization is left to the researcher. Given a certain set of procedures, a certain set of findings, an hypothesis that, when tested, enables one not to reject the theory from which it was derived, the researcher makes an inference or generalize to the population from which the sample was drawn. This logic is straightforward, once all the procedures are in place. This ideal of formulating generalizations that approximate the laws formulated within the physical science has, for some researchers (see Thorndike, 1910), been a long-standing ideal in educational research.

However, in qualitative inquiry, even with the use of case studies, Eisner (1998) argues that the researcher can also generalize, but it is more likely that “readers will determine whether the research findings fit the situation in which they work” (p. 204). The logic is therefore ‘analogical.’ The generalization process occurs through the ‘power of the results’ to enable one to associate or to find significance in his or her own environment. Even more, Cullingford (1991) mentions that if schools are very particular institutions, they have a lot in common with each other. As he puts it:

We might be able to detect (or believe to detect) the ethos of each school as we walk in; but we must also remember that in the context of the larger community, each school is very similar. Each school has its place.

(Cullingford, 1991, p. 4)

Most schools and classrooms are effectively right-angled places, brittle rather than flexible, hard rather than soft, and standardized rather than unique. As a result, qualitative case studies “are full of opportunities for generalization” (Eisner, 1998, p. 207). However, they are not likely to get statements such as ‘if you have x, as measured by y, under the conditions a and b, then you get z.’ Rather, more modest and realistic analogies can be made. Generalization in
case studies needs to be treated as "tentative guides" (Eisner, 1998, p. 209), as ideas to be considered, not as prescriptions to follow.

In this study, generalization is be left to the reader. The logic is to give an account of what is found in the two cases (B.C. and Québec) so as to let the reader determine whether the results match with the world in which he or she works or studies.

A last point needs to be made about ethics in this qualitative inquiry. All researchers argue that unethical behaviors have no place in scientific research. We are to be ethical at all time, 'paragons of virtue' if possible, thereby "ensuring not only the good opinion of others, but access to a better life later" (Eisner, 1998, p. 213). The first element to be considered is informed consent. The concept, for Glesne and Peshkin (1992), implies that potential participants are made aware (1) that participation is voluntary, (2) of any aspects of the research that might affect their well-being, and (3) that they may freely choose to stop participation at any point in the study. Eisner (1998) argues, however, that not all consent can be informed. In the case of general observation, like a classe, individuals may not even know what they are providing to the researcher.

In this study, all interviewees (including teachers and administrators) received information on the implications and rules of the study (a consent form), as found in the UBC policy on ethical review activities involving human beings. In terms of observation (general and specific), two solutions were adopted. The first one was to present my research approaches to all history/social studies staff members, including some administrators, during a departmental staff meeting prior to the investigation. The second one was to introduce myself to students at the beginning of one of their history/social studies classes in agreement with the history or social studies teacher. A follow-up meeting with the participants was also included to present the research findings and discuss the conclusions. Many participants, especially the teachers, were also interested in the findings of the other case study so as to know more about citizenship.
education practices in Canada. A meeting has been proposed to participants, for each case study, to discuss the entire research after the final dissertation.

Another element to consider is the confidentiality of the research. All observations, interviews, and personal documents are kept confidential. The only persons who have access to this information are the researcher, his advisor, and his committee members. No one is able to tell who had been observed and interviewed. All names were changed, including the name of the institutions. A draft copy of the final report of each case was presented to the school for discussion and comments. Finally, it is important to mention that no individual received remuneration or compensation for their voluntary participation in this study. As discussed with both schools and school districts, copies of the final thesis will be donated to each institution.

4.5 Review

In this chapter I discussed the methodology and methods for this research. After presenting the features of qualitative inquiry, I discussed case study design and the use of multiple-case study in education. This led me to explain in detail the purpose of this study and the three methods (document analysis, observation, interview) that will be employed to analyze each high school (in B.C. and Québec). I also mentioned that since each case is generally too vast for studying everything, I focus more precisely (but not exclusively) on 'subcases:' history and social studies classes.

Accordingly, this chapter examined some of the concerns regarding the validity and the reliability of the study. I suggested that some 'analogical' generalizations could be made by the reader. Finally, I touched on the question of ethical tensions that accompany qualitative inquiry, more precisely case studies.
In this section, I use the term ‘qualitative inquiry’ as an equivalent term for ‘qualitative research.’ As the reader will notice, qualitative inquiry can also be historical, sociological, political, and more. Its character can be derived from any of the disciplines from which its focus, description, and explanation can be attained.

2 See the distinctions between qualitative and quantitative modes of inquiry in Glesne & Peshkin (1992).

3 In this thesis, I use Blumer’s understanding of ‘sensitizing concept,’ that is, a concept (emerging from the literature) used as a screen to suggest potential lines of inquiry or as a way of looking at the field (in this case, citizenship education). Sensitizing concepts do not determine what will be found on the ground or do not lead to theory testing.

4 Although the interviews were primarily conducted for another research project, most questions for this research were also included in the questionnaire, in agreement with the principal investigator.

5 For practical and logistical reasons, it was possible to conduct observations in the school (general and specific) only a week per month, except in May (2 weeks). Some discussions were, however, made using internet and/or telephone with history teachers and administrators on a regular basis.

6 After discussion with the history teacher, these students later received formal consent from their parents but could not schedule an appointment during my visits in Montréal in May 2000. Since I was living in Vancouver while this research was conducted, one has to understand that it was, logistically speaking, complicated to arrange visits to the school on a regular basis and avoid drastic changes to participants’ own schedule. This situation required compromises on both sides; compromises that could not include the last three students.

7 Following Junker’s theoretical social roles for fieldwork (ranging from ‘complete participant’ to ‘complete observer’), I use generically the role of ‘participant observer’ in this thesis. Hammersley and Atkinson (1995) note, however, that most field research involves roles somewhere between these two poles. In fact, researchers may adopt roles ranging from ‘participant observer’ to ‘observer participant’ in field research depending on the particular circumstances.

8 Burgess (1984) provides a detailed list of questions we might ask ourselves when doing participant observation in class; see chapter 4.
CHAPTER 5

V. DESCRIPTION OF THE B.C. HIGH SCHOOL AND SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS

In the following two chapters, I will draw on insights gained from my general and specific observations, interviews, and document analysis to describe citizenship education practices as found in one B.C. high school. This chapter will first provide a general description of the school, using the form of a narrative vignette (section 1). It will, then, describe a typical B.C. social studies class for each of the two social studies teachers (grade 11) who agreed to participate in the study and discuss their teaching practices from a citizenship education viewpoint (section 2). The goal of this chapter is to set the context to better understand B.C. students' own conceptions of citizenship in light of their citizenship education experience. In doing so, particular attention is given to the different visions teachers may have of their nation, their country, and their citizenship (see chapter 1).

In chapter 4, I have argued that citizenship goals have historically provided the underlying rationale for social studies in Western provinces, including B.C. Rather than teaching separate school disciplines (history, geography, etc.), Western Ministries of Education have combined them into a more global and inclusive program. As Tomkins (1983) puts it: “the goal of ‘citizenship’ probably comes closer than any other to identify[ing] 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. 13).

As a result, this case study research focuses on teachers and students in their social studies classes. Since much of the content on Canadian citizenship is introduced in social studies 11 (or more specifically History 11 for the I.B. program), only teachers and students from this grade are included in this study.1
5.1 Description of the school: “It's pretty friendly. Here it's high fives and hello.” (student)

Monday, May 10, 8:25 am. A gold convertible YJ, with four senior students onboard, races into the students' parking lot. The driver of the jeep is looking for a place to park around the main building but, obviously, he is too late. The parking lot is full, except for five places reserved exclusively for 'visitors' like myself. So he decides to park his Jeep on the grass at the far end of the right row, just between the last car and the first portable classroom of a series of 30 placed like 'LEGO' blocks on the playing field of the school just behind the main building. He knows this is illegal, but he has no time to circle around the main building, a two-level building in a 'U' shaped style, in hope of finding another space which may not even exist. The four students get out of the Jeep with their backpacks. They are all wearing X-large T-shirts with impressively high running shoes. They look taller and also more relaxed than me with my brown briefcase and leather jacket. Two of them have caps and blue short pants. They are members of the well known basketball team of the school, one of the best in Western Canada. One graduate recently made the news in the local newspapers for a basketball scholarship he received from a prestigious American university. Sports in the school, as many will tell you, contribute to the creation a remarkable school spirit.

I'd say there's a really strong tradition here of being a Senior High and taking academics seriously. Also there's a strong sports culture. (teacher, female)

“DDDDring,” the school bell rings; it is 8:30 am on my watch. The four students, as well as many others outside chatting or smoking, are heading to the front entrance, facing the teachers' parking lot and the main street. Although it is May, the grass on both sides of the alley leading from the student parking lot to the main entrance is as green as in July. The school is
surrounded by aromatic multicolour flowers and small bushes which give a refreshing and natural look to the old grey building. On clear days like today, the white peaks of the Coastal mountains surrounding the Fraser valley melt into the skyscrapers, banks, malls, and the McDonald's just a few blocks from the school creating what British Columbians are looking for: modernity in a super-natural environment. This Canadian province, with its mild climate, ocean, mountains, vineyards and golf courses, represents for British Columbians a region of its own; a place where the overwhelming presence of nature continues to inspire the lives of its residents (see Resnick 2000).

The four students enter the school, climb the entrance steps, and rush to their lockers. I try to follow them but they soon dissolve into the heterogeneous mass of students in the main hall going in all directions like a crowd in a mall. In a second, I find myself in a strange place with hundreds of unfamiliar young faces speaking dozens of foreign languages, creating what seems to me a complete cacophony. I tell myself that if Canada is an experiment in multiculturalism, this high school is clearly its ‘laboratory.’ Students from various ethnic origins understand this very well.

I think it's just incredible how so many cultures are being accepted [in this school]. It's a good example of how several people with different beliefs coming from everywhere in the world can come to one place and live in harmony. (student, male)

Over my head, in the main entrance, is a large wooden plaque with the inscription “Welcome to Pacific Secondary School”² (PSS) or “Pacific High” as students say. PSS is the oldest school in the district. Its history goes back to 1908 when a public four-room schoolhouse was built in the city. In 1928, PSS was officially opened with eight classrooms and an enrolment of around 100 students in what was an important fishing and farming community, a ‘melting pot’
of British Canadians, Japanese, Ukrainians, and East Indians. In January 1953, PSS officially moved to its present location in a modern school building with 31 teachers and 720 students. The school newspaper, strangely entitled “The Etudiant,” wrote the following lines in its last edition of 1952:

Our school has carried on through two World Wars, times of prosperity and times of depression—from the time of Sir Wilfred [sic] Laurier to that of the Hon. Louis St. Laurent — from the horse and buggy age to the dawn of the atomic age. Truly, next month will be a landmark in the history of [the school].

It will have a new home!

Over the years, several annexes and portables were added to the main building, which still serves for some classrooms, the gym, the cafeteria, and the administration. Several social studies classes are in the main building, the others are outside in the portables behind the school. On the beige walls of the main building is a picture gallery of all graduating classes since that of 1927-1928, which curiously is fixed just over Danny’s door on the second floor. Danny is the head of the Social Studies department. Archaeologists say they can construct a whole account of the past from artefacts. These graduating pictures have many accounts to offer about the size of classes, the ethnic composition of the student-body, economic conditions, dress, hairstyles. One administrator originally from Québec puts it this way:

[When I first came in] one of the first things that impressed me was the history of the school. You go up in our halls and you've got pictures from the 1930s right up to this year. You meet people and you find out that their grandparents or parents went here. Kids love to go down the hall and laugh at their parents' pictures. (administrator, female)
One student commenting on the school adds:

The school's like well rounded, it's got history. The buildings and the facilities are old but we have a routine that we've settled into. (student, male)

Today, there are few more multi-ethnic places in Canada than PSS. The birth place of its students ranges from Hong Kong to Russia and Kenya; the colours of their faces vary widely; their clothes and 'looks' ranges from baseball caps and basketball shorts to pink hairstyles, to Muslim hijab scarves. All this diversity gives the school a 'cosmopolitan tint.' The 1225 students are rushing to the same classes, at the same time, for the same purpose: to get their diploma. Of those students, over 450 (36 %) require ESL training, which means that by the end of their high school they should master at least two languages. This challenge puts enormous pressure on teachers who now face many (perhaps too many) languages and accents in their classrooms.

When I came to the district 18 years ago, we had 7 kids in ESL, 7 out of a school of 1200, one teacher. Most of us didn't know what ESL was [...] Now, it's quite true, we all become, in some ways, ESL teachers because the make-up of your students is very different. So it requires a lot more patience [...]. (teacher, male)

The administration is well aware of the dilemmas and tensions ethnocultural and linguistic diversity sometimes create in the school, especially when thinking that the district has no official policy on students speaking 'English only' in school. One administrator, commenting on the situation, says:

You cannot enforce English only in the halls, unless we had Language Police out there. There's no way you can do it. So, it can't be policed. It
provides the kids with a bit of a break, probably makes enforcing in the classroom better, it makes more sense. […] Teachers have had to learn to work with students who have English as a second language […] It means teachers have to change their strategies. They need more visuals […] One of the things we want to work on here is getting perhaps English-speaking kids to be a little more patient. I think we need to educate English-speaking people to encourage our ESL students to speak more, to have the patience just to wait for them to form their thought. (administrator, female)

But, as Dryden (1995) found in his ethnographic study of a similar Mississauga educational institution, schools like PSS are far from unique. They typify the public high schools of English-Canadian urban centers. PSS is right in the middle of a city of over 150,000 inhabitants, with a huge multi-ethnic population (over one third is of foreign origin). In the last 15 years, the exploding population growth, from job seekers coming from Eastern provinces — for people in B.C., Winnipeg is ‘East’ — to refugees, has turned this insular community into a large suburb of Vancouver, a place where some ethnic groups can now function publicly in their own native language. As one school administrator, reflecting on the situation, puts it:

You can exist [here] and not speak English. You can shop, you can go to the bank, you can go to a Doctor, you can go to a Dentist, you can go anywhere […] (administrator, female)

Most students I talked to appreciate their school, its reputation, its tradition, its inclusive atmosphere, and its security. Although the main building — slated for demolition — is relatively old and ‘smelly,’ there are, surprisingly, no racist graffiti on the wall and no ‘high security’ lock system keeping students inside the school. Students come and go in their school as
they wish, except during class time when they are required to attend their classes and provide little ‘pink slips,’ which they get from the administration, when they are late. This comprehensive ‘8 to 12’ school is well known in the district for its tradition of academic success, its inclusion of ‘special needs’ students, and its vocational options, from the International Baccalaureate (IB) program (explained below) to the cafeteria program, auto shop, and French. The school also has various clubs (e.g., environment, multicultural) and activities (e.g., dances, after-class sports competitions) which are organized by students with the help of some adults.

The administrative guide of the school describes it this way:

[PSS] is a non-semestered comprehensive school with a long tradition of excellence. [PSS] strives to provide an appropriate learning environment for students from a variety of backgrounds. (School Program of Planning Guide, 1997-1998, p. 20)

When asked to characterize their school, student interviewees said:

It's pretty friendly. Here it's high fives and hello. (student, male)

[The school’s] got some great teachers and, I don't know, I just like the atmosphere […]. (student, male)

I been here for 3 years. We have a variety of courses I can chose from, we got great facilities such as the internet, great computer courses […]. I think this school is great. This school is a safe place to be. (student, male)
5.2 Social studies teachers and their teaching styles

Tuesday, May 18, 9:40 am. Danny is double-checking his class preparation while IB (grade 11) students are entering the classroom 201. The IB program is offered in PSS to all students in the district who want an academically enriched program:

In [PSS] the IB is first and foremost a programme of academic enrichment. We are interested in involving our students in a holistic approach to knowledge, thus giving them opportunity to draw connections between and among all subject areas. (International Baccalaureate School Program, 1998, p. 2)

In grade 11, the IB history program — also called ‘social studies’ by students — focuses on the history of North America (Canada, United States). The aims of the program are: the development of an understanding of the nature of historical evidence; the development of the capacity to marshal facts and evaluate evidence and try to discuss issues from an historical point of view; the development of the capacity to readjust historical views in the light of new evidence or new interpretations of familiar evidence; the acquisition of a sufficient body of historical knowledge; the development of a sense of historical continuity; and the diminution of ethnocentric prejudices and the development of a more international approach to world history (see International Baccalaureate School Program, 1998, p. 14).

When asked to describe their program, students in the IB program said:

We are focusing more on the nations that affect changes in the world more greatly than Canadians [...] But we focus on like the United States, what they go through and how that affects us [...] So we get an outside understanding rather than just a basic understanding of Canada. (student, male)
I think it's really different [pause] from regular Social Studies 11. I think with
the subject materials, definitely it's more wide and we have to start critical
thinking instead of just memorizing a lot of stuff [...]. (student, female)

The grade 11 IB history program covers both the grade 11 social studies Integrated
Resource Package (IRP), which sets out the provincially prescribed curriculum for social studies
(B.C. Ministry of Education, 1997), and the grade 11 IB program (of the district). More
specifically, the social studies 11 program marks the culmination of students' social studies
education in B.C. Building on the knowledge, attitudes, and skills students have gained in their
previous courses, the grade 11 social studies program offers an integrated approach to Canadian
and global issues. As the grade 11 social studies IRP states in its description:

With its focus on historical and contemporary social, cultural, political, legal,
economic, and environmental issues, Social Studies 11 contributes to the
important goal of preparing students for their future lives as Canadian citizens
and members of the international community. (B.C. Ministry of Education,
1997, p. 2).

The program covers three areas of importance to students' understanding of Canadian
society (20th century) and of their roles as Canadian and global citizens: the Canadian Identity;
Canada in the World Community; and Canadian and Global Citizenship (B.C. Ministry of
Education, 1997, p. 2). The program concentrates, therefore, on Canada and Canadians
throughout the 20th century with some particular interests for students on their region and
province.

As students examine what it means to be Canadian, they assemble information
with which to construct enlightened scenarios for their own futures, as well as
for those of their communities and their country. (B.C. Ministry of Education, 1997, p. 2)

Following social studies 11, which is an elective course since the academic year 1999-2000 (but most students apparently take it so far), there are two elective history courses offered in grade 12 on World history and First Nations (see B.C. Ministry of Education, 2000).

Like many other schools in the district, PSS social studies teachers (grade 11) use several complementary textbooks: Bartlett, et al. (1989), *Towards Tomorrow: Canada in a Changing World-Government*; Dunlop, (1987), *Towards Tomorrow: Canada in a Changing World-Geography*; Morton, (1988), *Towards Tomorrow: Canada in a Changing World-History*. In addition to these textbooks, students in the IB programs also utilize two other textbooks: McNaught, (1988), *The Penguin History of Canada*, and one textbook on American history, Nevins and Commanger, (1992), *A Pocket History of the United States*. Analysis of these textbooks show that they no longer rely exclusively on story-telling or descriptive series of facts (historical, political, military) related to wars, heroes, or white British Canadian males to be remembered by students. The history textbook (Morton, 1988), for example, is written for all English-Canadian students to help them have a better understanding of 'their' past. Many activities (at the end of each section and chapter) are elaborated to help students make sense of the past, and to draw their own historical, social, and political conclusions. To favour the development of historical skills, the author provides in his introduction a section on how historians study the past, how they collect evidence, and how they make sense of it. The use of multiple textbooks (history, geography, politics) in PSS social studies and history classes also provide students with different accounts or understandings of similar issues, not a single 'official' one.
However, as teachers will tell you, these textbooks, which are more than 10 years old in many cases, do not constitute their “most useful teaching aid.” In order to cover the entire curriculum implemented in 1997-1998, teachers must use other pedagogical aids, such as photocopies, clippings, articles, briefs, and so forth. Social studies teachers in PSS would like to get new textbooks, but as one teacher explains, textbook prices are so high and the school/district budget so stretched that the social studies department will have to wait another year to start replacing the present ones.

“Beep!,” I suddenly hear one administrator speaking with a nasal twang over the PA system: “[... ] Attention, cafeteria is closed today for the Alumni reunion. But the first 30 students coming to the lounge will get one hot dog for a dollar [...].” At the back of the classroom, a group of five Asian students talk with each other in what seems to be Chinese. They have no interest at all in the messages being transmitted to students. All the others are either taking their places or whispering with their neighbours. For them, it is business as usual; just one message among many others they will receive today. Danny looks at his watch and decides to begin. He closes the door. Students go back to their seats assigned by Danny. Desks are arranged in a traditional way: eight rows of four desks with the teacher in front. From my seat at the back, I can see by the rear windows the teachers’ parking lot and a large Canadian flag placed on the corner of the school.

“Nelson,” he says firmly, “pull down the blind, I have the sun in my face.” Nelson stands up and executes the task. With a grin, Danny tells his 29 students (19 non-white dispersed all over the room), in a passionate way, that he found two ‘special’ history collectible books on Abraham Lincoln over the weekend, published in the late 1800s. Danny is proud of his find. “Just $50.00 for the two,” he muses, with the books in his hands. Just looking at students’ faces, one can easily notice that many wonder why would someone spend so much on these old books. After all, they look so antiquated; one is even missing its cover.
“Alright, now the movie on the West,” Danny says. This is the second part of a video on the conquest of the West and the famous battle of Alamo (Texas), where Davy Crockett ‘bit the dust.’ Students take out their notes as he prepares the monitor and the VCR. They know they will have to answer questions at the end of it, so they listen very carefully. Surprisingly, no one is sleeping on his/her desk.

While they carefully watch the video, I take the opportunity to familiarize myself with the classroom environment. “The classroom,” states a B.C. Ministry of Education report (of the 1960s), “should be functionally equipped to facilitate Social Studies instruction… The classroom should actually promote the objectives of Social Studies instruction just as evidently and just as forcibly as a good biology room facilitates good instruction in that subject” (as quoted in Hodgetts, 1968, p. 41). Progressive educators have claimed that the physical environment of the classroom (shape, decorations, murals, magazine racks, maps) largely reflects an overall tone, an atmosphere which contributes to the quality of education. It gives the classroom a ‘personality,’ helping students to stimulate their learning. Students, Cullingford (1991) adds, are profoundly affected by atmospheres. They are sensitive to physical appearance.

Danny’s classroom is much more than ‘blackboards and chalk.’ It is saturated with posters, maps, videos, and file cabinets. On the left corner of his board is a thought: “Don’t avoid thinking because you might learn something!” Over the blackboard, right behind his desk, as well as on the right wall are placed a series of large Canadian posters ranging from B.C. Parks to Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland; nothing on Québec. Two large North American maps are also found. On the left wall, there are other posters of the B.C. Lions football team (1998-1999), the B.C. legislative assembly, the Canadian provincial flags and coats of arm, and the famous St. Andrew’s golf course. Danny has an extensive video library along with an impressive collection of history textbooks. On his bulletin board, just beside his personal locker, are two
other thoughts, placed underneath the Charter of Rights and Freedoms: "I am here to teach, you are here to listen," "What part of NO didn’t you understand?"

"OK guys, let’s go over the questions now," Danny says as students are stretching out. The video is over. One by one, students read the questions Danny prepared on a sheet and try an answer. Danny provides explanations after each answer. At the end of it, Danny explains his personal account of the West, talking about the famous battle and making some connections, when possible, with the Canadian parallels. "In the U.S.," he says, getting more excited, "the settlers went out before the law. In Canada the law moved before the settlers. That's why we had a peaceful settlement while the Americans had a 'Wild West'." Students, in silence, write very carefully what Danny is saying. He knows it, so he speaks slowly and accentuates his pauses and, occasionally, writes on the board the most difficult words or names, unknown to students... and myself. "OK, stop there and take a look at these two briefs," Danny says. He gives students copies that he has prepared. "Alright, now read the one on Davy Crockett." In silence, students follow Danny's instructions. Again, they know what is coming next.

"Ryan, why did Crockett go to Texas," Danny asks. "Well," he began to reply. His voice is so quiet, his expression so tentative that I understand nothing. "Speak up Ryan," Danny replies. Ryan tries an answer, this time louder. He is right. Danny goes over the text, using the 'Socratic method,' asking students a series of leading questions so as to let students 'discover' the answers. Along the way, Danny is using a large map of North America and some personal pictures of his own trip to Texas to help students figure out what he is talking about.

Then, Danny uses another short video, "Hell Fire," to support his account of history and help students visualize what happened during the period. Suddenly, the bell rings. Danny looks surprised; on his watch the class is not over yet. But within five minutes, all students of the school, led by their teachers, are out in the rear parking lot. "Did you know about it?" Danny asks Rick, another social studies teacher rushing out. Rick knew about the fire alarm test. "You
know Danny," he replies, "when we are so close to retirement we sometimes forget things..."
The class is over for these 29 students. They will see Danny again in two days.

Danny is a history teacher for the IB program as well as the head of the social studies department. He has been teaching for over 28 years, 18 years in the district and four years in PSS. He is about 50 years old, brown hair with grey patches on the sides. Danny is slim, and usually wears 'golf T-shirts' with nice pants and shiny shoes. Although it is May, Danny already has a nice sun tan, evidence of his long weekends on the golf course driving balls. Danny came out of Saskatchewan where he grew up in a bilingual family in Gravelbourg. Like myself, Danny is of French-Canadian origin, the difference being that French is still my mother tongue, while Danny tells me he speaks French "only when he has to." His ancestors came from France two centuries ago and curiously settled in Saguenay-Lac-St-Jean, not far from the home of my own ancestors. At the turn of the century, one brother moved to the United States (Minnesota), and later settled in the Prairies. It is that branch of the family that made its way west to B.C. Danny is proud of his ancestors and knows all about his family tree.

Danny defines himself as a "traditional teacher." He likes to play a traditional role in the classroom teaching students the knowledge and skills necessary "to do well on IB exams and provincial exams." "This style of teaching," he says, "suits my personality." For Danny, 'content' and 'process' seem two separate (and perhaps competing) things. "I am content-driven versus process-driven. Therefore, content is far more important than process for me." Danny considers himself as "an historian who teaches history, not a teacher who happens to teach history." The subject defines himself. His interest is on what he teaches, not so much on his own teaching style. For him, good historians (in the IB program) are cast in the role of 'content experts' because, as he puts it, "students have to write exams and if they haven't covered the Mexican Revolution, for example, and the kids do not understand the significance of the Mexican constitution in 1917, you're only hurting the kids." As a result, Danny claims that if
teachers are not “willing to submit [themselves] to covering the course and preparing kids for those exams, then, [they] probably shouldn’t be teaching those kids.” In this understanding of pedagogy, historians provide the content (factual knowledge), while students are portrayed as the ‘receivers.’

I ask Danny where he incorporates the notion that students, particularly in the IB program, do not only acquire knowledge but develop also a wide variety of attitudes and skills. “Well, that’s true,” he replies, students in the IB program are introduced to critical thinking skills. Then, he goes on:

Both in the I.B. history and the provincial history exams there is an element dealing with critical thinking. It involves having the kids read historical documents, primary sources or secondary, being able to determine bias, non-bias, being able to determine fact versus opinion and reliability. We do a number of exercises in which kids are able to take sources they’ve never seen and able to evaluate what is the author saying. In the I.B., they have a section called ‘historiography’ where they view history from different theories. In terms of historiography, the kids have to be able to understand different points of view and what bias the historian has.

So the challenge for Danny in the two-year IB program is to prepare his students to acquire the required knowledge (in history and politics) and develop the necessary skills (critical thinking, analysis) to adequately pass the final exams which testify that students not only master what is prescribed but are mentally prepared to access a higher level of education, usually university.
Danny tells me he agrees with much of Granatstein’s recent argument on Canadian history. “We have,” he tells me, “to get back to more Canadian content, to what Hirsch (1988) calls “cultural literacy,” that is, a shared body of knowledge of a given society. How can you deal with some issues like Québec separatism if you don’t know something about Québec history?” Before acquiring critical thinking skills, students need to learn what is already known. For him, even if they are in the IB program, they are not and cannot be ‘historians’ so the limited time in class should be better spent on building a solid grounding in the basics of the subject. As Danny puts it:

If it was up to me, there would be a lot more Canadian content in Canadian history because you have to have knowledge before you can deal with issues.

[We have] students with minimal knowledge of Canada, particularly if they’re from Hong Kong. So you’re asking a kid who’s just got off the plane to deal with Canadian issues? [half laugh] They have trouble finding Vancouver on a map, let alone what the issues are!

Similarly, Danny thinks that students lack common socio-cultural knowledge, which (often) is uniquely Canadian and makes sense only to Canadian citizens. This knowledge, as suggested by Osborne (1999), helps make a society what it is and encourages students to gain a sense of collective memory.

I noticed some years ago, [pause] when you’re teaching Canadian history, [pause] the normal things that Canadian students would know about […] [pause] be it something like Stanley Cup playoffs or the Grey Cup […]. That’s very foreign to half of our students. As a result, they don’t have the same cultural background […].
But Danny is well aware of the political tensions in Canada around the meaning of nationalism, citizenship, and national identity. "I know," he tells me, "that [in Québec] they're Quebecers first and Canadians second, [while] in B.C. we are Canadians first and British Columbians second." Danny accepts this reality and tries, as much as possible, to teach students about the 'distinctiveness' of Québécois, especially during 'hot periods' like referenda. He uses textbooks, videos and clippings on "The matter of Québec," as stated in Morton's (1988) history textbook, to help students understand about the historical national conflicts between English and French-Canadians. The grade 11 history textbook, for instance, provides in its chapter "A Nation in Conflict" an entire section on the evolution of Québec and Canadian nationalism, patriotism, and the divergent visions Québécois and English-Canadians have had of their country. In its activities, the textbook offers two different historical accounts of Québec and Canada (one from René Lévesque and the other from Pierre Trudeau) and asks students which viewpoint they support and why? (see Morton, 1988, pp. 172-173). The grade 11 government textbook (Bartlett et al., 1989), which offers a complement to the history one, states in its section on Canadian politics that "nationalism refers to the common hopes of a group of people who are united by culture, political system, or place of birth, or by combinations of the three" (Bartlett et al., 1989, p. 89). More interestingly, the authors add that:

[S]ome members of the Parti Québécois [...] argued that a Québécois spirit of nationalism related to culture and place of birth, and that Québec deserved political sovereignty. Québec nationalists wanted independence from the rest of Canada because it would preserve, encourage, and advance Québécois culture. (Bartlett et al., 1989, p. 89)

Similarly, Danny does not avoid 'controversial issues,' relying exclusively on English-Canadian political or military historical events, as found by Hodgetts (1968). Danny's goal is to
encourage students to be interested in their past and be aware of the complexities and challenges facing the future of Canada. This objective supports the intent of the grade 11 history textbook:

While history may be the study of the past, it is written in the present for the future. Historians are fascinated by what happened years ago but they understand those happenings with minds shaped in their own time and they address future readers. (Morton, 1988, p. iii)

When talking about Québec nationalism, I see little hostility in Danny’s attitudes. No racist comments, no desire to make Québécois ‘just like others’ (comme les autres). But I am not sure if Danny would accept a lesson for his students that Canada is not a traditional ‘nation-state’ with one national community made up of various ethnic groups, but a federation of various peoples who view themselves as ‘distinct’ nations. He is surely attentive (and aware of the very fact Québécois have a different understanding of Canadian history and, more importantly, that British Columbians are far from the concerns of Québécois.

I’ve asked this of my students, ‘How many have been to Québec?’ and probably out of a class of 30 only 1 or 2. So it’s not that a lot of people have been to Québec [or understand Québec].

From that perspective, Danny’s classes do help students to develop an interest in Canada and B.C., while appreciating other people’s political aspirations and values. What Danny teaches is, however, no guarantee that students will develop into democratic citizens respectful of Québécois’ rights, identities, and aspirations, especially when thinking that Québec continues to be presented, in B.C. social studies, as une province canadienne, not as a distinct national group within Canada. As Danny puts it:
Of course, as Québec separatism comes and goes, it becomes less of an issue in the curriculum. If it happens to be a national or federal election, then, that becomes sort of the issue that year. But I think when it comes to the overall curriculum, [pause] Québec is just one of many provinces in Confederation. Therefore, I don't think teachers particularly single it out [pause] unless it happens to be a referendum.

Danny also mentions that unlike history education in Québec, the teaching of history in B.C., particularly in grade 11, is not regionalized, or taught only through the lens of the province, but focused on Canada as a whole with a particular interest for the West and B.C.

No, Canadian history is not taught through British Columbia versus Canada, that's very different than Québec. Québec is just one of many provinces [pause] and it's viewed that way.

Analysis of the social studies 11 curriculum (including the IB program) confirms that Québec is introduced in the program insofar as it contributes to the development (or weakening) of the Canadian 'nation-state.' The program emphasizes the value of diversity, the respect for cultural differences, and the importance of social justice and global issues. But it continues to be structured in a conventional way, implicitly assuming that Canadian citizens are members of the same imagined community despite their divergent ethnic, religious, linguistic, or provincial affiliations. As the document states in its prescribed learning outcomes:

The search for a Canadian identity has been a vital cultural issue in Canada in the 20th century. By exploring this issue, students gain understanding of the cultural forces that both shape and reflect the Canadian identity. (B.C. Ministry of Education, 1997, p. 3)
Similarly, I found that Québec nationalism is often confused in class and in the program with ‘separatism’ and the ‘Parti Québécois,’ as if all Québec nationalists are separatists and members of the PQ. For example, the grade 11 social studies Integrated Resource Package (IRP) encourages teachers in its prescribed learning outcomes to challenge students to conduct a mock royal commission on issues such as “Québec separatism” (B.C. Ministry of Education, 1997, appendix A).

Danny claims to be a traditional teacher, but traditionalism is too simple a concept for his pedagogy. Danny deliberately (and perhaps intuitively) uses a wide range of teaching methods adjusted to different learning styles and students’ needs from lecture to group activities, the ‘assignment method,’ the Socratic method, and finally discussion. It would be overstated to maintain that Danny’s students are all ‘bench-bound listeners,’ lined up in rows, sitting passively while taking notes. Danny reflects on his teaching style:

I take a traditional role in the classroom [but] I use a lot of video, which is often documentaries, to supplement what I’m doing in the classroom, be it a lecture type of approach or having kids work together or on assignments.

Furthermore, Danny does not rely exclusively on the prescribed textbooks which are not only dated but sometimes in contradiction with Canadian realities. The grade 11 government textbook, for example, incorrectly states in its description of the Constitution and Charter of Rights and Freedoms that “Québec and New Brunswick, because of their large francophone population, are [...] officially bilingual” (Bartlett et al., 1989, p. 155). “Textbooks,” Danny argues, “are very insufficient to teach content, that’s why I’ve been using videos, newsclips, documentaries since, I bet, 20-odd years now.” Danny often takes his students beyond the content of the textbooks, presenting more than one historical account and making connections.
with special details or current events when possible. Danny, as he expresses it, deeply wants to make history interesting for students.

To me, teaching the kids about history, what happen in history from Hitler’s sex life to Stalin’s relationship with his son, it’s all the details of history that makes it interesting. This is what I love, that’s what I try to get across to the kids.

Then, talking about students’ concerns for current affairs, he adds:

Current affairs are part of the course, be it 5 or 10%. It’s hard to put a number on these things. [But] some of the material that you do teach does lend itself to current affairs […] Kids are correct in that they would like to see more current affairs in class. But if it doesn’t relate to what we’re doing, I don’t usually go into it, unless there’s a direct question.

As the head of the department, Danny does not hesitate to take civic initiative and bring politicians to class during crucial political events, such as the 1995 Québec Referendum, to help students grapple with the political life, and understand and perhaps appreciate the work of their representatives. Danny, from this perspective, helps develop in the students a sense of ‘political confidence,’ that is, a belief that citizens can participate and influence political decisions. As he puts it:

We had a number of MPs, our own MP, and the President of the Liberal Party was here too. They came in and they talked to the kids […] that’s normal to have your MP or MLA in, especially around election time.
As we see, teaching styles are largely influenced by teachers’ preferences, personalities, and philosophies. There is no magic formula in education for creating ‘good’ citizens. “A good question-raising, interesting, provocative lecture, no matter how traditional,” Osborne (1996) argues, “can teach students more about democracy than any amount of cooperative learning or project-based activity” (p. 61). What is important to bear in mind is not only that teaching approaches are not neutral in terms of citizenship, but that it is pure mystification to think that some particular approaches will automatically create good democratic citizenship in students. As Postman (1996) puts it, “[t]here are one and twenty way to sing tribal lays, and all of them are correct. So it is with learning [and teaching]” (p. 3). The following social studies teacher, Joan, is another illustration.

“Take the stairs facing Danny’s door,” she tells me. “Then, take the rear exit and walk the parking lot until you reach the first portables row. Turn left, and walk to the corner of the main building. Turn right, this is the third portable on your left, portable 143.” As a military officer, I have walked almost everywhere in Canada in many ‘tactical’ situations (night, day, rain, snow) but this is the first time in my life I feel I need a compass to get to my next class. I follow her instructions but, finding myself outside, all the portables look the same. Which one is hers? I go back to my instruction plan and finally get to what seems to be her portable. I am uncertain since the door is wide-open and the miniature portables’ numbers are on the door. I take a chance and go in the room. Luckily Joan is there, talking with one block F student (grade 11). She looks at me as I find a place in the back of the classroom. “I’ll be with you in a second,” she gestures with her fingers. Joan’s classroom is very different from Danny’s. Windows are protected by wire mesh guarding against stray balls coming from the playing field just a few meters behind. Student desks are arranged in semi-circle (‘U’ shaped) with the teacher’s desk in front. Joan placed several pictures and posters to mask the pale beige walls of the portable, ranging from The Canadian Heritage Rivers System, the Canadian Parliament, the provincial flags, and a
series of posters produced by past students on environmental issues and politics. On the front wall is a thought from Einstein: “Great spirits have always encountered violent opposition from mediocre minds.” I wonder how many students will get ‘violent opposition’ in this class. In the back of the room, just where I sit, is a long metal bookshelf with various recent (and not so recent) dictionaries, history, geography, and politics textbooks. It is 12:45. The 20 students (nine non-white) take their seats while Joan is telling me what will be the topic of today’s class. Students mix relatively well despite the fact there is no seating plan. The class is not segregated by gender or ethnicity. Some wonder what am I doing in ‘their’ classroom. I realize that I am definitely on foreign ground. One female student, Christine, is more curious than others. She comes by and asks me naively who I am and why I am here. “Are you a student-teacher with Joan?” she asks. I tell her, as well as the others around waiting for an answer, who I am and why I am here. “Listen to his accent,” says a voice coming from the front, “that’s French for sure.” I suddenly realize that their fast English (with unknown idiomatic expressions) is not my academic English I learned at UBC. In a second, my Québec roots took precedence over everything I was saying in what seemed to me a ‘respectable’ English. For a quick moment, I felt as a stranger in my own country.

On the board, Joan is writing the work students have to do: “For the next class: Finish chap. 4, Questions; test on chap. 3-4, Tue May 25; group presentations Thursday.” Then, Joan picks up a piece of paper on her desk and starts reading what turns out to be a student’s homework assignment on the ethnic crisis in Kosovo and the Holocaust. Based on the paper, Joan tries to make links between the two events, talking about fear of the ‘Other’ and the repressive response of ethnic nationalists, showing that ‘history repeats itself.’

“Christine,” she says firmly, “do you have a question?” Christine was not listening; she was chatting with her colleague. “Sorry, Miss” she replies. Then, Joan tries to involve students by asking them what they think about the crisis in Kosovo. A couple of students provide Joan
with their comments, arguing that racism is "very sad" and that, hopefully, we can escape such a situation in Canada. Earlier in the semester, Joan’s grade 11 students, along with some of Danny’s class, went to UBC for a visit to the Holocaust exposition. This activity, Joan hopes, will help students to increase their knowledge of the subject and prepare their group presentation on an anti-racism campaign in the school.

“OK class,” she reminds students in a relaxed way, “I want a clear pamphlet supporting your ideas [on anti-racism] that we could present to the principal.” “You have the rest of the period,” she adds, “to prepare your group presentations.” Bodies stretch out, smiles appear, and tranquillity replaces action. Energetically, students join their groups and start working on their assignment. Jeff is back from the bathroom, situated in the main building, with a bag of chips he probably picked up in the machine next to the rear exit. “Give me some,” says his partner as they go over their pamphlet, which they called “Eracist.”

Joan is moving from one group to another, asking questions of students and providing hints on how to write and present their work. “Class,” she interrupts, “I need to talk to you. You have to prepare yourself for the presentation; you are not young kids, you are in grade 11.” Joan has no serious discipline problems with her students, but she occasionally steps in to remind the class to keep the noise down and focus exclusively on their presentation, not on tonight’s basketball game or something else. I realize that group activities, often associated with ‘student-centered’ approaches, require a lot of classroom management. A classroom atmosphere conducive to both teaching and learning is extremely precarious. Only one or two tumultuous students can affect and infect a whole group, turning a quiet classroom into a noisy social gathering. The time flies by. As in every class, some teams work seriously; others are laid back. The bells suddenly rings; the class is over. “Make sure that everyone participates in the oral,” Joan warns, as students gather up their backpacks and leave the portable.
Joan is a white social studies teacher in her 30s. Born in B.C., she has been teaching for 14 years in the province; this is her second year as a social studies teacher in PSS. When asked to describe her job as a teacher, Joan says that she enjoys teaching social studies 11 because, “in that course, there’s a venue for learning about each other’s background, and having a sense of common citizenship. That’s good [since] Canada is a multicultural [country] welcoming different people of different backgrounds.” For Joan, citizenship is the *raison d’être* of social studies. As she puts it:

In terms of citizenship, I mean that comes into being Canadian as well, [pause] that takes teaching [pause] students about their heritage and where their country comes from, what built the country and what do we need to do... to keep our country the way it is, see it in a world-wide perspective, and opening their eyes to realize that we are unique in the world [...] If you have to give one word to sum it up, I would say it's citizenship.

From that perspective, Joan agrees with much of the overall goal of social studies programs in B.C. In its rationale, the grade 11 social studies IRP states:

The Social Studies Kindergarten to Grade 11 curriculum provides students with opportunities as future citizens to critically reflect upon events and issues in order to examine the present, make connections with the past, and consider the future. (B.C. Ministry of Education, 1997, p. 1)

Like Danny, Joan is attentive to, and worried about, students’ lack of historical knowledge. This deficiency, she argues, undermines the chances of creating a strong national identity found in many European countries.
[In] European nations, I think kids are taught to respect their past more. In Canada, because of the constant transitions and changes, and maybe with new immigration, some of the kids feel that it’s not helpful to look back 100 years; whereas if you have a national identity based on a solid French culture or German culture, you feel that there's a nationalism there that goes back so far that [pause] every citizen is trying to respect the past in one way […].

She thinks that a weak sense of nationalism in Canada impairs the teaching of Canadian history in social studies. It sends students the negative perception that Canada is a country with little past, thus discouraging them from according an importance to the learning of Canadian history for their life as future citizens. This view is eloquently expressed by Griffiths (2000) of the Dominion Institute who recently argued that young Canadians making their way through the school system have few opportunities to learn about defining moments of Canadian history.

But certain historians have argued that Canadian nationalism has historically been used to impose a narrow view of national culture and identity on students, focusing exclusively on white, British Canadian males (Strong-Boag, 1996; Stanley, 1990). That sort of nationalism would undermine the chances of creating an inclusive democratic citizenship. Joan is far from rejecting cultural pluralism as a ‘positive force’ in Canada. A visit to her classrooms confirms that multiculturalism and anti-racism are central to her teaching of social studies. But Joan contends that focusing exclusively on today’s socio-cultural issues attenuates students’ considerations for historical events, particularly French-English relations, that are also central to the development of Canada.

I think they like it because it’s easier [for them]. I think that’s one of the things that I’ve noticed, they like things that take less effort, in a way. Yet, to be fair, they all still enjoy learning about their world. They’re young and they’re
egocentric as teenagers and if it affects them personally then it becomes of interest.

But for Joan, if the study of Québec is central to the understanding of Canada, the country is still viewed in her minds as a ‘nation-state’ made up of various ethnic/immigrant groups, not a multinational state.

In Canada, we have a struggle with that [nationalism] because we're a nation of immigrants [...]..

Relying on textbooks, personal notes, and various historical documents, Joan tries to create in her classes a certain balance between historiography and current affairs that affects students' lives. Because the social studies 11 program is ‘more flexible’ than the IB program (no provincial examination), Joan says she has “more leeway with Social 11.”

I can do the Holocaust in detail and do the field trip and spend 5 to 6 classes on that particular topic, whereas I couldn't do that in History 12 or the IB program.

The social studies 11 IRP facilitates such initiatives by explicitly encouraging teachers “to use a variety of approaches to organizing units. Although Social Studies 11 has an issues orientation, teachers may choose, for example, to develop units based on themes, inquiries, problems, projects, case studies, or other strategies” (B.C. Ministry of Education, 1997 p. 5). So Joan uses also a variety of materials, along with textbooks, to stimulate students and increase their interest in social studies.

I'm a news-aholic, so for me, [pause] I guess you bring to it what you value, and I value current events and news [...].
But beyond the use of 'pedagogical aids,' it is Joan’s teaching styles that make her classes dynamic and stimulating for students. Joan not only teaches a subject, but teaches students, which implies that she has to know them, spend time with them, and believe in them. For her, teaching citizenship is not only a matter of content but of attitudes.

I try to go with the punches and [pause] encourage them. [I try to] be a team player with them, kind of. [...] I try to be inclusive [...] You want to excite them about history and geography, [as well as] the electives that are in grade 12 because [pause] our program depends on having kids being motivated in grade 11.

For her, 'subject-centered' and 'student-centered' are just two sides of the same coin. Joan knows well what she has to cover during the year and tries to adapt the curriculum as much as possible to the students she meets twice a week. In certain situations, in which students are expected to learn basic historical facts, Joan uses direct instruction. In others, she honestly prefers discussion, group work, or projects, so as to favour debate and experiments that call on students to think and explore for themselves. Joan also introduces them, when possible, to 'historical thinking,' that is, to approach historical narratives critically. But, as Joan recognizes, she has great difficulties implementing historical thinking in class because some of her students clearly have no interest in such an (intellectual) approach to history. Public schools, she adds, have to welcome everybody, from the brilliant future university graduate to the dropout. And, this complicates the task of teaching history so as to stimulate everyone and avoid systematic failure. As she puts it:

I try to [pause] have a style where I offer different types of teaching and evaluation to go on. So that there's some traditional [pause] teaching, very content-driven, especially the history and government section, along with
[pause] group work on certain projects, that will allow kids, who are weaker academically, to do better in oral presentations. [...] I suppose, with my clientele, I've got a very large class section of kids that are, basically, scraping through to get graduation to I.B. kids, in some cases. So, you want to stimulate the ones that are going to go on to university and yet [pause] there's a balance of [pause] not making it so hard that kids want to drop your course [...] This year [pause] it was a little more creative [than last year] with some of the projects and things that I did with them. [...] I mean, you can do it [historical thinking] but it's a tough sell [...] I want the kids to know how to do historical research, to come up with decent statements and arguments, original arguments, critical thinking. [So] it's not that I don't present to them how to do it, it's just that [pause] some of them don't want to do it or simply don't care.

We see from Joan's comments that despite the intents of the program and the good will of history teachers to expose students to the process of analyzing and constructing historical accounts, so that they can arrive at their own understandings, the actual situation in social studies classes often lead teachers to different and unexpected practices, which do not reflect what 'ought to be.'

5.3 Conclusion

What can we conclude from this B.C case study analysis? Are schools agents of democratic citizenship? What teaching methods should be employed in class for teaching democracy? There are no simple answers to these questions. Schools have different shapes, settings, and rules, which affect their clientele. PSS offers a stimulating site for analyzing citizenship education practices in English Canada. Its ethno-cultural and linguistic diversity, its
reputation and tradition of academic achievement, and its strong support for school and community involvement make it a unique public place for socialization, for learning about democracy in school clubs, activities, or in more subtle interactions with other people. Whether student interviewees really have an impact or school decisions and teaching is beyond the scope of this research.

As for Danny and Joan, they are two typical English-Canadian teachers aware of the debate in Canadian education about the role and meaning of nationalism, democracy, and citizenship in history/social studies education. Despite their divergent pedagogical approaches, both must contend in their daily classes with similar social, cultural, linguistic, and pedagogical dilemmas. The students they face no longer represent a culturally and linguistically homogeneous group, namely British Canadian. A growing number of ESL students lack not only basic historical knowledge of Canada but have speaking and writing deficiencies which often impair their learning aptitudes.

Similarly, social studies teachers like Danny and Joan increasingly have to consider both the exigent goals of their programs and students' expectations for and interests in history/social studies. This is a considerable challenge for social studies teachers who, according to the 1999 B.C. Social Studies Task Force, are not prepared adequately to teach their subject in 'deeper and more thoughtful' manners (B.C. Social Studies Task Force, 1999, p. 5).

Part of the solution, for the task force, lies in studying more carefully students' own understandings and expectations. As I have been arguing, recent educational research shows that students do not passively assimilate what is presented in class but 'live out a curriculum.' Despite their young ages, they have, as Cullingford (1991) notes, “clear ideas about what is successful in its delivery” (p. 2). In many cases, they know, better than anyone, which teaching styles are successful, which techniques of learning bring the best out in students. The students I
met were articulate. They showed consistent judgement about what they think is ‘good’
education for them.

When asked what they like or would prefer in their social studies classes, B.C. student
interviewees provided divergent but interesting comments based on their school experience. For
some, social studies classes were essential to their full integration in and understanding of
Canadian society. These classes provided them with some of the competencies necessary to play
an active role in their communities. As one immigrant student puts it:

When I came to Canada, I knew nothing about Canada at all. But because of
Social Studies courses, especially Social Studies 11, I understand [pause]
Canadian history, Canadian background, the Charter, how the government
works, and how a bill is being processed […] So I think it’s a good course.
(student, male)

For others, social studies classes turned out to be boring, historically removed from their
lives and concerns, concentrating only on one teaching style — usually the traditional lecture —
with little attention or concern for controversial and current issues such as the Nisga’a Treaty.

I’ve noticed that in the school system, [teachers] mostly concentrate on one
learning style. I’d like to explore other learning styles so that everyone would
have a chance to do well. For me, it would be discussion, [pause] a little bit of
group work, and mostly, can’t remember what it’s called, but the one where
you read a textbook, you have the questions memorized, et cetera. That’s what
we’ve been taught, basically, through our whole education. (student, female)

I think you need a teacher to make it fun for you […] So, if it’s fun you’ll
remember it. The lecture days are like out of school, kids don’t like that. I
think [we should learn] the main facts of history. I don’t think that you really need to get into ‘What was the name of the street that the tank was blown up on?’[…] (student, male)

More interestingly, I asked student interviewees if they were taught to interpret history through a different system of beliefs, in other words to ‘experience’ different understandings of Canadian history. Students replied that schools, in their experience, tend to avoid such controversial practices and adhere to more traditional and ‘accepted’ conceptions of citizenship education. One student puts it this way:

No, they [teachers] really don't get into that. They don't touch it on the provincials because it's a touchy subject. They try not to discuss touchy things because it's not proper, because kids will get complaining at home. The teachers will be getting phone calls and getting in trouble […] (student, female)

1 Although I recognize that the dichotomy, ‘content’ vs. ‘process,’ is problematic since both concepts are inseparable when talking about history education and the construction of knowledge, I use the term content, here, in reference to information or factual statements about history, geography, politics, and so forth found in the documents (e.g., curricula, textbooks). For a better analysis of this false dichotomy in history education, see Seixas (1999a).

2 In order to protect or make anonymous the identity of the school and participants, all the names have been changed, including the name of the school.

3 Students in the IB program are required to pass specific IB examinations. For this course, students have a written exam (80 percent) and guided course work (20 percent). The written exam is divided into two papers: the first one includes two essay answers and one primary source document which forms the basis of 6 questions; the second one consists of 10 questions for the ‘contemporary’ option and 16 questions for the ‘modern option’ of the course, and three essay answers on one particular region. The course work is an individual investigation work undertaken under guidance of a teacher.

4 There is a provincial examination in grade 12 covering 20th century history for those taking History 12. The examination recently made the news for its lack of emphasis on Canada (see Steffenhagen, 2000).
The change from a mandatory to an elective social studies course in 1999 did not go uncontested. A special report of Steffenhagen in the *Vancouver Sun* (2000, February 24), suggested that with the new situation, a B.C. student can now graduate from high school “with only Canadian history up to 1914” (p. A2).

The fact there is no provincial examination of social studies 11 also gives teachers a certain flexibility for not only teaching the curriculum but preparing their own local examinations. Joan uses a variety of exams (6) focusing on Canadian history, geography, and politics. Questions range from multiple-choice, to true-or-false, written-response, fill-in-the-blanks, and evidence questions. Examinations emphasize not only memorization but also synthesis, analysis and critical thinking.
VI. B.C. STUDENTS’ UNDERSTANDINGS OF CITIZENSHIP: “CANADA IS DEFINITELY A GREAT PLACE TO LIVE; THAT’S WHY WE IMMIGRATED HERE.” (STUDENT, MALE)

In this chapter, I look at some B.C. social studies grade 11 students’ conceptions of citizenship, at how in light of their experience in their school (PSS) they understand citizenship in terms of the key concepts presented in chapter 2: rights, pluralism, and participation. Chapter 9 deals exclusively with citizenship, nationalism, and national identity. It provides a comparative analysis of both Québec and B.C. students’ understanding of nationalism and identity in the Canadian-Québec context.

6.1 On Canada, Canadians, and rights

Canada is a pluralistic, multi-faceted society that does not lend itself to easy generalizations. Gallant (1981) once said that in this context a Canadian is someone who simply has good logical reasons to believe he is one. When asked what Canada is, students (immigrant and Canadian-born) provided many stimulating reasons (moral and practical) why they are Canadian and how they define their country. The intent of this section is not to provide an overview of all the varied responses from students but to focus on one key theme that was recurrent in almost all their comments: rights. B.C. student interviewees, whether they are Canadian-born or immigrant, repetitively stress in their responses the rights, freedoms, and opportunities they have in this ‘free’ country. For some, their past experience in their home-country gives them a means of comparison between ‘here’ and ‘there,’ between liberal democracy and (too often) oppression and dictatorship.
I haven't been to a lot of different countries but it seems like one of the best countries to live in, there's just a lot of opportunity[...] I think it's just one of the few countries where there's a really good set of morals, ideals and values. (student, male)

I think that we have in Canada much more freedoms than quite a few countries [...] And,multiculturally, I believe that we have a lot of cultures and I feel like the majority of us accept it. (student, female)

B.C. students believe that Canada, as prime minister Chrétien likes to repeat in public, is a 'great place to live.' They value their country and their citizenship. They recognize the benefits, opportunities, rights and freedoms available to them in Canada. They stress the necessity of having equal rights and individual freedoms, as well as accepting others, and keeping good relations among individuals and groups. Some also talk about the importance of being committed to protect individual rights in a democracy.

I don't want to say third world countries, but other countries don't have our freedoms [...] So, it's very freedom oriented here [...] We have a lot of choice, rights, and freedoms, I like being a Canadian. (student, female)

The most appealing thing about Canada is the fact that if you hold a Canadian passport you can go anywhere in the world and be welcomed [...] (student, male)
I think if you have rights, like the right to vote, you should go out and vote
because it's part of your responsibility [to protect your rights]. (student,
female)

If students openly admit they do not know much about all the provisions of the Canadian
state, as in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, some implicitly talk about what Marshall (1965)
calls the social rights provided through the welfare state, like medicare, public education, and so
forth. Many students view these rights as central to their definition of Canadian citizenship. As
noted by Gilbert (1996), in a welfare state, while all three types of rights (civil, political, social)
are important, it is the third which usually offers the greatest hope for citizens. The chief
concerns of citizens, he argues, “relate to the equitable distribution of access to normally
expected levels of wellbeing” (Gilbert, 1996, p. 51). The following student interviewees
reinforced this view:

I don’t want to just keep comparing to the [United] States but our education
here, I think, is quite good. I like our education [...]. (student, female)

Canada is definitely a great place to live. That’s why we immigrated here, to
Canada [...] We just wanted to find a better place to live...[pause] to get more,
to get better education, [pause] higher living quality. There’s so many
considerations. (student, male)

For one social studies teacher, students over the last twenty years have become more
aware of their inherent democratic rights in the school system. They are more conscious of what
is legally and morally acceptable for their personal development and autonomy. As one female
student interview puts it, they want to be treated ‘fairly.’
As for the school environment, like how you’re treated and respected in the school and everything, I think that [...] it’s fair here. (student, female)

I have argued earlier (chapter 3) that one goal of citizenship education is the formation of critical and reflective citizens aware of their rights rather than passive subjects of the regime. Common entitlements, as found by Marshall (1965), constitute the basis for full citizenship. According to Osborne (1996), common citizenship rights and social justice are now part of the new definition of citizenship in social studies programs. A similar argument is also offered by Sears et al. (1998). According to this view, the 1990s are characterized by a greater consideration for rights and responsibilities in social studies education in Canada, which they believe is related to Canada’s 1982 Constitution. Some commentators (see Gwyn, 1995; Laforest, 1995) have even suggested recently that our new Constitution has given rise to a ‘rights culture,’ in which individuals (including students) become more aware of their personal rights and the necessity of being treated justly by the state.

The B.C. social studies grade 11 IRP explicitly encourages students to demonstrate a respect for rights and human equality. The document states in its expected learning outcomes:

In Social Studies 11, students develop understanding of the fundamental principles of law in Canada. This understanding of the legal system of Canada, coupled with an understanding of the rights and responsibilities of individuals in a democratic society, is essential for the practice of effective citizenship.

(B.C. Ministry of Education, 1997, p. 4)

A similar notion of respect for citizenship rights is found in the grade 11 social studies government textbook (Bartlett et al., 1989), particularly in the two chapters on “The Canadian Constitution” and “The Charter of Rights and Freedoms.”
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Canada's Constitution is in many respects a reflection of the most important features and values of our political system [...] [Yet] the significance and effects of the new constitutional provisions are still unfolding. (Bartlett et al., 1989, p. 148)

From my interviews, it is hard to conclude that these young Canadians have, in fact, developed a 'rights culture à la U.S.' as suggested by Gwyn (1995). An increased interest in social studies programs for law-related education in the 1990s has surely helped develop more knowledgeable students about the necessity of rights in democracy (see Yates, 1997). But, as we will see below, neither the program nor B.C. student interviewees are concerned exclusively with citizenship rights.

6.2 On cultural pluralism and multiculturalism

In 1971, the Canadian government embarked on a unique experiment by announcing its official support for a policy of multiculturalism. With a population increasingly non-white, and non-British/non-French, the federal government discarded the notion of biculturalism as recommended by the 'B and B Commission.' The original policy — later enshrined in a law in the 1988 Multicultural Act — had four goals: to support the cultural development of ethnocultural groups; to help members of ethnocultural groups overcome barriers to full participation in Canadian society; to promote creative encounters and interchange among all ethnocultural groups; and to assist new Canadians in acquiring at least one of Canada's official languages (Kymlicka, 1998, p. 15). Overall, it replaced the 'assimilationist approach' by an 'integrative approach' to full citizenship. It dealt with cultural pluralism in ways more consistent with Canadian democratic values and practices.
Although the policy was first implemented at the federal level, English-Canadian provincial governments have recognized multiculturalism in a variety of ways. In B.C., the government has adopted in 1990 a multicultural policy, later enshrined in a Multicultural Act (in 1993). As education is a provincial responsibility, provincial governments promote multiculturalism through education in several ways (Puttagunta, 1998): ESL/FSL programs for immigrants; nonofficial language (or heritage language) instruction; anti-racism educational programs; and multicultural educational programs. Multicultural education, as Kehoe (1996) notes, is also integral to social studies education in Canada. Through social studies, “children learn about the diversity of people in Canada and throughout the world” (Kehoe, 1997, p. 147).

The social studies grade 11 IRP is clear about the importance of cultural pluralism for creating an inclusive democratic citizenship in Canada. The document states in its expected learning outcomes that:

The 20th century has seen profound changes in the social fabric of Canada. In examining social issues, students [should] gain understanding of the dynamic regional, cultural, and ethnic diversity of Canadian society. (B.C. Ministry of Education, 1997, p. 4)

A similar view is offered by Morton (1988) in his history textbook. To the question ‘what is a Canadian?’ Morton (1988) argues that “[t]he answer is for each Canadian to decide, from a range of choice” (p. 220). “In a rapidly shrinking world,” he adds, “showing that different groups can live together in harmony is one of the most important contributions which Canada can make to the survival of humankind” (Morton, 1988, p. 220).

B.C. student interviewees are children of the ‘multicultural era.’ They arrived in Canada or were born after the implementation of the policy of multiculturalism. So, for most of them, all they know about Canada and Canadians is multiculturalism. One or two immigrant students have
even learned in their home-country the irrefutable consequences of intolerance and ethnic allegiance. In this context, it is no surprise that student interviewees, whether they are Canadian-born or immigrant, think multiculturalism is ‘the solution’ to cultural pluralism. As one Canadian-born student, who is also member of the multicultural club of the school, puts it:

I think, I feel its pretty open [in this school]. I think we have built multiculturalism through the years, because we have a multicultural club. And I think they’ve been pretty successful with that. (student, female)

Another Canadian-born student adds:

I think some people still think it is [a white country] but, then, I think that a lot of people are more going [sic] towards multiculturalism. (student, female)

One central theme of multiculturalism and multicultural education in Canada is the preservation and development of the multi-ethnic heritage of Canadians. Their aims, as Moodley (1995) notes in her analysis of multiculturalism, are “to counteract assimilation [into the mainstream] and to increase knowledge and understanding of the individual’s ethnocultural heritage” (p. 809). In other words, multiculturalism provides ethnocultural minorities with ways to feel more comfortable within the mainstream societal institutions of Canada by helping them to preserve and share their own cultural heritage (Kymlicka, 1998). Multiculturalism implies that there is more than one way of being Canadian, that it is no longer seen as unpatriotic to reject ‘Anglo-conformity.’

A majority of student interviewees, particularly immigrants, find a compatibility between multiculturalism and common citizenship. They were proud of their ‘doubled-sided’ or ‘multiple’ identities and the opportunities they have to express them in Canada. They
emphasized the fact that, in some situations, there are advantages to having multiple identities and speaking different languages in this country.

I’m okay with being Canadian, because, I think I can kinda fit into both cultures, to even the Chinese culture, because that’s what I am at home, too […] And some people see me as being, like Chinese, [pause] but then, I’m also Canadian, so I kinda get the best of both worlds. (student, female)

When I describe myself to people who ask, I usually say “I’m half Chilean, half German, all Canadian.” I don’t know, I see myself as [pause] a little bit of everything. And I think that’s what Canadians do […] that they’re not just one select race […] they’re part of the whole world. (student, female)

Others, while recognizing the importance of their cultural (or ethnic) heritage, prefer to act publicly as ‘Canadian,’ to separate their cultural (or private) space from the public one. This is mostly the case of immigrant students who either have little if any memory of their original culture/language or have spent only a brief period in their country of origin. They have typically begun to distance themselves from the home-country and have constructed an identity and sense of belonging that they believe are first and foremost Canadian. One student originally from Taiwan puts it this way:

I think I’m more Canadian than I am Chinese because I came here when I was so young it’s hard to remember what it’s like to live in Taiwan […] I’m sure my parents try to make me Chinese or whatever but, yeah, I think I’m more Canadian. I think, even though I know how to speak Mandarin, my mom would speak to me in Mandarin but I would answer her in English, which is kinda bad but […] that’s what I prefer. I like being Canadian […] My parents
both, at home, they're like “Oh you have to stick with your culture.” So they
tell me stories about Chinese culture and things like that. So I learn about that
as well as, but like all my friends here I learn, at school, being Canadian.

(student, female)

These comments confirm other studies’ conclusions that second- and third-generation
individuals in Canada “progressively [merge] into the dominant society” (Ward, 1982, p. 17) and
do not form segregated ghettos. They legitimately use their private sphere to perpetuate elements
of their cultural/linguistic heritage, but accept the necessity of a common public sphere (with
shared norms, language, etc.) for their lives as citizens. As Breton (1986) notes, “[this is] part of
their search for full integration in their society [italic in original]” (p. 55). Most of them have no
sense of belonging to the original country and, thus, have no real desire to return and settle where
their parents or ancestors lived. This is the case of the following students from Taiwan.

I went back to Taiwan when I was in grade 5, but just to visit my relatives
because all my relatives are there. Obviously things are different, like, it’s so
polluted there. You just don’t want to be there. (student, female)

I don’t really remember much of [Taiwan] […] I used to go once a year until I
got really tired of it […]. (student, male)

Another immigrant student, from Mexico, adds that the ‘traumatising’ experience of his
family in a developing country is largely responsible for his adoption of Canadian citizenship. As
he puts it:
Right now, the only other experience I get from [Mexico] is the stories that my parents tell me from when we used to live in Mexico. And the stories they tell me are just kinda horror stories [...] (student, male)

As we see, student interviewees deeply want to adopt a Canadian identity despite their divergent cultural or linguistic ones. If immigrants seek to adopt or reproduce aspects of their cultural/ethnic heritage, they usually do so within the Canadian context. This is not to say, however, that the process of (re)constructing these new identities for immigrants has gone uncontested in school and the classroom. A certain level of intolerance and racism still exists in the school, which one administrator believes, is greatly associated with language ability and adaptation.

There's been a couple of incidents where we think maybe they've been racially motivated. [But] I think it has to do with their language ability. Once they can speak English, fine. It's when they can't speak the language that there becomes an issue. (administrator, female)

Student interviewees do not express discontent about the color, dress, or mental characteristics of immigrant students or members of ethnic groups. But some Canadian-born students believe that immigrant students avoid integration by socializing (or “sticking” as they say) only with members of their own cultural groups. The following comments are typical:

I do notice that there are certain groups that stay only [...] with their own kind. But maybe that's not their fault, maybe its just that they don't [pause] happen to know the [...] language. (student, female)
Once in a while I feel uncomfortable, say if I’m around a bunch of people who speak a different language and I have no idea what they’re talking about.

(student, female)

In this case study, I found that language segregation was a key factor in reinforcing prejudice. The administration, as well as the student council, take the situation very seriously. In 1998-1999, the school hired an external consultant to lead focus groups on issues such as bullying and racism. The multicultural club of the school repeatedly stresses in its campaigns the importance of building a multicultural school spirit by trying to involve students in activities, such as ‘special events days.’ One club member reports on the role of the club at PSS:

We have a bulletin board that […] celebrates all different celebrations of all cultures. [Also], what we did was to have a week where it [was] multicultural week. One day it [was] Japanese, and at lunch time, in the cafeteria, everyone really dressed in Japanese cultural clothing. We sold like sushi and we had dances and things like karate. And Mexico was the next day[…]. (student, female)

Studies (see Fisher & Echols, 1989) have shown, however, that such activities are often superficial and do not necessarily lead to better understanding of cultural diversity and greater tolerance of ethnic groups. More importantly, they do not counteract what Roman and Stanley (1997), relying on Gilroy, call the ‘new culturalist racism,’ that is, a limited tolerance of ethnic groups which blinds people to the fact they continue to act in subtle racist ways.

But, surprisingly, immigrant students expressed in their interview no real feeling of having been discriminated against in school. Being an ‘external’ white francophone interviewer
from UBC have had an effect on their comments. But, for one Muslim student wearing a traditional scarf:

It's not really a big thing [to be Muslim] because all people, they've seen other Muslims or they're quite accepting. I suppose I'm pretty used to it, right? Because I've been doing it for quite a few years. Problems? No, not really that I've been experiencing. (student, female)

Another student supporting this view has this to say:

I think multiculturalism [...] prevents us from being racist cause we're used to having so many different races around us. We consider them as being different but we don't particularly go towards racism. (student, female)

6.3 On participation

A democratic state clearly requires more than equal citizenship rights and respect of diversity (Taylor, 1997). It requires that citizens be committed to participate actively in public affairs. If democracy is the rule of the people, by the people, and for the people, the people, by definition, must be interested and active. "A decision made by all the people," Milbrath (1965) claims, "is better than a decision made by only part of the people" (p. 142).

Relying on scholars such as Pateman (1970), Barber (1984), and Taylor (1989), I have argued in chapter 2 that participation in a democracy should be viewed ultimately as a 'way of life' based upon moral principles concerning how citizens ought to live individually and collectively in a democracy. The central idea of a 'participatory democracy' is that people should be closely and extensively involved in voicing their opinions and making decisions and laws that affect their lives and freedoms. As the author of the history textbook, Morton (1993), puts it, a
central proposition of citizenship in Canada is that “people acquire it by experience and commitment” (p. 51).

Several studies in education have confirmed that “the main ideology of citizenship education [in Canada] is the importance of citizen action and participation” (Masemann, 1987, p. 5). If schools have historically viewed and presented participation in ‘elitist’ terms — regarding politics as a realm reserved for ‘experts’ — there is evidence, according to Sears and Hughes (1996), that present-day English-Canadian ministries of education have shifted their approach to accord a greater importance to an ‘activist’ conception of participation (committed to wide public participation in public affairs). To illustrate, the B.C. social studies grade 11 IRP states in its rationale:

The Social Studies Kindergarten to Grade 11 curriculum provides students with opportunities to practise the skills and processes necessary to be responsible, active citizens. (B.C. Ministry of Education, 1997, p. 2)

But, as Hahn (1998) indicates, despite all policies and curricular intentions to favour participation, political activity is greatly influenced by the political attitudes and beliefs of citizens. People who express a strong sense of ‘political efficacy,’ that is, a belief that citizen action can influence politicians and public policy, are found to be more politically active than those who express only low levels of efficacy. Similarly, citizens who have a sense of ‘political trust’ (trust of representatives and institutions) tend to be less cynical not only about politicians but also about politics in general (institutions, policies, bureaucracies) than those who have little political trust.

The large majority of student interviewees regard participation in Canada’s public affairs as an important civic responsibility. They emphasize the necessity of voting when they become legal, ‘full’ citizens (no distinction was made between local, provincial, or federal levels of
government), and caring for the good of their local community, province, and country. The following comments are typical:

I think definitely when I’m old enough to vote I’ll exercise that right [...] People don’t vote because they think ‘Oh, it’s not a big deal.’ But, then they complain all the time about taxes being too high. They don’t realize that your vote makes a difference [...]. It’s pretty sad considering they complain about the lack of democracy when they don’t even exercise it themselves. (student, male)

As I said, if you care about something [...] like if you care about your province, your country enough, then you will go out and vote. It does come with the responsibility of [citizenship]. (student, female)

I know one vote probably isn’t going to make a difference but I think everybody should go out and try to make an effort to learn what each party is trying to tell them and vote for somebody. (student, female)

Those who held that full citizenship implies participation in public affairs also had a sense of political trust and confidence in Canada’s democratic institutions. Some, particularly immigrants, even suggested that Canadian politicians, compared to other countries, are less corrupt and doing a much better job for their fellow-citizens.

I think it’s really hard to kind of trust politicians, through what they say through the media, because you don’t really know if what they’re saying is just for face or whether it’s what they mean. Pretty much, I think everybody has a moral conscience to do what’s right. (student, male)
I have faith in them, I don’t know if I trust them at the time, but I believe in them [...], I believe they’ll do the right things. (student, female)

I guess compared to, like comparing [politicians] to some of the leaders in Africa or whatever, they’re much better, they’re not as corrupt. (student, male)

One Canadian-born student, however, was categorically cynical of our politicians and institutions. She felt strongly alienated from Canadian institutions (provincial and federal levels), labelling political parties, elections, and politicians as a part of a ‘masquerade.’ She clearly typifies other students who believe that politicians are crooked, with no moral ideal and only seeking personal privileges. More importantly, she insinuated that our democratic system only favours a ruling group, a ‘political elite,’ that governs by virtue of its influence and prestige.

I don’t agree with anything of our politics. I don’t agree with anything that they’re doing. I don’t personally want to vote. Like I know it’s just one vote. I don’t personally think it’s going to make a difference out of millions of people [...]. [Politicians] know some stuff, they know what they’re doing, but I don’t agree with anything they’re doing. I don’t completely believe everything that they have to say. (student, female)

Commitments in a democratic society start well before people have full legal citizenship rights. Students have many opportunities in their schools and their local communities, to be ‘active citizens’ rather than ‘passive beneficiaries.’ Since democracy embraces much more than voting in elections, students can, in many ways (clubs, student council, forums), participate in public life and change things that need changing. They can engage in discussion with others (staff, teachers, administrators) about school activities, policies, and practices. They may even
propose new approaches for dealing with various social, educational issues such as multiculturalism, racism, and bullying. Schools not only teach about democracy but can encourage commitments by creating opportunities and working conditions that support democratic principles. Relying on Dewey (1916), several scholars (see Reeher and Cammarano, 1997) have proposed to democratize the school life so as to give students chances to practice democracy. As Audigier (1999a) summarizes it, “c’est en citoyennant que l’on devient citoyen!” (p. 65).

I asked students if they were engaged in their school community and, if so, what were their engagements. The intent of this section is not to verify if the participation and role of students in school organizations, committees and so forth have a real impact on school decisions but to present the views held by students with regard to their commitments in school. Many student interviewees declared a moral obligation to participate in the life of the school. As one school administrator says, “the first year I came here, I was amazed [when] looking at 16, 17, 18 year olds with a lot of leadership ability” (administrator, female). “I suspect,” she adds, “that probably 80 percent of our kids are involved in something.” A visit to the school during lunch time confirms that students (mostly upper grades) are involved in school activities. One student interviewee puts it this way:

Now that we are in grade 11 and 12, the senior grades, we have this feeling, this obligation that we have to be involved because if we didn’t, there’d be no one there. (student, male)

Other students believe that participation in school activities and organizations is important for developing democratic skills and acquiring a sense of belonging to the group.

I’ve noticed that [involvement] prepares you for the future in the fact that the different councils and committees, they really welcome students to join things
such as the student council, library club, multicultural club, et cetera. I feel that as I got involved with those I gained certain skills that would help me with the future. (student, female)

This year, I went to a few more like basketball games, still haven’t gone to a football game, but that will be like next year. I went to the drama production and I’m part of the environment club, so like recycling like every week and stuff like that [...]. I think if you get involved, you definitely get to meet other people as well as build a sense of belonging. (student, female)

But for others, they prefer to be involved in more ‘personal’ or ‘one-on-one’ activities requiring skills and aptitudes for dialogue, foreign languages, and peer tutoring. The following student shares her peer tutoring experience.

[Last year] I took peer tutoring and that helped me understand people, like, from different countries. ‘Cause you had to actually sit down and actually talk to them. And they had to talk to you because it was kinda just the circumstance that you’re under […]. [But] I think I should be more involved […]. (student, female)

Finally, a minority of student interviewees argue they prefer to focus their attention exclusively to academic work. They contend that they want to concentrate on their academic success, particularly if they are in their first year of the I.B. program.

For this year I kinda just wanted to see what I was getting into with the full I.B. Then next year, I’m going to join at least the soccer team and then maybe other things afterwards. (student, male)
Honestly, I don't volunteer very much, I'm not in Student Council, I don't really play sports. I just never considered it, so I just never decided to go for them [...]. (student, female)

6.4 Conclusion

I end this chapter thinking about the nature of citizenship for these B.C. students. I tell myself that we have travelled a long road in the last 30 years in citizenship education. In 1968, Hodgetts concluded that "[t]he majority of English-speaking high school students leave the Canadian studies classroom without the intellectual skills, the knowledge and the attitudes they should have to play an effective role as citizens in present-day Canada" (p. 116). They were, in other words, 'bench-bound listeners' prepared to play essentially a passive role in Canadian society.

Students I met are of a different generation, a different world. Many claim to be not only aware of their rights, but also committed to protect their various rights and freedoms and participate actively in the building of their communities, whether they are educational, local, national, or global ones. If student interviewees know more about global issues, they want to remain Canadian, with a moderate but real sense of belonging to their country. But, unlike previous generations, they have a strong sympathy for multiculturalism, rejecting 'Anglo-conformity' as the only way to be a good Canadian. These findings corroborate the conclusions of other recent studies (Sears, 1996b; Osborne, 1996; Moodley, 1995; Masemann, 1989) showing that "a lot has happened in citizenship education over the past 25 or 30 years" (Sears, 1994b, p. 122). For student interviewees, Canadian citizenship is no longer understood in a 'narrow view.' If this situation can be associated with different and more progressive teaching practices, new textbooks, and curricular changes, which emphasize more activist conceptions of citizenship (as claimed by social studies teachers but not necessarily found in this research), I
suspect that the multi-ethnicity of the student body and the historical experiences of students (particularly recent immigrants) do have also a major impact on their attitudes. Unlike more homogeneous white anglophone communities, these students live on a daily basis with members of various ethno-linguistic backgrounds which force them in one way or another to constantly reassess their own stereotypes and attitudes towards immigrants or members of ethnic minorities in general.  

If we consider students' thinking about their social studies classes and teachers (see chapter 6), the socio-educational environment in which students find themselves may, in fact, have a greater influence on their attitudes or, at least, provides a better explanation why these B.C. students have adopted a more liberal-democratic and inclusive citizenship.

Some student informants confess that in the present context they lack socio-political and historical knowledge of Canada. Others, unconsciously or not, continue to reproduce racist behaviors and attitudes in the school despite their intention to be 'multicultural.' A small group of students, finally, have little interest in public affairs and concerns for social commitments, whether it is in their school or in their community. Such findings do, of course, fuel the fires of certain critics according to whom students in our schools are becoming increasingly cynical and apolitical (see Griffiths, 2000; Granatstein, 1998).

On this last point, two concluding remarks can be added. First, all the findings from this study do not lead to such easy generalizations. If some are, indeed, cynical and politically indifferent, a great majority of students has clearly expressed interest in and concern for democratic citizenship. Finally, we need to consider that it is extremely laborious to maintain that the school, and more specifically citizenship education, is solely responsible for the lack of historical and political knowledge, cynicism, and political indifference of certain students. As I have shown earlier, other agents, such as the media and the family, do have a clear impact on students' understandings, behaviors, and attitudes.
Two journalists came to similar conclusions in their analysis of another large multi-ethnic school in B.C. (see Bolan & Ward, 1997).

Several researchers have found that most immigrants in Canada settle in large multi-ethnic cities such as Vancouver, Toronto and Montréal for various reasons, including racial tolerance. In B.C., surveys have showed that Vancouverites tend to be more racially tolerant than British Columbians in general. But as one B.C. researcher, Alan Dutton, warns, such results must be analyzed carefully. Not only do respondents tend to unconsciously skew their responses to reflect a more 'liberal' accepted response, but they are also influenced by contemporary events such as unemployment rates and popular incidents (see Rinehart, 1997; Mulgrew, 1997).
CHAPTER 7

VII. DESCRIPTION OF THE QUÉBEC HIGH SCHOOL AND HISTORY TEACHERS

Following the same procedure as for the B.C. case study, in the following two chapters I will draw on insights gained from my general and specific observations, interviews, and document analysis to describe citizenship education practices as found in one francophone Québec high school (école secondaire). This chapter will first provide a description (using a narrative vignette) of the Québec school (section 1). Then, it will describe and discuss the teaching practices of two grade 10 history teachers who agreed to participate in this study (section 2). This chapter sets the contexts for understanding students’ conceptions of citizenship (chapter 9). It tries to show how issues of nationalism, federalism, and citizenship influence both citizenship education practices and students in this Québec high school. In order to offer a certain coherence between the two case studies, section 2 offers two typical accounts of citizenship education practices covering the portions of the program dealing with the teaching of Canada, Québec, and the West.

I have argued in chapter 4 that the grade 10 history program (‘Histoire du Québec et du Canada’), and the teachers and students who participate in this program, will be the primary focus of this case study because the Québec Ministry of Education has historically relied on history education, particularly the grade 10 history course since the 1980s, to teach democratic citizenship. This link between history and citizenship is so strong, so necessary and indisputable, that following the recommendations of the Task Force on the Teaching of History (1996) and the Task Force of Curriculum Reform (1997) citizenship education will officially be part of all history courses (from grade 3 to grade 11) in the new programs that will be implemented by the Ministry of Education. One can argue that studying history education in Québec does help understanding more about citizenship education practices in that province.
Monday, February 14, 8:10 am. On the corner of the street close to where I spent the night, I take a bus of the STCUM (Société de Transport de la Communauté Urbaine de Montréal) to get to my high school, normally a 20-minute ride. This is a typical cold winter morning. It snowed all night. Roads, sidewalks, cars, and roofs are all covered by 30 cm of snow. The cold and dry wind is drifting away the huge banks of snow left by the snowploughs during the night. I can barely see through the foggy windows of the bus. Roads are slippery and the traffic going downtown is extremely slow; but Quebec drivers are used to those winter conditions. In the bus, the crowd gets bigger as we come closer to the school. Packed like sardines I can hear the driver saying to the kids as they enter: “Enlevez vos sacs à dos!” Some follow his advice; others simply walk in and ignore the driver’s notice. Over my head, is a series of ads for teenagers from the Quebec Ministry of Health on sexually transmitted diseases. Condoms in various ‘fruit’ colors are portrayed with the comment: “L’amour, c’est plein de saveurs!”

I have been to Montréal secondary school (MSS) several times but this is my first winter experience in public transportation. I know where the school is located but I am not sure exactly where I should stop. I realize that most people in the bus are teenagers all going to MSS. Still sleepy-eyed, one girl beside me says to her friend: “Je ne passerai jamais ma vie à cette école là!” Another student adds “merde, on va encore être en retard!” Indeed, it is 8:50 am, classes start at 8:45 am, and we are not there yet. I tell myself that going to school on time in such conditions is next to impossible. The school administration knows it. So today, students can go to their classes without the usual ‘late slip’ given by the administration for late arrivals.

Suddenly, all students get out of the bus. I suppose this is my final destination. I take a chance, put on my polar gloves and ‘tuque,’ grab my briefcase and follow them in the narrow snow path — not cleaned up yet by the city employees — which ultimately leads to the school.
The weather is so bad that the only things I can recognize are the huge church tower next to the school and the large fleur-de-lis flag placed on every school building in the province. As I get closer to the student entrance, I distinguish some of the students' paintings on the massive concrete walls of the school. These historical murals, as the administration will tell you, were created by students in the 1990s to give a fresh and artistic look to what is, in reality, an impersonal, concrete and angular three-story building shaped like a cross.

The main hall represents the intersection of the four wings and it is crowded with students rushing to their lockers situated in a locked area on the main floor. One janitor is sweeping the ceramic floor covered by slushy melting snow. Students pay him no attention and walk with their snowshoes on the clean sections of the floor. Several paintings are also found on the walls and pillars inside the school. Each of the four wings is painted in a different color (green, red, blue, and yellow) and bears the name of one of Montréal’s historical figures. School subjects are, as much as possible, grouped in a particular wing. History classes, for instances, are all grouped in the red wing. Located in the main hall, are a student Caisse populaire Desjardins (credit union) to encourage students to put money aside ("minimum $5.00," says a notice), a student cooperative, where they can get school supplies, and a security office with two unarmed staff members. During their breaks and lunch times, students manage both student organizations.

Over my head, the four wings of the second and third floors intersect to create an impressive mezzanine of over 30 feet. Students often hang around on the benches, watching their peers dancing, walking, or simply talking in the main hall below. The administration is situated on the first floor at the far end of the green wing, just beside the main entrance. Several graduating pictures, school prizes, plaques, and other trophies of the school cover the walls of the green wing. To make it more animated, all school doors, including classroom doors, are covered by students’ paintings, usually in reference to the subject of the teacher.
MSS is a typical post-Quiet Revolution high school. Built in 1970 on the ‘Plateau Mont-Royal’ as a francophone all girls’ school, its mission changed in 1974 when it became a coeducational comprehensive high school (école polyvalente). During most of the 1970s, it remained culturally and linguistically homogeneous (white, lower to middle class, francophone). In 1985, the Commission Scolaire des Écoles Catholiques de Montréal (CECM) — now known as the Commission Scolaire de Montréal (CSM) since Québec has adopted a secular/linguistic school system — gave the choice to the school between keeping its vocational and technical programs or becoming a centre for ‘welcoming classes:’ classes for allophone students who take French as a second language. With an increasingly diversified population, and close proximity to the Portuguese and Greek neighbourhoods, the school chose the latter.

In the late 1980s, the school rapidly reached a population of nearly 2000 students from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds. This situation created many tensions among students and the large staff, mostly white francophone. It was then that a new principal came into office and conducted a school-wide study to determine the precise causes for all the dissatisfaction in MSS. Considering the results of the study, many changes were made, including the reestablishment of a student council, extra-curricular activities, and the creation of stronger community membership and involvement. The school library, which recently won a national prize for its exemplary educational role in the neighbourhood, provides a typical example of the socio-cultural links between the school and the local community. As one school administrator born in the neighbourhood puts it:

[MSS] est une école des années 70, les polyvalentes commençaient. C’était [donc] une polyvalente dans ce temps-là. Présentement nous sommes une école secondaire, c’est complètement différent. La mentalité a changé, maintenant c’est le socio-communautaire du Plateau. On travaille beaucoup avec la
Today, with a population of 1273 students (including two ‘welcoming’ classes for French as a Second Language students) and 75 teachers, MSS is one of the most representative middle class high schools (grade 7 to 11) of this part of the island. Around 60 percent of students were born in Québec and the remaining 40 percent from over 70 different countries. Included in the most important ethnic groups at MSS are Portuguese, Hispanic, Chinese, and Vietnamese. For one administrator, MSS is a good example of how different ethnocultural groups are accepted by the majority and can live together side by side in such a francophone public institution.

As the staff will tell you, despite the multi-ethnicity of the student-body there are very few overt racial tensions in the school: no racial fights, no desire from the white francophones majority to make everyone the same.

(Administrator, male)
Although students welcome people from various ethnic and linguistic backgrounds, this school must operate within a political and educational framework that requires students to speak the public language of Québec, namely, French. As a result, teachers, administrators, and other staff (librarians, youth workers, counsellors) often remind allophone students to speak French, at least publicly. To support this objective, the administration has included a section in its “Code de vie” (living code), adopted by the school council. The code is found in every student agenda and it states: “[d]ans l’école la langue d’usage est le français. En conséquence, je communique en français en classe, durant les activités et lorsqu’un adulte m’adresse la parole” (Student agenda, 1999-2000, p. 22). Commenting on this rule, one administrator adds:

La langue de l’école est le français et on parle français. Dans les cours et partout dans l’éccole, sur le terrain de l’éccole, c’est la langue [pause]. C’est sûr que des fois on peut entendre parler une autre langue mais dans la majorité des cas on entend parler le français […]. C’est rendu la norme, on parle français partout. (administrator, male)

A visit to the school during lunchtime confirms that ethnicity and language do not ghettoize the student-body. Students tend to group by their looks, music styles, and sports activities rather than staying with their ‘own kind.’

Aussi drôle que ça puisse paraître, c’est souvent par le goût de la musique, par la façon dont ils s’habillent qu’ils se regroupent […]. Je pense qu’ils se regroupent par centre d’intérêt plus que par ethnie. (administrator, male)

Following the Estates General on Education in 1996, the Ministry in its plan of action for the reform of the education system (MEQ, 1997a) gave greater autonomy to school administrations but asked Québec schools, in return, to establish a more democratic and
inclusive governing process, with greater commitment to the community. MSS had already, since the early 1990s, adopted this new direction by inviting various local representatives to be part of the school community.

[La] communauté au alentour est impliquée dans l'école, soit par des subventions qu'elle donne pour des activités ou qu'elle donne pour la pédagogie, ou pour des ressources personnelles. Il y a des animateurs, par exemple [...]. Il y a [aussi] les maisons de jeunes. [Même] la caisse [populaire] est impliquée directement dans l'école. (administrator, male)

Today, the school has a well established “conseil d'établissement” (institutional council), made of school administrators, teachers, various community representatives, parents and student representatives, that is responsible for the quality of educational services, the operation of the school, and the applications of regulations. For one administrator, this new approach to schooling implied many changes to the philosophy of the school.

Maintenant avec le conseil d'établissement, les parents sont encore plus impliqués dans les décisions de l'école. Avant c'était le directeur qui voyait à l'application des programmes. Maintenant, tout doit passer par le conseil d'établissement et [pause] dans le conseil d'établissement on a les parents, on a la communauté et on a les enseignants. Et, il y a les élèves qui sont impliqués dans ce conseil d'établissement. Donc ça fait toute une différence dans [pause] dans la mentalité de l'école. (administrator, male).

In terms of school environment, this new ‘communitarian’ approach to schooling led to greater collegiality between community representatives, administrators, teachers, and students.
Teacher and administrator interviewees all agree that MSS has improved significantly in many ways. One teacher comments on this new approach:

C'est un beau mélange, je pense, au niveau de la clientèle. Il y a moyen de faire avancer beaucoup les élèves. Il y a une équipe de profs qui est vraiment [pause] très dynamique. Ce n'est pas une école où il y a des conflits majeurs.

(teacher, female)

Like many other urban high schools in Canada, MSS faces diverse problems such as alcohol, drugs, and bullying. But cooperation with the neighbourhood police (police de quartier), community workers, and many other interveners help prevent crime, bullying, and violence. Until recently, MSS was considered by the school board a disadvantaged school and it received significant amounts of money to help students in need (free cafeteria tickets, extra youth workers). With a stronger economy and massive community programs, the neighbourhood is now, statistically speaking, closer to the mainstream with an economic profile that is slightly below the average for the island. The local newspaper, a weekly newspaper with a circulation of about 35,000 copies, regularly highlights the achievements of students or the projects in the school. The McDonald's, just a few blocks away, contributes to the school by offering a “Diner-spécial” (lunch special) for MSS students showing their student card: “2 hamburgers, 1 frite, 1 liqueur pour 2,99$,” reads a large commercial poster in the entrance.

When asked to describe the school, student interviewees stressed that it is a welcoming environment for all, including immigrants. Some commented on the good relationship between students, teachers, and the administration despite earlier tensions related to violence and drugs, and the school’s remarkable emphasis on school activities and community involvement.

Moi je dirais que c'est une une bonne école. Il n'y a pas beaucoup de racisme ici. (student, male)
On est assez bien entouré et si on compare avec d'autres écoles, on a moins de problèmes professeurs-élèves ou direction-élèves. (student, male)

A comparer à mon ancienne école, il y a beaucoup plus d'activités parascolaires. C'est comme un lieu où t'apprends, où tu t'enrichis, où tu peux mettre tes talents en pratique. (student, female)

7.2 History teachers and their teaching styles

Wednesday, February 16, 12:50 pm. It is my birthday and I feel as if I were 15 years younger, just like all the teenagers around me. I leave the cafeteria on the ground floor and head to my history grade 10 class in the red wing, room 204 (second floor). With the large motto “Je me souviens” painted in white and blue on the door, it is next to impossible to miss the classroom. I enter and ask the teacher Benoit, already at his desk, where I can sit. Benoit assigns the seats in his class. “OK, for this class, third row, third desk. She won’t be here today,” he replies in a popular French language while looking at his student list. I take my seat in silence and unpack by briefcase. Students are hardly in the door and not yet in their seats. Many are talking about the major snowstorm we have had in the last days. Benoit realizes that several students are missing but decides to go on. He grabs the chalk on his desk, walks to the blackboard behind him, and starts to write. Students finally take their seats when hearing the ‘clack clack’ sound of the chalk at the board.

Despite an incongruous fountain placed at the back of this room, which was originally meant for a chemistry class, this is a modern history classroom containing various kinds of evidence that Québec and Canadian history is taught here. On the beige front wall, just behind Benoit’s desk, is a large blackboard filed with information for today under the heading: “Retour sur les métis et la Politique Nationale.” On the left side of the board is placed a large 4’x 8’ map
of Québec with the most current details. On the right side (between the exit door and his locker),
two posters: one on aboriginal peoples, “Regard sur le Canada,” and another one on Québec
titled: “Le Québec: des origines au 3e millénaire.” Just over these two posters is a small map of
Montréal and its quarters. On the right wall, there is a long cabinet in which are placed many old
history textbooks, reference documents, and dictionaries. Over the cabinet is a series of
laminated posters produced by La Presse newspaper on “Le Monde.” On the rear wall,
photocopies are placed in piles on the heater just underneath the windows through which we can
see the old stone church, reminding students of the Catholic past of Québec society. Finally, on
the left wall, a series of posters on “La Nouvelle France,” “Le Canal du St-Laurent,” “Les Pères
de la Confédération,” and “L’Assemblée Nationale” are displayed in rows just over several maps
of Europe and the world. There is also a large reproduction of a painting from nationalist artist
Charles Huot depicting the first (bilingual) Parliament of Lower Canada in 1791.

School history in Québec has long created heated debates in Canadian education.
Hodgetts (1968), for example, found in his study of civic education that “French-Canadian
students in Quebec have a picture of history peopled with saintly, heroic figures, motivated by
Christian ideals working almost exclusively for the glory of God” (p. 31). In addition, he claimed
that programs put the emphasis on the ability of teachers to tell an interesting, vivid historical
story as if history was “an exact record of a fully known past […] not open to conflicting
interpretations” (Hodgetts, 1968, p. 62). Trudel and Jain (1970) came to similar conclusions in
their analysis of Québec history textbooks. More recently, Granatstein (1998) and Memni (1996)
have suggested that in focusing almost exclusively on Québec historical events, current history
programs only reinforce the PQ separatist views among the youth.

As Québec historians and history teachers will confirm, until the 1960s, history education
— as for many other topics — under the control of the Catholic Clergy, was nothing more than
moral and religious education combined with ethnic and patriotic attachments to the patrie (la
nation canadienne-française). But influenced by a new liberal nationalism that was emerging in Québec in the 1960s, the Parent Commission recommended, among other things, that the goals, contents and methods of history education in Québec be re-evaluated. The Parent Commission deplored the traditional religious history presented in class and the lack of uniformity in history programs, particularly between Catholics and Protestants. It recommended that history be dissociated from purely religious and patriotic justifications. It suggested that that history teachers adopt a more liberal and neo-progressive approach to history education which does not emphasize rote learning, but rather analysis and learning by practice.

Following the Report of the Parent Commission, all history programs were modified in the late 1960s, and later in the 1970s, to adapt to the modern realities of Québec and Canada. In 1979, the Ministry of Education published a report (L’Ecole québécoise) stating the main principles on which the current history programs (elementary and secondary) were drafted in the early 1980s.

At the secondary level, students are required to take two history courses: one on General History (Histoire Générale) in grade 8, and one on Québec and Canada (Histoire du Québec et du Canada) in grade 10. An elective grade 11 history course on the 20th century (Histoire du 20e siècle) is also offered in some Québec high schools but no more than 15 percent of students take it (see Task Force on the Teaching of History, 1996, p. 44).

The grade 10 history course, which is required to obtain the high school diploma (diplôme d'études secondaires), has for its global objective to provide students with an overview of the past of Québec and Canada from its beginnings to the present day, and to help them understand the evolution of Québec society within the broader Canadian and North American context. As the curriculum reads:

Le programme […] centre son étude sur la compréhension de l’évolution de la société québécoise dans le contexte canadien, nord-américain et occidental.
tente de répondre de façon particulière aux questions que l’élève se pose sur la société à laquelle il appartient. (MEQ, 1982, p. 12)

The grade 10 history curriculum is divided into seven modules covering: The French Empire, the Canadian colony (French Régime), the Conquest and the British Régime, the beginnings of parliamentarism, Québec and Confederation, industrial development, and contemporary Québec.

At MSS, two documents (one textbook and one learning guide) complement the history curriculum. The history textbook, Cardin et al. (1984), *Le Québec: héritages et projets*, focuses on the “historical projects” that have shaped Québec within Canada. Divided into 15 units (from the French colony, through to the Quiet Revolution and the early 1980s), the authors wish to encourage students to put themselves in the shoes of ‘their’ ancestors during the periods studied. At the end of each unit, is a “heritage activity” to help students analyze and discuss the various themes covered. The last unit, which stops in 1984, invites students to create their own “projet d’avenir” for Québec in light of the previous discussions on language, federalism, nationalism, and capitalism. Analysis of the textbook shows that the document provides a clear description of the knowledge, attitudes, and historical skills to be acquired by students. The document also offers different historical accounts — often by quoting divergent opinions and interpretations — and many activities to help students draw their own social, political, and historical conclusions. Likewise, French-Canadian ‘martyrs’ and ‘heroes,’ such as Madeleine de Verchères and Dollard des Ormeaux, who were so prominent in the old history versions of Québec and Canada, find themselves eclipsed from the document. Despite all these shifts, the textbook has been criticized, however, for its Québec ‘nationalist’ bias (see Nemni, 1996).

The student learning guide, Forget and Langlois (1996), *Une clé pour l’histoire: Guide d’apprentissage en histoire du Québec et du Canada*, was created in 1996 and covers exactly the
same seven modules found in the official curriculum. Based on a constructivist approach to
learning, the goal of the guide is to help students organize the historical information received in
class by synthesising, making links, and drawing conclusions with various tables, maps, pictures,
schemas, and diagrams. Students at MSS have to buy the guide and write their personal answers
in the various sheets (over 200 pages) which can be detached and placed in a three-punch folder.
The authors write to students in their introduction:

Les activités [du guide] te rendront apte à résumer, à faire des synthèses, à
départager ce qui est important de ce qui est complémentaire et même à créer
tes propres modèles d’organisation et à les mettre en pratique afin de mieux
réussir ton cours d’histoire, mais surtout afin de devenir plus stratégique et
plus efficace dans ta façon d’apprendre. (Forget & Langlois, 1996, p. iv).

“What is a Métis?,” Benoit begins firmly. He is standing in front of his desk facing his
24 students (seven non-white dispersed all over the room) seated in a conventional classroom
setting: nine rows of five desks. Students remain silent. No one tries an answer. “OK,” Benoit
muses, “we will check in the dictionary what a Métis is.” “You know,” he adds, as if he wanted
to convince them, “it doesn’t hurt to consult your dictionary.” Benoit gets his dictionary from the
shelf and goes over the explicit definition. Then, he explains it to students in his own words,
giving some Canadian examples. “Ah, OK!” some students exclaim. “Well,” Benoit adds, “you
better understand what follows on Manitoba and the Métis because this is very important for the
exam.” In a wink, I see illumination in the eyes of inattentive students. They may not like Louis
Riel or may just assume this narrative is totally removed from their personal concerns, but they
have to pass the course to get their diploma. And this, they surely know.

Suddenly, someone knocks at the door. Benoit looks surprised. It is 1:05 pm. He walks to
the door, and lets the student enter. In his hand, is a late slip from the administration that Benoit
compiles judiciously in a folder. In a humorous way, Benoit looks at the student, from immigrant background, and asks him if he is a Métis. The class starts to laugh. Khan, a student originally from Iran, does not understand what is going on. He goes to his desk in silence and, then, asks another student what the joke was about.

This introduction leads Benoit to an historical account of Louis Riel in late 19th century Manitoba during this critical period of the development of Western Canada. Most students have their learning guide open on page 138. “At the time,” he says, “Riel was perceived in English Canada as a TRAITRE.” “But in French Canada,” he accentuates, “we saw in him a HÉROS, a defender of French-Canadian interests!”

“Monsieur, where is Manitoba?,” asks an immigrant female student in an international French language. “Well,” Benoit retorts, “Manitoba is right here.” Showing on his large map of Canada the location of the western province. Benoit tries in an energetic way to explain the divergent interpretations English and French-Canadians have had of Riel. To show students that Riel was, for French-Canadians, a victim of English-Canadian loyalists, Benoit situates them in the larger political context of the 1870s-1880s. “You know, as I said before, Ontario has the majority of federal seats in the parliament, and historically the federal government pleases Ontarians.” “So, that’s exactly what happened with Riel in the 1870s and 1880s,” he exclaims. “We saw with L’Affaire Riel the real vision English-Canadians had of their country.” “This is the reason why French-Canadians like Honoré Mercier created a national party to oppose the dominant view.” “But it was not a sovereigntist party,” he quickly adds. “Be sure that there will be a question on this in the exam, we cannot skip this in our history,” he nods. Benoit explains that Riel and the Métis were, for English-Canadians, an obstruction to the development and progress of ‘their’ Canada. “But for French-Canadians,” he confesses, “it was the end of a dream, the dream of a francophone Western Canada.”
I see in Benoit's attitude a lot of suspicion when talking about English Canada and the federal government. Benoit talks about the arrogance of English-Canadians in the development of the west and the racist attitudes toward the Métis and aboriginal peoples (*les 'sauvages').

"Monsieur, what is the answer for the section in the guide on the "Soulèvement des Métis?," one male student asks. Benoit takes his sheet and repeats the answer, but he reminds students that history is more than note taking. "In history," he explains, "you need to listen and understand. Taking notes is not enough." For Benoit, practising history involves more than memorization, it demands understanding and analysing accounts of the past.

Then, one female student asks: "Monsieur, is Manitoba a bilingual province?" "Non!" Benoit replies in a passionate way, "there are more immigrants than French-Canadians in Manitoba." "You can still find some, but they are minorities in all Western Canada." Getting more excited, he adds, "outside Québec, French is a problem." "As you all know, even in Québec we have difficulties to preserve our culture and language, and to really live in French in Montréal." Students listen attentively to what Benoit is saying. No one is sleeping. But I am not sure if they really understand all the implications of the critical message Benoit is trying to pass on to them, particularly to allophone immigrants.

"OK," Benoit continues, "the National Policy on page 140." With his personal sheets in his hands, Benoit, walking the rows, provides students his account of the various reasons that led the government of Macdonald to put forth a national policy following the election of 1878. "Macdonald," he argues, "was in favour of a strong federal government at the expense of provinces." "The creation of the intercolonial railway and the colonisation of Western Canada were two strategies to solve Canadian problems and boost the economy." In his narrative, Benoit often characterizes people and events by using simple expressions or examples to catch students' attention, even to provoke them and stimulate a discussion. For instance, Benoit talks about the origins of the "Shepherd's pie," known in French as "pâté chinois" (Chinese pie). He explains
that this is not a Chinese meat, but a cheap high calorie ration that was given to Chinese immigrants working for the Canadian Pacific Railway. Benoit ties this to the racist attitudes English-Canadians had toward Chinese immigrants in the west. Many students in the classroom try to separate from Benoit’s narrative what is ‘relevant’— in this case, the answers to the learning guide questions — from what is ‘trivial.’ One female student, like several others, has already completed the activities (on page 140) and simply lays back, listening passively to Benoit’s explanations. It is 2:05 pm, the class is almost over. Some students are already packing up their material while others simply close their books and wait for the bell in silence. Benoit knows it. So he reminds students to complete, at home, the activities discussed in class today. “The next class,” he informs, “will be on the changes that effected Québec.” “Yeah!” some students exclaim as they head to the exit door.

Benoit is male history teacher in the early 40s. He has been teaching high school history for nine years. He is about 5’8”, brown hair slightly grey on the sides. An active hockey player, Benoit has an athletic physique. He often wears shirts or T-shirts and blue jeans. As a francophone Québécois, Benoit was born in the neighbourhood at the Hôpital Notre Dame de Montréal. As he tells me, he is one of the few Québécois born during the short mandate of premier Paul Sauvé (1959-1960). Originally a hospital employee, Benoit decided to go back to school in the 1980s. He graduated with an Education degree in History/Political Science so as to become a history teacher.

A strong Québec nationalist, Benoit decided to teach history because he believes this is one of the few school subjects that is focused on the historical development of Québec, on “our history,” as he puts it. Animated by a social (and national) consciousness, Benoit thought that teaching history would help his compatriotes to understand more about who they are and where they are going. But Benoit is well aware that school history in Québec had long been used to inculcate a narrow and ethnic view of Québec and Canada, often through a traditional focus on
political and military events and dates to remember. In a modern society, he argues, we can no
longer teach this kind of history in school. For him, the actual focus of the grade 10 program on
the ability to comprehend, analyze, make links, and interpret historical accounts offers a better
approach to history in a democracy. As he puts it:

Le cours qu'on a présentement est différent de ce que nos parents nous
enseignaient. Je pense à ma mère, elle savait son histoire par les personnages.
Ce qu'on fait, enfin nous, c'est à dire le ministère [et les enseignants], c'est
qu'on amène les élèves à comprendre le pourquoi et non pas [uniquement] la
connaissance des dates et ce qui s'est passé à telle la date. A ce moment là,
l'analyse est nulle [...]. Avant on procédait avec des dates, alors qu'aujourd'hui
on procède avec l'analyse, le pourquoi [...]. Je pense que c'est une bonne
chose de pousser les jeunes à s'interroger sur le pourquoi des choses.

Although Benoit recognizes that school history is no longer focused on the inculcation of
patriotic allegiance, he admits that the program he teaches is invariably tied to his own values,
beliefs, and aspirations despite his original intentions to remain as neutral as possible. Since
history is a social construct, then, it becomes important for him that students be exposed to
different constructions of the past, particularly the one of Québécois. As he clearly states, if you
do not offer your own conception of history, others (English-Canadians) will impose theirs.

Moi quand j'ai commencé à enseigner j'ai essayé d'être neutre, le plus
possible en me disant que j'ai un programme à suivre, puis je m'en tiens à ça
[...]. Alors [qu'aujourd'hui] j'interviens plus, je donne plus mes idées [...].
Maintenant si j'ai une question qu'un élève me pose, je saute sur l'occasion
pour étaler un peu mon nationalisme, [pause], ce qui n'était pas le cas avant
[...]. Je leur dis aussi que ça prend une perception [en histoire]. Si t'enseignes
pas ta perception de l'histoire, l'autre va le faire à ta place et pas
nécessairement à ton avantage.

The Council Superior of Education (1998) came to similar conclusions in their analysis of
citizenship education in the 'state of Québec.' In its annual report to the Minister, the Council
notes that:

La question [de construire au Québec une citoyenneté] devient d’autant plus
complexes qu’elle est parfois récupérée à des fins politiques. Au-delà des
intentions réelles de l’État québécois de définir des paramètres d’un “vivre
ensemble” viable, il faut reconnaître que ces efforts s’inscrivent aussi dans un
rapport politique avec le gouvernement fédéral qui déploie ses propres
stratégies en vue de promouvoir sa représentation de la citoyenneté.

(CSE, 1998, p. 20)

These comments open the door to a (delicate) discussion on the different conceptions of
history and citizenship in Canada and the ‘one’ of Québécois. Which conception of history
represents Québécois? Who decides what? And, how can we teach it? For Benoit, the role of
historians is to help students develop the competencies necessary to confront different
conceptions of the past. His interpretations become a personal narrative that is held against the
official one of the Ministry and, perhaps, the ones that students have developed outside the
school system. But, in the present context, not all narratives receive the same attention or the
same importance in class. As Benoit puts it, the central goal for him remains the teaching of the
‘national’ program:

Au fond, moi je suis payé pour enseigner l’histoire du Québec et du Canada,
pas pour donner mes opinions [...]
There is in Québec a ‘hidden incentive’ to follow the official curriculum: the compulsory grade 10 examination of the Ministry at the end of the year. All students must complete a two-hour “Examen de fin d’études” (final examination) covering the entire program. Given at the same time throughout the province, this examination includes two types of questions: multiple-choice questions and short free-response questions. Exams, corrected by both the Ministry and teachers, are sometimes perceived by history teachers as a way to assess their teaching style and their ability to conform to the curriculum. The program elaborated by the Ministry (with the help of some teachers, scholars, and administrators) is, like any other account of the past, situated within a civic and educational project, that is, to create citizens. The conceptions of the past, the world, and society found in the official curriculum are as much cultural and ideological as they are scientific and educational (Audigier, 1999b). Because history is socially constructed and shared, certain cultural and ideological beliefs held by Québécois — or at least by the government of Québec — are transposed in the goals, structuring, and content of the curriculum.

As the Task Force on Curriculum Reform (1997) puts it, “toutes ces questions [recherche de valeurs communes, de préparation à l’exercice de la citoyenneté, de l’intégration à une culture commune, et de l’égalisation des chances] ont des incidences sur le curriculum d’études” (p. 33). Analysis of the curriculum confirms that the program is centered on the evolution and life of Québec and Québécois within the Canadian and North-American context, not on Canadians in the development of their nation-state. This is a subtle distinction. The focus on Québec and Québécois in the program goes beyond pedagogical and historiographical reasons. It is clearly linked to the changing nationalist attitudes of French-Canadians in Québec in the 1960s. As I have noted earlier (chapter 1), in moving from la nation canadienne-française to la nation québécoise, francophone Québécois developed a different way of conceiving their citizenship and place in Canada. The government of Québec became the primary focus for collective actions. These changes inevitably influenced public education, particularly history education.
As clearly intended in the title, the focus is not on Canada per se, with some regional or provincial variants, but on Québec (the sociological nation) within Canada (the state). Titles, objectives, and factual statements usually refer to both Québec and Canada. But although the main objective is to prepare citizens, surprisingly no mention at all is made of Canadian citizens. It is always inferred, by assuming that the words ‘society,’ ‘nation,’ ‘state,’ and ‘democracy’ refer to their country. Benoit comments on this ideological reference to Québec nationalism in the program.

Certains disent, “Ce cours d'histoire du Québec est [pause] un cours qui est mis sur pied pour les séparatistes.” Mais moi je leur dis non, peut-être que pour une des rares fois on est en mesure d'enseigner notre propre histoire et [pause] connaître les raisons pourquoi on agit d'une telle façon [au Québec]. A ce moment, c'est une identité que tu [ne] retrouves pas quand c'est une histoire qui est satellisé par les Canadiens [anglais] par exemple. C'est deux façons de voir les choses.

The textbook of Cardin et al. (1984) goes even further by mentioning in its analysis of the concept of the ‘state’ that in Québec the expression L'État québécois (the state of Québec) refers to the both the government of Québec and its administrative body. “Sometimes,” the authors add, “the word Québec designates also the country itself” (Cardin et al., 1984, p. 104). As they put it:

Quelquefois, le mot État désigne le pays lui-même où s’exerce l’autorité d’un gouvernement et de son administration. Par exemple, on dira que le Canada est un État d’Amérique du Nord. (p. 104)

In terms of pedagogy, Benoit defines himself as a traditional history teacher, a “one man show,” as he puts it. This is not to say he believes he is a history expert or a nationalist.
indoctrinator' who does not care for the needs of students. But he is simply not convinced of the value of certain so-called 'student-centered' pedagogical approaches to history education.

Relying on his experience with several student-teachers he welcomes every year to class, Benoit assumes that approaches such as cooperative learning not only go against his personal understanding of history education, but also are generally of little interest to his students.

Benoit prefers to adopt a teaching style that allows him to play a leading and dynamic role in the classroom. With this method, he argues, he can construct his own interpretation of Québec's and Canada's past by unpacking the information found in the curriculum and the textbook, explaining it, and giving examples and comparisons (between the past and the present).

For example, Benoit often refers in class to the scenario he gives students at the beginning of the year. In order to show that history is socially constructed, he puts them in the situation of witnesses of an accident. Then, he asks students to provide their own interpretation of what really happened. Students come with different but all valid interpretations of it. Then, Benoit
takes three extreme positions to show how people interpret similar events in different terms depending of their values, knowledge, attitudes, and perceptions.

Le premier cours que je donne, je leur donne la perception de l'histoire. Il y a un accident, une moto qui est frappée par une auto, que s'est-il passé? Il y a trois témoins, trois façons de voir les choses: le pessimiste, l'optimiste et puis le neutre. Le neutre dit: "il s'est fait frapper, il est blessé mais il devrait s'en sortir". L'optimiste qui dit: "ah, il a sauté dans les airs, il est tombé, mais il n'a pas grand chose". Et puis le négatif dit: "c'est écoeurant, j'ai vu l'os de sa jambe, il est mort c'est certain". Mais je dis que c'est trois perceptions différentes. L'histoire c'est la même chose.

Since direct contact with the past is impossible in history, Benoit tries to put students in touch with their collective past by using several aids such as maps, videos, and artefacts. But he admits that he rarely has time to teach students the 'technique' of history: how to examine the sources, to analyse, to interpret, and to deconstruct the different narratives. History is presented as a chronologically faithful representation of the past, seen as a succession of social, political, economical events and periods. Benoit confesses that students tend to be more interested in getting the 'right' answer than creating their own history and developing various civic and historical competencies, which often demand a lot of attention and intellectual aptitudes.

Oui, c'est sûr que développer des habiletés ça fait partie du cours, mais ça les intéresse plus ou moins. Moi j'essaie de les sensibiliser à ça le plus possible, mais c'est évident que, malheureusement, pour la plupart [d'entre eux] ça rentre par une oreille et ça sort par l'autre.
Similarly, Benoit would like to focus more on current events and local history that have shaped modern Québec, and particularly Montréal, so as to help students get in touch with ‘their’ reality. But as the program is now designed, only the last module (module 7) concentrates on the modern period (the last forty years). In the same way, very few units allow for the study of local concerns. Benoit argues that the recent socio-political and constitutional changes that affect students, such as the rise of modern nationalism in Québec, the increasing role of cultural communities, and the two referenda are covered too quickly at the end of the year. Similar statements were also found in the public hearings of the Task Force on the Teaching of History in 1995. As he puts it:

Toute l'histoire contemporaine se passe rapidement. Je dois avouer là-dessus que c'est une lacune peut-être dans le module sept. On ne parle pas plus de la charte ou des droits qu'on va parler de Charlottetown, qu'on va parler du référendum de 80, puis celui de 95. Il faut croire que dans le programme, c'est pas toujours de ce qui est le plus important [pour les jeunes]. C'est évident qu'il n'a pas grand chose pour eux qu'ils peuvent palper. Il y a au maximum trois, quatre cours où est-ce que vraiment ils peuvent se dire: “Ah, je me reconnais, j'ai connu ça, j'ai entendu parler de ça.”

During my observations, I realized that students from ethnic groups do not participate actively in class. They rarely voice their opinions on comment or a history that, actually constructed, is not necessarily ‘theirs,’ except when Benoit voluntarily questions them. And, even then, many feel uncomfortable speaking publicly. Therefore, I asked Benoit how he deals with the increasing number of students from ethnocultural groups in his history classes. He argues that the participation of these people in his history classes is, in fact, minimal for reasons he attributes simply to language adaptation.
C'est évident que la participation des minorités dites visibles en classe est à peu près nulle. Peut-être parce qu'ils ont de la misère à saisir le français, peut-être parce qu'ils se sentent pas à l'aise. Il faudrait aller voir. Moi je pense qu'il y a une difficulté avec la langue. Quand je vois ça, j'essaie de pas trop de les importuner [en classe] parce que c'est déjà bon qu'ils apprennent une autre langue.

But, Benoit adds that saying students from ethnocultural communities do not participate actively in class is not to say that they fail to acquire new knowledge or develop historical and civic competencies. Some of them, he adds, are even his ‘best’ students.

Mais c'est pas parce qu'ils [ne] sont pas forts, j'ai des élèves qui vont péter des scores aux examens ou bien on voit qu'ils comprennent très bien [en classe].

So Benoit believes the real problem in history with students from ethnocultural communities is the incapacity of Québécois, and more specifically of the government of Québec, to include and integrate them adequately into the Québec nation. He believes these students often feel historically and linguistically marginalized.

On a assez de difficulté ici à franciser nos immigrants. Moi ce que je déplore souvent, c'est qu'ils viennent apprendre ici obligatoirement le français mais, quand tu as le dos tourné, ils parlent tous en anglais. On est pas plus avancé. Je veux dire, si on force quelqu'un à parler en français puis quand tu es pas là ils parlent en anglais,[alors] ça vaut rien. Je pense que c'est un des gros défauts du Québécois [pause], enfin du gouvernement du Québec, d'être incapable d'intégrer ses immigrants. C'est une très grande difficulté de les intégrer quoi qu'en dise le gouvernement avec ses statistiques.
Recent studies (see Jodoin et al., 1997) have confirmed that allophone high school students (particularly recent immigrants) in Montréal tend to use less French as a common language than Francophone students. Similarly, allophone students use English more readily than French in their conversations with others. In 1998, following the ministerial plan of action for the reform of education, the Ministry of Education, in conjunction with the Québec Ministry of Relations with Citizens and of Immigration, implemented a new policy on intercultural education and educational integration to help, among other things, immigrant students integrate more adequately into Québec society. “The school,” the document reads, “is the main, although not the sole, institution, responsible for ensuring that students learn and use French, the language of public life, with which Quebecers of all origins can communicate and participate in the development of Québec society” (MEQ, 1998b, p. 8) The policy statement adds that allophone students in schools with high ethnic concentration have less “aptitude for French” (MEQ, 1998b, p. 13), or a weaker tendency to use French as a common language. As a result, the Ministry in its educational objectives wants to foster the use of “French as the shared public language and the vehicle of culture” (MEQ, 1998a, p. 8) in school by promoting activities designed to increase relations between francophone and allophone students (cultural events, discussion groups, technology communications). Clearly, the government has realized that social and linguistic integration, particularly at the school level, is central to create an inclusive and cohesive society in Québec. With the Charter of French language (Bill 101), Québec now uses its power to support the learning of a certain proficiency in French so as to help allophones master the language of public life and participate actively in the building of modern Québec.

Similarly, the Ministry has asserted that the school environment in general and history programs in particular will be reorganized to incorporate more explicit references to citizenship and intercultural education. “The curriculum and school life,” the Ministry notes, “should
familiarize students with Québec’s heritage and the shared values that underlie it, namely, openness to ethnocultural, linguistic and religious diversity” (MEQ, 1998a, p. 26).

Tuesday, February 15, 2:30 pm. Nancy takes her class list on top of one of the piles of materials on her desk to see who is missing. Today, 25 students are in class, five non-white. While she goes over the list, name by name, I familiarize myself with the classroom painted in tones of white and pink. As in other history classes, I find in her class a traditional setting of six rows of six seats with Nancy’s desk at the front. I sit at the far right of the class on one of the 36 orange plastic chairs, next to the windows. Only two other students (one white male and one white female) are in my row. I realize that most students are seated in the front seats; almost nobody is at the back where students habitually prefer to locate themselves. I suppose that Nancy is responsible for this ‘unusual’ situation. Behind Nancy’s desk is a large blackboard with a pull-down map of North America suspended in the middle of the board. On the right wall is a series of large color posters placed between the windows: the National Aboriginal Day, the Museum of Fine Arts, the March West Reconciliation (RCMP), and a statute of a controversial Québec premier, Maurice Duplessis. On the back wall, Nancy has mounted several maps of Québec, Canada, and the world. Finally, on the left wall, just beside the exit door, is a large wooden bookshelf, a poster of the “Semaine Nationale de la Citoyenneté,” and a newspaper clipping virulently criticising the controversial federal Bill C-20 (the Clarity Bill) entitled: “Ottawa veut nous clouer le bec!”

“OK class,” Nancy begins. “Today, we have a contrôle (review) to see if you have studied what we covered in class last week.” In silence, students take out a piece of paper, write their name, and wait for the questions. Students are used to these ‘quickie tests’ with Nancy. Orally, Nancy reads her questions and gives students time to write their personal answers. After five minutes or so, Nancy looks at her watch and decides to collect the sheets. “OK,” she says calmly, not to surprise students who are still writing, “make sure your name is on the sheet and
pass it to the back.” With the whole class, Nancy goes over the questions and asks students for their answers. Several students show their enthusiasm or dissatisfaction when hearing the correct answers.

Then, Nancy distributes a clipping (cartoon) to students titled “Les origines de la fédération canadienne.” Some students complain about the clarity of the illustration. “Well,” she concedes, while distributing the last sheets, “the photocopy is not very bright, but I believe it clearly expresses the origins of Confederation.” Nancy goes over the historical cartoon in a Socratic way to help students make sense of it.

“What is the tall man (Macdonald) doing?” Nancy asks.

“Trying to hold the two active kids (Nova Scotia and New Brunswick) who refuse to play the Canada game,” answers the group.

“OK, and who really supports Macdonald in his game?”

“Ontario,” replies a student reading what is written on Macdonald’s hat.

“And, what is the Québec guy doing?” Nancy finally demands.

“Holding two bags (a religious and a language bag),” the class responds quickly.

Using an irreproachable prose, Nancy presents her interpretation of the cartoon with historical references to the creation of Canada in the 1860s. “Why might the Reform Party’s slogan ‘Think BIG’ also be applicable to Sir John A. Macdonald?” she asks; no answer from students. To induce reactions, Nancy moves on and demands, “you know, Macdonald, the one on the 10 dollar bill?” “Well, Madame,” one student mutters, “I think because Macdonald had a grandiose view of Canada.” “Exactly!” Nancy retorts. Talking about the building of the intercolonial railroad (“Le grand tronc”) and the colonisation of the west, she shows that the conservative prime minister was favouring a highly centralized system (legislative union), while the French-Canadian élite (particularly the Liberal representatives, known as ‘Les Rouges’) was supporting a
federal union. Relying on the information found in the learning guide (module 5), Nancy talks about the various reactions about the creation of a federal system and the characteristics of this system.

"Confederation, is a system with two levels of what...?" she asks naively.

"Ah, yes, two levels of government," reply some students reading their notes.

"Who can name those levels?"

"Well, you know Madame, Chrétien and Bouchard [...]," one student with a Portuguese accent suggests.

"You mean the federal and provincial levels," Nancy clarifies.

"Yeah! That's what I meant [...]," retorts the student.

"At the creation of Canada," Nancy comments, "the federal system was a very intelligent compromise to bring all the colonies together, but with time the federal government has asked for more and more powers so that today there is a lot of confusion in Canadian politics."

The official curriculum clearly reinforces Nancy's belief that studying the creation of Confederation is central to understanding today's (constitutional) problems. As the document reads: "l'analyse politique des documents constitutionnels et du système fédéral devrait [...] permettre [à l'élève] de mieux saisir l'utilité de la connaissance du passé pour la compréhension des problèmes du présent" (MEQ, 1982, p. 45). With current examples, Nancy tries to help students understand the implications of different levels of governments for their lives.

"Why is there a Québec flag outside the school?" she asks.

"Because the government of Québec finances the schools," one student replies.

"You are right, education is a provincial jurisdiction. But now tell me why there is no fleur-de-lys on the stamps you buy at the post office," she adds.

"Because it's Canada, Madame," the same student retorts.
"Yes. And have you ever heard of a Québec army?" she continues.

"Ah! non," many students answer with a laugh.

With other examples, Nancy tries to show students that the federal government in the BNA Act kept the most important powers and gave the residual ones to the provinces. The goal of prime minister Macdonald was to favour the creation of ‘one people, one government’ while French-Canadians, with George E. Cartier, believed it would simply create a ‘political nationality’ which would never threaten the national identity of French-Canadians. Then, Nancy asks, “why was Québec totally opposed to a legislative union, instead favouring a federal union?” One student tries an answer: “Because it’s more democratic this way, Madame. Each province can decide its own rules.” Nancy explains that French-Canadians in Québec were opposed to the idea of being, once again, simply a minority in Canada. They wanted to be treated *d’égal à égal* with their fellow-Canadians.

Finally, in conclusion of her discussion, Nancy asks if students know the origins of the word ‘Canada.’ One student says, “Madame, in the [Heritage] minutes we see on tv, they talk about Kanata not Canada?” “Oui!” she replies, “the word comes from an aboriginal expression that was later translated into C-A-N-A-D-A.” “And, by the way,” she adds, as students pack up their material, “what happens on July 1st in Canada?” “We move!” says one Québec born student. Many students start to laugh since there is a provincial regulation in Québec stating that apartments must be leased from July 1st to June 30th of each year to avoid family moves during the school year. So, for many Québécois, July 1st has become in their imagining the ‘moving day.’ With a grin, Nancy goes on, “Ben non! It’s Canada day!” “Ouais,” the student obviously puzzled replies, “but nobody celebrates this day here […]”

Nancy is a 5’4” history teacher in her early 40s with brown hair and hazelnut eyes. She has been teaching at MSS since 1996. Previously, she taught students with learning difficulties in 228
another high school of the district. Nancy knows everything about the history of MSS. She feels at home here because she studied in this school as a teenager. It was then that she was "struck by history," as she puts it. She simply fell in love with the study of the past and decided it would be part of her future job.

Je viens de Montréal, je suis née dans ce quartier-ci, et j'ai eu un coup de foudre pour l'histoire dans cette école. C'est le premier cours qui m'a [véritablement] réveillé dans tout mon cours secondaire. Alors je me suis trouvée un intérêt foudroyant pour l'histoire puis à partir de ce moment, mon rêve était d'être prof. d'histoire.

Coming from a lower class family in a modest neighbourhood of this Montréal quarter where there was no political discussion, no real interest in higher education, no newspapers or illustrated magazines, she was, in her own words, nothing but a "surprise package." Only the Quiet Revolution and its ideological emphasis on access and equality of education for everyone (from kindergarten to university) could bring people like Nancy into the world of teaching. With her vast experience with students having learning difficulties, Nancy has developed a philosophy of education around the rhetorical goal of 'success for all.' Her objective is to be dedicated to the success of her students, to help them acquire knowledge and competencies relevant to adult life, whether they are brilliant or have learning difficulties, francophones or allophones, nationalists or federalists. And this, she argues, can only work if you catch their attention; if you show the relevance of what is taught in class. So Nancy often links historical content to current issues or questions, by bringing clippings, cartoons, artefacts or other aids to enable students to understand the continuity/discontinuity between the past and the present and to recognize the value of history for their life as citizens.
J'essaie toujours de partir d'une question qui puisse les rejoindre dans leur vécu. Mais graduellement, je cherche à les amener à une question qu'eux même ne s'étaient pas posée. Ça demande de la créativité. Des fois je vais arriver avec un accessoire, avec quelque chose de visuel, un déclencheur, une chanson, un petit bout de film [pause], une caricature, des choses comme ça.

Similarly, Nancy knows very well that comprehension is increased when students participate and understand in their own words what is presented in class or in the textbooks. Nancy avoids lecturing for hours with language that seem foreign to most students. She prefers to be passionate, to use her past experience as a lower class student and adapt the curriculum to the diverse student population she works with everyday. Her goal is to help them make sense of the past and of the concepts in the history program.

Ma façon d'enseigner l'histoire, c'est [pause] la plus simple possible avec beaucoup d'images. J'essaie de mettre de la passion, des sentiments, parce les élèves sont allergiques à la langue de bois, au langage très “politically correct”, très neutre qui endort le mental, qui manque de sens. Moi mon objectif c'est toujours de donner un sens, donner un sens continuellement à tous les mots qu'ils écrivent dans leur cahier, à toutes les expressions qu'on va utiliser, à toutes les unités d'apprentissage.

Nancy recognizes, however, that implementing this ‘student-centered’ approach to the program is not an easy enterprise in the present context. Not only does she believe the grade 10 history curriculum embraces a (Québec) nationalist view of Canadian history, she also confesses that many of her students lack the motivation to
learn history in a critical and analytical way. And, those with this motivation, she adds, have often developed strong nationalist views prior their entry in grade 10.

Les élèves sont tous sûrs, sûrs, sûrs que j'ai dit oui [au référendum de 95].

Pourquoi? Parce que le programme d'histoire porte sur le Canada et le Québec mais la lorgnette est beaucoup plus sur le Québec. Et, depuis la Conquête, il y a eu beaucoup d'oppression envers les Canadiens-Français [...]. Avec le cours d'histoire qu'on fait, oui, ça les amène à voir le Canada comme un oppresseur.

Then, talking about the attitudes of students in class, she concludes:

Oui, ils sont parfois paresseux, [pause], une grosse partie du travail consiste à les motiver tout le temps, ça me demande beaucoup d'énergie [...]. Ceux qui ont un intérêt pour la chose politique, qui sont capables de te parler un peu de Lucien Bouchard, de Chrétien, de Pettigrew, de Dion, ceux qui les connaissent sont quand même très minoritaires [...]. [Et] ceux qui sont conscients et politisés, c'est clair que la plupart sont nationalistes.

7.3 Conclusion

MSS offers an interesting case study of a francophone multi-ethnic student population in Québec. Document analysis, school observations, and discussions with participants all suggest that the recent emphasis on community membership, cultural integration, and sociocultural activities in school contribute actively to citizenship education. As another ethnographic study of this school found in 1995, students from various cultural backgrounds have many opportunities to learn and develop civic competencies necessary for active or participatory citizenship even if the school does not operate within a democratic framework. Yet, it is not clear from this study why and who really participates in those clubs, sports, and activities.
The two grade 10 history teacher interviewees (Benoit and Nancy) have established that despite their different teaching styles, both have as a common goal the development of more informed, responsible, and thoughtful citizens. Saying they aim at developing citizens is not to say, however, that students receive a single unequivocal discourse about citizenship. The grade 10 history program, textbooks, and history teachers have different if not contradictory views about issues of nationalism, democracy, and citizenship. This situation, I believe, provides students with many interpretations from which to choose but it also complicates severely the task of integrating all students into a common national community and state. This problem is also amplified by the fact many students often have difficulties making connections between their own experiences and social representations and the ones presented by teachers in class.

As a result, what we can hope is that these two teachers consider that because students have different past experiences, cultures, languages, representations, and abilities, they need to develop teaching methods that benefit all students and enrich their understanding. But this is not an easy task for two white, francophone Québec-born teachers. Democratic citizenship can no longer be reduced to the passive transmission of a narrow conception of the nation and the state not open to conflicting interpretations. In the present situation, this is a tremendous challenge for Québec history teachers who, according to the Task Force on the Teaching of History (1996), have "often insufficient training" (p. 63).6

Even so, some student interviewees mention that they totally agreed with the teaching style of their history teacher, stressing his/her concerns for students' interests, energy, or clarity.

J'aime ça travailler avec [ce prof] parce qu'il enseigne d'une façon pour qu'on le comprenne, dans nos mots. (student, male)
Many others, on the contrary, suggested repetitively in their interviews that teachers need to adopt more active methods in history education (to make it “fun”), develop greater concerns for group works and for ethnocultural relationships, as well as a good sense of humour. For them, teachers need to balance more effectively group demands with individual attention and concerns so as to create a nurturing and pleasant environment for all. Put differently, they want teachers who will create an atmosphere in which students enjoy their work.

Si j'étais prof, je parlerais moins, j'irais plus chercher les élèves.

(student, female)

Si j'enseignais, mon enseignement serait sûrement différent parce que eux ici à l'école ils sont nés au Québec. A part les vacances dans d'autres pays, ils n'ont jamais vécu ailleurs pour savoir [sic] les difficultés des immigrants à être acceptés par les autres. (student, female)

Moi j'enseignerai avec plus de sens de l'humour comme ça les élèves vont rester plus réveillés. (student, male)

---

1 The final examination of 1997, for instance, had 30 questions divided into two sections: one multiple-choice section from question 1 to question 22, and one open-ended section, from question 23 to question 30. In both cases, questions refer to various sources, documents (traces and accounts), maps, draws, and charts which call on students' memorization and analysis. The Task Force on the Teaching of History (1996, p. 49) has recently argued that the
examination essentially evaluates the objectives at the core of the program (i.e., intermediary objectives), which generally involve remembering facts. The task force has, therefore, recommended that the Ministry rewrites its examination so as to evaluate more effectively the main objectives of the program focused on the development of intellectual skills necessary for historical thinking.

2 As an example of this subtle (national) distinction between Québec and Canada, the curriculum states in its rationale (section 2.3.3) that “l’histoire nationale concerne tous les Québécois…” [national history is a matter for all Québécois’] (MEQ, 1982, p. 12). No mention is made of Canada and Canadians in this section on ‘national’ history. Québec and Québécois are presented as a collectivity just like Canada and Canadians. Supporting this national view, the last module of the program (module 7), covering the 1960s to the present-day, focuses exclusively on “contemporary Québec” (Le Québec contemporain). No reference is made to the country as a whole. In fact, the word “Canada” appears in this module of the curriculum only in the general orientation of the module when talking about the participation of Canada in the Second World War (see MEQ, 1982, p. 57).

3 Claude Richard (1997) showed that ‘biases’ in some francophone history textbooks in Québec are commonplace and relate to other words, events, or groups such as aboriginal peoples and Les Patriotes.

4 In order to prepare these formative evaluations, Nancy often refers to several documents or handouts prepared by the school board (school services) on the various modules of the program. Like the final examination of the Ministry, these exams generally involve multiple choice and short free-answer questions.

5 The exact response of the female student was: “Ouais, mais il y a personne qui fête ça ici [sic] la fête du Canada[…].”

6 According to the Ministry of Education, as of 1988, 28 percent of history teachers (grade 10) did not have relevant training and nine percent had taken only 30 credits in history. Until recently, most history teachers completed a bachelor’s degree in education comprising a major in history (60 credits) and a minor in education (30 credits). The recent Québec reform of the teacher training program has reduced the history component by 40 percent and increased the education component by 75 percent (see Task Force on the Teaching of History, 1996, pp. 63-64).
CHAPTER 8

VIII. QUÉBEC STUDENTS’ UNDERSTANDINGS OF CITIZENSHIP: “LES ÉLÈVES ME RESPECTENT COMME SI J’ÉTAIS NÉ ICI, JE SUIS CITOYEN DU CANADA COMME EUX ET J’AI AUTANT DE LIBERTÉS QU’EUX [...].” (STUDENT, MALE)

In this chapter, I will present Québécois students’ understanding of citizenship in light on my interviews with various Québécois-born and immigrant grade 10 students from MSS. As in the B.C. case study, these students were encouraged to reflect on their citizenship based on their past experiences and the knowledge, attitudes, and skills they have developed in their school and history courses. Results presented here are based on a series of open-ended questions relating to: rights, pluralism, and participation. Because the following chapter deals exclusively with the attitudes of students towards Québécois/Canadian nationalism, identity, and citizenship, this chapter will not provide an in-depth analysis of national identity and citizenship education.

8.1 On Canada, Québec, and rights

One of the key characteristics of modern citizenship is its emphasis on equality and rights for citizens. As Marshall (1965) noted, democracy emerged partly in reaction against the way feudal regimes defined political and economical rights for their subjects. With the rise of equality as a defining element of democracy, people came to realize that in order to be free, citizens must have certain guaranteed rights and freedoms.

Reaffirming this principle, Canada adopted a Charter of Rights and Freedoms in 1982 that was meant to be not only a legal devise to be used by individuals, particularly women and members of marginal groups; it was also an instrument to build an inclusive pan-Canadian political culture respectful of all citizens. In other words, the intent behind the implementation of
the Charter was the development of a Canadian society more respectful of and consistent with liberal democracy.

But the implementation of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms did not go uncontested. In Québec, many nationalists have been suspicious of this new liberal approach to citizenship because in many ways it has reinforced the role of federal institutions such as the Supreme Court. By the same token, it has altered the dualistic and asymmetrical view of Canada held by most francophone Québécois, making their province increasingly ‘just like others.’ As Québec nationalist Laforest notes (1995):

The fundamental objective of the authors of the 1982 constitution seems to have been to promote throughout Canada (including Quebec) a political culture capable of reinforcing in each citizen the feeling of belonging to a single Canadian nation. (p. 133)

If this argument has powerful implications for Québec nationalists, particularly for those who have stirring memories of this dramatic period of the early 1980s, the situation is somewhat different with the new generation of Québécois. Québec students who participated in this study have little if no memory at all of Canada prior 1982. Most of them were born after the patriation of the Constitution and the adoption of the Charter and have implicitly accepted life in a political culture that is supportive of Canadian citizenship rights.

Le Canada, en théorie, c’est le meilleur pays où il fait mieux vivre. Je vis bien, j’ai mes [droits]. Je n’ai pas à me plaindre [...]. (student, male)

This remark might even be truer for immigrant students who have no direct historical relationship to Québec and Canada. The following student, originally from Africa, describes the situation in Canada this way:
Je dirais que c’est très juste ici, il n’y a pas vraiment de problèmes de respect des libertés. (student, female)

One Québec-born student also comments on the necessity in democracy of respecting the rights and equality of individuals regardless of gender, ethnicity, and even sexual orientation.

Je trouve ça important de respecter les autres. Le sexisme, les gais et toute ces choses là, je pense que le gens devraient être plus égaux. Je trouve que c’est dans ce domaine là que la société doit évoluer, [afin] que tous soient plus égaux, je trouve que ça irait mieux. (student, male)

An immigrant student from the Caribbean adds that in this country, all citizens, including naturalized ones, have the same rights and freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution of 1982, which he believes is a remarkable aspect of Canada.

Tant que j’ai ma carte de citoyenneté j’ai autant de libertés qu’un autre qui est né ici. J’ai autant de libertés que lui, je suis citoyen canadien, j’ai été accepté lorsque j’ai fait ma demande pour venir ici, donc j’ai autant de droits que lui. (student, male)

In fact, most students interviewees have developed an attitude toward rights and freedoms that is fairly consistent with the views held by the grade 10 history program. In its rationale, the curriculum states that “[la] démocratie suppose l’expression de valeurs différentes, au sein d’une même société. Bien présentées, ces divergences ne peuvent que sensibiliser l’adolescent à la défense des droits fondamentaux [...].” (MEQ, 1982, p. 12). The last unit (7.3.3) of the curriculum reinforces this idea by focusing on the various changes that have affected Québec.
society since the Quiet Revolution. One of the elements is: language, individual rights, and collective rights (MEQ, 1982, p. 60).  

One history teacher is critical of the argument presented by students, claiming that many of them have not only learned the necessity of having citizenship rights, but developed an unconscious inclination to believe they are entitled to rights without necessarily owing obligations or responsibilities to the society to which they belong. As he puts it:

S'il est vrai qu'elle [la Charte] était nécessaire pour certaines choses comme les abus, on te l'a généralisée à un point tel que c'est uniquement de ça [dont] on parle: "j'ai le droit, j'ai le droit, j'ai le droit." C'est bon la Charte, mais il [ne] faut pas exagérer. C'est qu'il existe des devoirs aussi, [mais ça] c'est pas écrit dans la Charte. (teacher, male)

The comments of certain student interviewees can lead to this conclusion. But, despite the view of this teacher, most participants clearly express the necessity of balancing rights with responsibilities, and accepting that in a democracy, rights and freedoms are always relational and depend on a nexus of social linkages. An immigrant student from Algeria puts it this way:

Moi je pense que la liberté c'est savoir comment agir pour ne pas nuire aux autres personnes parce que le Canada, on [le] dit, c'est un pays libre. (student, male)

A majority of student interviewees, particularly immigrants, stressed several times the many opportunities and freedoms they have in Canada compared to other parts of the world. Some of them have lived in autocratic regimes and can compare their situation here with their past experiences in their home-country. From that point of view, it is clear that these young citizens exhibit a certain pride (and loyalty) with reference to living in Canada. One student says that in
this country, citizens are not paid by politicians to get their vote. Another one emphasizes the
fact that many Canadians are unfortunately not even aware of their freedoms.

Il y a plus de droits que dans d'autres pays, comme dans l'Afrique, tu peux
faire ce que tu veux, tu as le droit de parole, le droit de te défendre, et puis on
te paye pas pour aller voter ici. (student, male)

Moi je trouve ça génial. On est dans un pays extrêmement privilégié puis
beaucoup de gens ne se rendent pas compte. (student, male)

In Québec, as clearly noted in the grade 10 history program, questions of rights and freedoms are
also connected to 'collective rights' such as language and self-government destined to preserve
and promote the national culture of Québécois. If individual rights are intended to eliminate
inequalities in society, they may create a situation where some groups (francophone Québécois)
are unfairly disadvantaged in the 'cultural market place,' to use Kymlicka's expression. Since the
1970s, Québec has used its power to ensure that the dominant English-speaking culture does not
deprive francophones of the conditions necessary for their cultural survival. In order to promote
the use of French as a public language, Bill 101 forbids certain kinds of commercial signs in
other languages and encourages businesses to work in French only. Some student interviewees,
mostly Québec-born francophone, fear that despite the good will of the government of Québec,
English is taking over in Montréal. A situation one student links to the Americanization of
Québec society.

Pour la langue, oui on est différent. Mais on s'en vient de plus en plus
américains. (student, male)
Certain students even suggest that the increasing influx of ethnocultural groups speaking different foreign languages does not help the situation for francophones. English and many other languages other than French now compete in the Québec public sphere.

Continuellement entouré avec des personnes qui parlent anglais et de plus en plus de gens qui parlent d’autres langues, c’est sûr que ça peut pas aider à garder le français comme [notre] langue principale. (student, male)

In this situation, it is ironic to see that several students, including certain francophone Québécois, tend to conclude that learning English is thus a prerequisite for their own ‘survival,’ especially in the market place. The following remark is telling.

Moi je trouve qu’il faut essayer de parler anglais parce que tu vas sur le marché de l’emploi et ils te demandent d’être bilingue. J’ai fait beaucoup de demandes d’emploi d’été et c’était toujours [la même question]: “T’es bilingue?” (student, female)

The Ministry of Education is well aware of the tensions between the requirements of the Charter of French language and the necessity of preparing students for a global economy largely dominated by English, North American trends. As a result, the Ministry has decided to put the emphasis on the learning of multiple languages in school while preserving French as the language of instruction and public life. As the policy statement of the Ministry, Québec Schools on Course, reads:

It is vital that students master their first language (or the language of instruction) and for this reason, it must be the top priority of our schools. We study our first language in order to communicate, but also because it is a major part of our heritage […] [But] emphasis will also be placed on the
acquisition of a second language and a third language given the linguistic
context of North America and the globalization of economic activity and
communications [bold in the original]. (MEQ, 1997b, p.16)

8.2 On cultural pluralism and interculturalism

Québec has not always been receptive to cultural pluralism. As Balthazar (1996) has
noted, as long as francophone Québécois perceived themselves as an ethnic minority in Canada,
they had not expressed any willingness to respect and accommodate other ethnic minorities,
except (perhaps) for other Catholics. With the Quiet Revolution, and the increasing arrivals of
non-francophone, non-Catholic immigrants in the 1970s and 1980s, to compensate the low birth
rate of Québécois, the government of Québec tried to develop a particular approach to
immigration and cultural pluralism different from that in English Canada (multiculturalism),
which culminated in the adoption of a policy of so-called ‘interculturalism.’ As part of its nation-
building agenda, Québec has adopted its own policy more consistent with Québécois'
understanding of Canadian citizenship (see Ministère des Communautés Culturelles et de
l’Immigration, 1990). Based on a moral contract between immigrants and the host society, the
policy has four objectives: the promotion of French as the common public language, the
participation of immigrants and minorities in the social and economical life of Québec and the
adaptation of institutions to the multi-ethnic reality of Québec, and finally the promotion of
intercultural relations.

A comparison between the Québec policy of interculturalism and the Canadian policy of
multiculturalism shows many similarities (see Pietrantonio, Juteau & McAndrew, 1997). The
Québec policy, however, makes the limits of diversity more explicit, focusing on the ‘non-
negotiable’ requirements such as the French language embedded in the moral contract.² The
Ministry of Education, in conjunction with the Québec Ministry of Immigration and Relations
with Citizens, has put forth in 1998 a new policy statement and plan of action for intercultural education and new cultural integration programs to be used in all Québec schools with a particular focus on the Montréal region, where most immigrants settle. The objectives of intercultural education, the document reads, “overlap with those objectives in the citizenship education program that bear on diversity and learning to live together, which means that intercultural education is part of citizenship education” (MEQ, 1998b, p. 2).

The grade 10 history program elaborated in the early 1980s supports some of the goals of interculturalism. One of its learning outcomes is to help students be aware of the diversity of Québec population and of citizens’ sense of belonging. More explicitly, in its general orientations, the program defines Québec society as follow:

Comme les autres sociétés industrialisées du monde occidental, la société québécoise se caractérise par la pluralité et le changement […]. La richesse même de cette diversité pose l’exigence de citoyens informés, capables d’efforts d’objectivité et soucieux de respect mutuel. (MEQ, 1982, p. 11).

That being said, the program developed almost 20 years ago has been strongly criticized, not without reasons, by the Task Force on the Teaching of History (1996) for its lack of emphasis (in all the modules) on the contributions of ethnocultural groups in the shaping of Québec and Canadian history. The Task Force recommended, therefore, that the new programs pay special attention to the historicity of the presence of ethnocultural groups in Québec and Canada (Task Force on the Teaching of History, 1996, p. 48). As Moodley (1995) has noted, the existence of multicultural or intercultural policies does not ensure sound practice in the classroom. The relationship between policy and implementation of programs is not linear or hierarchical. This is particularly true when one considers that the grade 10 history program has not been amended since the 1980s.
One Québec-born student, commenting on this lack of emphasis on interculturalism in citizenship education, argues that in the present context students do learn about interculturalism through different agencies of intercultural socialization such as the school environment.

Le multiculturalisme, on l'apprend pas mal sur le tas. On l'apprend à voir du monde d'ethnies différentes, de religions différentes, [et] d'opinions différentes […]. On apprend tout de suite à composer avec ça sans en avoir été avertis par les professeurs. (student, male)

Valuable lessons can be learned, therefore, from interactions inside and outside the classroom with students who are culturally and linguistically different. In support of this idea, school administration has helped develop extra-curricular activities, such as intercultural and immigration student clubs, to favour social interaction, respect, and mutual understanding. The goal, as one administrator puts it, is to create an “inclusive school community.”

Commenting on the relationships between students of different ethnocultural backgrounds in MSS, one immigrant student says that when it comes to establish relationships with others, color or ethnicity is not an element that is considered.

C'est pas la couleur qui va influencer si les gens t'aident ou non, c'est la personnalité, comment tu es avec les autres. (student, female)

One Québec-born student declares that he feels fortunate to be in such a multi-ethnic environment where he can learn from different nationalities while still being ‘at home.’ This cultural mosaic becomes a window into the world ‘out there,’ a way to present students different languages, cultures, religions, and value systems.

Je trouve ça intéressant que ce n'est pas juste des Québécois [d'origine], qu'il y ait plein de nationalités. C'est différent, on apprend! (student, male)
Supporting the views held by the government of Québec on interculturalism, another Québécois-born student adds that the multi-ethnicity found in this neighbourhood of Montréal is unique in Canada since no other predominantly francophone major city has this 'character.'

On parle de la multi-ethnicité à Montréal, [bien] il n'y a pas ça dans aucune autre ville au Canada. On ne retrouve pas ce mélange là avec les francophones.

Le mélange de cultures qui peut y avoir au Québec, c'est unique au Québec.

(student, male)

A recent study on the attitudes of Montréal students (Jodoin et al., 1997) suggests that francophone students are largely supportive of interculturalism. According to their conclusion, language and/or ethnicity is not a determining factor when it comes to social relationships for Québec-born and immigrant students in francophone Montréal schools. Yet, it is clear, particularly for Québec-born francophone students, that the school must operate in a framework dictated by the common language of Québec.

As intended in the policy of interculturalism, integration is understood as a 'two-way system' in Québec. If immigrants are required to integrate into the dominant society, students of ethnocultural groups are also encouraged to preserve and share their heritage. They are no longer required to assimilate all the dominant cultural beliefs held by the Québec population. As a result, immigrant students or students from ethnocultural groups have learned to develop both their ethnic and common identities within their 'host' society.

Je suis partie [d'Afrique] quand même assez jeune. J'avais six ans, mais j'ai eu le temps d'implanter quelques racines. Mais je suis quand même attachée au Québec, je me dis on est venu ici et il faut reconnaître quand même qu'on vit ici. (student, female)
Si les gens me disent: “d’où tu viens?” Je vais dire [que] je suis Portugais, mais de plus en plus je suis en train de devenir plus Québécois. Puis mes enfants vont être Québécois [...] (student, male)

But constructing, or more precisely reconstructing, an identity is always a critical process, particularly for immigrants. As Taylor has noted, cultural attachments are normally too strong to be given up by people. They are, thus, part of the ‘horizon within which one is capable of taking a stand.’ In other words, if identities are chosen by individuals, there are some commitments and attachments that people cannot reject easily when (re)constructing their own identities. And, this complicates the task of integrating into a dominant society while remaining true to ourselves.

One student, from Morocco, comments on this tensions between maintaining aspects of an ethnic heritage and adapting to a new political community.

Moi je suis arrivé ici à 7 ans, ça fait que j’ai pas eu assez le temps de vraiment être complètement marocain, mais je suis arrivé trop vieux pour complètement devenir québécois alors j’ai la moitié des deux [...] On dirait que je suis un peu des deux cultures. (student, male)

During my observations in school, I heard no explicit racist comment and found no graffiti suggesting racist attitudes toward immigrants. In the hallway, students from various ethnic or linguistic backgrounds interact together in a casual climate. My observations in history classrooms lead to similar conclusions. I asked students, particularly immigrants, if they had witnessed or suffered from racism in their school. Most student interviewees expressed no real feeling of having been discriminated against or excluded at MSS. One student from Africa suggested that the fact the school population is extremely diverse contributes positively to this
integrative environment. Another immigrant student adds that there is no real problem of racism at MSS.

Ici, il y a beaucoup de gens, même [que] les gens sont immigrants au moins à
la moitié [sic]. Ce qui fait que c'est pas un problème de venir d'un autre pays.
C'est pas un facteur important. (student, male)

Je trouve qu'ici c'est varié [...]. Il n'y a pas de problème, tout le monde
s'apprécie. Il n'y a pas vraiment de problème de racisme. (student, female)

Despite this ‘welcoming’ environment for non-white and non-francophone students, the last
immigrant interviewee notes that her different French accent was a problem for social integration
with other Québec francophones when she immigrated to Montréal.

J'ai du m'adapter avec le français parce que j'avais un accent plus européen.
Alors quand je suis arrivée ici ça m'a pris environ un mois avant de bien saisir
comment ils parlaient. Parce que moi quand quelqu'un me parlait, je restais
bouche bé, je faisais: “Je m'excuse mais je ne comprend pas.” (student,
female)

Two Québec-born students agree with the intercultural principle according to which immigrants
have to adapt to Québec, particularly in terms of official language.

C'est sûr qu'il faut qu'ils [immigrants] s'adaptent aussi dans certaines
mesures. Ça veut dire qu'il faut qu'ils apprennent une des deux langues
[officielles]. (student, female)
Although the two students both rejected possible connection in school between racism and language adaptation, research (see MacMillan, 1998) confirms that Bill 101 in Québec has sparked heated debates in the last 20 years around tolerance of ‘foreign’ languages, freedom of expression, and minority language education in that province. Are Québécois really intolerant if they support French-only public education (for immigrants)? Is it racist or discriminatory to allow English Québécois to have public education in their own language but not anglophone immigrants? These ethical questions are beyond the scope of this chapter. However, one thing is clear: when considering that language and cultural heritage have tremendous significance for individuals and collectivities, it is imperative that Québec schools, and more specifically history teachers, give priority to ethnocultural and linguistic diversity. If students in this Montréal high school now find themselves in a multi-ethnic environment, most staff, administrators, and teachers at MSS continue to represent the white, francophone Québécois majority. Similarly, teaching practices too often reflect ethno-cultural values and attitudes, which do not always respect and represent immigrants’ experiences in Québec and Canada. One immigrant student reports on her experience in history.

J’ai remarqué que le professeur enseigne l’histoire mais c’est plutôt dans l’esprit des [Canadiens] français. (student, female)

The situation is not particular to this school. As the Ministry of Education (1998b) has noted in its policy statement on educational integration and intercultural education, educational institutions urgently need to include ethnocultural minorities more adequately in their procedures, curricula, and staffing. In its plan of action, the Ministry (1998b) maintains that:
In conjunction with community organizations, the ethnic media and others, [the Ministry] will promote the teaching profession among immigrant students or students of immigrants parents as a way of encouraging them to enrol in education programs. (p. 9)

Similarly, the Ministry recommends that Québec universities make special efforts to increase their numbers of immigrant student-teachers and that school boards adopt or pursue the application of measures designed to ensure an adequate representation of ethnocultural diversity in their staff.

8.3 On participation

Politics in Québec is often perceived as a 'national sport.' Commentators from other provinces are struck by the recurrence of political discussion in both public and private affairs. Just walking the streets of the Plateau Mont Royal and looking at the French commercial signs — and all the 'STOP' signs in French — is enough to start an endless political debate with Québec nationalists around language rights. This characteristic of Québec political culture has been transposed in the commitments of Québécois in political affairs. Until the 1960s, Québec, influenced and governed by clerical ideologies, had adopted a conservative view of democracy, a view which relied heavily on obedience to established Catholic institutions and distrust of popular sovereignty. This situation even led some historians like Cook (1995) to call the French Canadian nation an "église-nation" (p. 91). French Catholic schools in Québec sustained the views held by the Clergy. The Religious and Canadian history program of 1905 illustrates this conservative approach to citizenship. In its rationale, the document states that the 'religious' goal of the program is: "d'indiquer à grands traits la marche bienfaisante de l'Église à travers les
With the Quiet Revolution, however, popular participation in resolving socio-political issues — including, of course, constitutional ones — has grown significantly so that today Québécois are among the most politically active citizens in Canada, at least in their ‘national’ province. Democratic state action came to replace religious control. The perpetual use of États généraux (General Estates), parliamentary commissions, referenda, forums, and task forces on various public issues such as education, language, secession, citizenship and immigration clearly illustrates this sense of civic participation in Québécois society. As Resnick (1990) has noted in his comparative analysis of popular sovereignty in English Canada and Québec, “[the] experience of nationalism […] over the past twenty-five years and the significant democratization of Quebec’s political life have given popular sovereignty a basis of support in Quebec civil society” (p. 102).

Following the 1995 Estates General on Education, the Ministry of Education (1997b) has reaffirmed in its recent educational policy statement the necessity of creating ‘responsible’ democratic citizens in Québec schools as it was recommended in the Parent Commission in the 1960s.

Our schools must not only help students develop a feeling of belonging to the community but also teach them how to “live together.” In doing this, they must pay attention to students’ concerns about the meaning of life. They must promote the fundamental values of democracy and prepare our youth for their role as responsible citizens. (p. 9).

The grade 10 history program, largely consistent with the views held by the Ministry, offers also some references to ‘responsible’ citizenship. The document states in its learning outcomes that:
If the term 'responsible' citizenship always refers to democracy in the program and the statements of the Ministry, Sears and Hughes (1996) have argued, however, that adjectives used to describe citizenship in some Canadian citizenship education programs — such as 'responsible' and 'informed' — are ambiguous and mean different things to different people. As a result, the term 'responsible' citizenship could even be consistent with more conservative and passive notions of democratic citizenship. One could argue that this is probably one of the reasons why the Québec Ministry of Education (1998a), in its policy statement on educational integration and intercultural education, states more clearly that:

[T]here is at present no citizenship education course to encourage students to participate actively in the community and help them develop a civic spirit that is attuned to a pluralistic society. The programs that treat this question do not cover it adequately. (p. 14)

Saying the actual programs do not focus adequately on civic participation is not to say, however, that schools, and more specifically citizenship education courses such as history, lead to the formation of passive citizens. In fact, a majority of student interviewees, including immigrants, expresses a moral responsibility for being involved in public affairs. Some talk about the beliefs that citizen action can make a difference in the political process (political efficacy). One student, commenting on civic participation, argues that one vote is probably "not a big deal" but all votes count in democracy. Another one believes participation is an important right in a democratic society that citizens must exercise.
Oui, moi je trouve que c'est important la participation politique. Je pense que tout le monde peut avoir sa petite influence mais je ne pense pas que ça va faire un gros impact. (student, female)

Bien sûr je vais voter pour le gouvernement, pour celui qui sera le mieux puis qui va le mieux nous servir. Si c'est pas toi qui vote, c'est quelqu'un d'autre qui va voter à ta place. Si on regarde, un vote c'est pas grand chose, mais c'est un vote qui fait que la personne peut gagner en bout de ligne. (student, male)

D'après moi c'est vraiment important de participer parce que c'est un droit et il faut le prendre. (student, male)

When talking about civic participation, some students express a view on their representatives. While having very pragmatic ideas about the roles of politicians (cannot please all citizens, go into politics as much for personal benefits as for collective ones), they manifest a certain level of political trust, considering that political representatives ultimately come from the people and work for the people.

Moi je vois les politiciens comme des gens qui ne peuvent pas plaire à tout le monde. C'est normal qu'ils ne peuvent pas plaire à tout le monde, c'est quasiment impossible de plaire à tout le monde. La plupart, je vois qu'ils sont honnêtes et j'ai confiance en eux. (student, male)

C'est un métier assez grand la politique. Je pense que principalement c'est d'essayer de défendre ses propres convictions puis de ralier avec soi toutes les autres qui ont les mêmes idées que nous. (student, male)
A minority of students (including one immigrant), however, were more sceptical of the roles of representatives (no distinction was made between provincial and federal). If these students admit politicians are elected, they believe that corruption and lies often motivate their personal aspirations. I noticed that these students were generally those who had a relatively narrow understanding of politics and civic participation, reducing them to ‘elections,’ and ‘referenda.’

Je trouve dans la politique il y a beaucoup de petits pièges. C'est pas toujours juste et vraie. Les politiciens essaient de travailler pour les citoyens, mais ils s'y prennent parfois mal. Ils prennent parfois la corruption pour se faire élire.

(student, female)

La politique ça m'intéresse pas vraiment. C'est sûr que je vais aller voter, mais je pense pas que je vais vraiment suivre à fond la politique. [Dans le fond] la politique c'est quoi? C'est des référendums, des élections [...]. (student, male)

I have argued that in a democracy the commitments of citizens go well beyond participation in the electoral/referendum process. Even if they are not full legal citizens, students have many opportunities in school to ‘exercise’ their citizenship by engaging in actions and discussion with others (staff, teachers, administrators) about school activities, policies, and clubs. They may even engage in responsive discussion and propose new approaches for dealing with various socio-educational issues such as language, violence, peace, race relations, and community actions (see Van Neste, 1998). Several students I met told me that society requires ‘input’ from its members to grow and flourish. Students, they argue, can participate and help change things that need changing in their society.
Sur le plan social je m'impliquerai parce que je trouve que pour évoluer, la société, il faut des gens qui veulent, des gens qui s'impliquent dans plusieurs choses communes. (student, female)

On ne peut rien faire [politiquement avant 18 ans] mais il y a certains moyens de pression dépendant [sic] de nos parents. Puis, le monde qu'on connait peut voir qu'on a certains jugements, qu'on est passionné pour quelque chose. Juste parce que tu es en bas de l'âge ça ne veut pas dire tu peux pas faire un certain effort pour changer les choses dans la société. (student, male)

Another measure of student participation (or future participation) in society is how active young people are in their school and local environment. So I asked student interviewees what their engagement was in their school and community. I was surprised to hear that most of them were participating in — and even leading — various organizations, clubs, and activities inside and outside the school. Regarding student participation in school, one student interviewee reports that:

Il y a beaucoup de gens qui participent ici. Ils participent à toutes les activités, c'est juste qu'il faut aller chercher sa place, le plus vite possible sinon il n'en reste plus [...]. (student, male)

More striking to me was to see their ‘quasi-normal’ attitude when talking about school involvement, as if their participation was somewhat natural, even expected. Students comment on their involvement in extra-curricular activities, in the student council, in the school newspaper (that was abolished last year for lack of funding), in the student radio show, and on their volunteer work at the library, at the student cooperative, or with the community center. They
believe that, compared to other schools in the district, MSS provides them with various ways of participating, of being active students.

A comparer à mon ancienne école, il y en a beaucoup plus d'activités parascolaires ici. C'est comme un lieu où t'apprends et aussi où tu t'enrichis, où tu peux mettre tes talents en pratique. (student, male)

Il y a quand même plusieurs équipes de sports, d'échec, du judo. Il y a d'autres organismes et on peut participer nous-mêmes dans l'école. Moi je trouve [que] c'est important de s'impliquer, faire autre chose que sa vie scolaire. (student, female)

Cette année je m'occupe de la coop. La Coop de l'école, c'est là où on vend des crayons et des choses comme ça. L'an dernier j'étais dans le journal étudiant, mais ils l'ont pas cette année [...]. (student, male)

On ramasse bouteilles [à l'école]. Puis on s'implique dans le quartier avec le milieu, avec le café étudiant de l'école. (student, female)

An immigrant student notes that his involvement in various organizations is important for his personality and sense of belonging to the school.

Je suis dans le conseil des élèves, le conseil d'établissement, je travaille à la bibliothèque, au secourisme. Je fais beaucoup d'activités dans l'école. C'est bon pour moi. (student, male)
The active participation of students in school activities should not overshadow the fact that certain students mention they prefer to participate in more 'personal ways' in the school life or simply concentrate on their academic work. One of them says he helps others in their academic work by offering assistance to those with learning difficulties in mathematics (grade 7).

Je vais pas trop dans les activités après l’école, dans le parascolaire. Je ne suis pas dans aucune organisation non plus. Je préfère donner des cours de mathématique au secondaire I. (student, male)

As might be expected, all those involved in their school or local community express a feeling of belonging to the group. By participating in collective affairs, students are building a sense of harmony, which contributes to the belief they are not simply passive beneficiaries, but active members of a learning institution, ‘their’ learning institution. As one student concludes:

Moi je fais des activités. Je suis aussi aide-bibliothécaire et c’est bon. Tu sens que tu fais partie de l’école. (student, male)

8.4 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have tried to show that student participants have interesting views about their nation, their country, and their citizenship. They have developed an attitude toward citizenship rights fairly consistent with the liberal democratic principles that underlie the Canadian political culture. This situation is even truer for immigrant students. The particular situation of students, living in a predominantly francophone environment, also helps many of them to be attentive to collective rights (e.g., language) in democracy, as clearly stated in the program.

Similarly, most student interviewees express their strong support for interculturalism in Québec, despite limited consideration for the policy in the history program and teaching styles of
teachers. Most francophone Québécois are no longer prey to any phobia, or feared being assimilated by immigrants or anglophones. Ethnicity, religion, or primary language are not determinant factors for them when it comes to establishing student relationships in their school or in their classrooms. This situation suggests that students learn to be tolerant and respectful of interculturalism not only in citizenship education but also in their daily interactions with students from various ethno-cultural backgrounds who legitimately want to be respected and treated as ‘full’ community members.

Yet, Québécois-born francophone students, who continue to represent the majority in the school, tend to be more assertive in the necessity for all Québécois to incorporate the Québec francophone ‘national’ culture. For some immigrants, this complicates the dual task of integrating into the dominant society while maintaining aspects of their ethnic heritage. Laperrière (1996) has found in her review of students’ ethnic/civic identities in Montréal schools that the local, socio-political, and economical situations of ethnic minorities also have a major impact on the integration of immigrants and the construction of their identities.

Finally, despite the lack of emphasis on civic participation in school history, most student interviewees, whether Canadian-born or immigrant, express a moral responsibility for being involved in public affairs. They believe social and political commitments are necessary in democracy. This belief is clearly reflected in their involvement in school activities, organizations, and clubs. But saying many students are ‘active citizens’ is not to say that they are always supporting political parties, practices, or politicians. Certain students are sceptical of the roles of political representatives and the ways democracy works.

I also found that trying to build a sense of active community so that students do not attend school simply by obligation has been one of the major goals of the administration in the last years. The multi-ethnicity of the student-body, language adaptation, poverty, and teaching practices are all factors that play a crucial role in the development of attitudes for these young
people. To help them feel ‘at home’ in their school, the administration has developed a
communitarian approach to school behaviour that relies heavily on collegiality, respect of others,
and commitments to the school. As the administration puts it in all student agenda’s “code de
vie:”

Etant donné que nous sommes plus de 1500 personnes à nous côtoyer tous les
jours dans l’école, il est nécessaire que nous ayons des normes de conduite
pour vivre en harmonie. Ainsi, chaque élève pourra se réaliser en tant
qu’individu et assumer son rôle avec les droits et les responsabilités qui s’y
rattachent. (Student agenda, 1999-2000, p. 22)

Students I met were supportive of this approach to schooling. They legitimately want to
be respected, included, and recognized for who they are. What MSS needs now is to find new
ways of incorporating this approach into its classrooms, its learning materials, and in its teachers’
attitudes.

---

1 A recent (limited) study conducted with 82 grade 10 and grade 11 students, in two francophone Montréal high
schools, came to similar conclusions. Based on a survey on citizenship attitudes, the author claims that over 90
percent of respondents said that knowledge of rights and respect of others are central principles of democracy (see
Truchot, 1998).

2 For an analysis of the two policies and their implications for public education, see Ouellet (1995).

3 In November 2000, a group of francophone Québécois and anglophone immigrants challenged the French
language Charter, asking the Québec Superior Court to change the actual law so as to allow francophones (in
Québec) and anglophone immigrants to have the choice of sending their children to English schools if they wish.
Reaffirming Québec’s position, the judge Laramée argued in his ruling that because education is an exclusively
provincial jurisdiction, Québec has to assume its responsibility in protecting French in North America (see
Vancouver Sun, 2000, November 15, p. A9).

4 Although voting in elections or referenda is only one — and perhaps not the most effective — means of
participation in democracy, the percentage of participation in electoral/referendum politics constitutes, at least
quantitatively, one way of assessing political commitment. Based on this premise, several scholars (see Jackson and
Jackson, 1997; Taylor, 1993) have stressed the fact that Québécois are more active citizens in their province than
Canadians in general. As an example, Taylor (1993, p. 117) shows that in the elections of the 1970s and early 1980s
over 82 percent of Québécois voted in provincial elections compared to less than 66 percent for Ontarians. Even when considering federal or 'national' elections (for English Canadians), the level of participation of Ontarians (less than 80 percent) remains inferior to the participation of Québécois. As another example of this high level of political participation, in the last 1995 Referendum over 94 percent of the (adult) population in Québec voted either Oui or Non to sovereignty.
It's good to be happy that you live in Canada. We should be more happy. Canada is a great country to live in [...]. (B.C. student, female)

Moi, j'aime beaucoup le Québec. J'aime ça parce que je trouve que c'est comme un pays. On est une province, mais je trouve qu'on est vraiment à part du Canada [...]. (Québec student, female)

Canada is in many respects a unique country compared to others around the world. Its territory is the world’s second largest, yet its population is smaller than that of South Africa. Canada is officially bilingual but only 17 percent of Canadians (in the 1996 census) claimed to speak both official languages. Although Canada achieved statehood in 1867, we can hardly find our real beginning as a nation-state since “there is no Declaration of Independence, no Magna Carta, no Bastille Day” (Kroetsch as quoted in Francis, 1997, p. 17). Canada gained its autonomy as a state gradually — from 1867 through to the Statute of Westminster of 1931, the Citizenship Act of 1946, and the patriation of the Constitution in 1982 — and, in large part, in reaction to what was happening in the turbulent republic to the south.

As a result, Canadians have no central myth of creation, no civic picture like ‘Uncle Sam,’ no shared narrative which celebrates the birth of the Canadian nation-state. With the strong division between French and English Canada at the time of Confederation, the Fathers of Confederation wisely decided to create a federal state instead of a legislative union. Divided as we were, Taylor (1993) claims, “we could only be brought together for common purposes” (p. 27). The consequence for today is the absence of a shared collective memory and a lack of consensus around the meaning of Canadian identity, and these have important implications for
the future of the country. While many Canadians support a multicultural conception of their
country, most Québécois, in sharp contrast, claim to have a distinct national language, public
culture, and national-political institutions within Canada. They have, in other words, a
multinational citizenship.

In our multi-ethnic states, people have many identities defined in terms of gender,
etnicity, religion, and so forth. These ‘multiple’ identities are often perceived as conflicting
with the alleged necessity of sharing a common sense of belonging. In this respect, Taylor (1996)
argues that it is important in democracy that people develop a collective identity that transcends
ethnic allegiance or religion. Democracy, he notes, demands a special sense of belonging among
national members, usually based on something Anderson (1991) calls ‘shared beliefs.’ These
beliefs are a set of societal characteristics such as language and history that individuals who
belong to the nation are encouraged to display. National belonging, Ignatieff (1993) adds,
appears to be very important in the history of states since no other form of belonging (to family,
work, friends) is secure if people are not protected by their nation. This view echoes the position
taken by Abbé E.J. Sieyès in his great French revolutionary tract that “the nation is prior to
everything. It is the source of everything” (as quoted in Miller, 1995, p. 29).

More importantly, Taylor (1993) argues that the personal identities we construct during
our lives are largely influenced by the nation we inhabit. To the question ‘who am I?,’ the
answer for him points to the values, language, culture, and institutions we share in our political
communities. Personal as well as national identities are always ‘provisional ones’ since new
events, or further critical thought, may cause us to revise them. But the key points of national
identities, although they are in constant development, are that: they provide the horizon within
which we construct our identities and act collectively, and they help keep societies together.

Once a population becomes ethnically or culturally diverse, people may wonder why they
should share the same country, rights, and responsibilities with others who are so different from
themselves. A national identity is supposed to provide such a point of convergence for citizens, at least in a nation-state. This implies that in order to work properly, a democracy requires a degree of cohesion.

I have shown in chapter 3 that Canadian schools have been used as a key nation-building institution, a place where young people learn about their citizenship, and in so doing construct both their collective and individual identities. But nation-building has always been puzzling in Canadian citizenship education. Not only is public education under provincial jurisdiction, additionally the French-English historical duality has impeded attempts to teach a common national version of Canadian identity in school history. Today, citizenship education programs continue to present students with different understandings of the nation and the state. Faced with such a situation, it is imperative to know what Canadian students think about their national identity, nation, and citizenship. After all, they are potentially the leaders of tomorrow, those who will decide if ‘the twenty-first century belongs to Canada.’

Critics (Griffiths, 2000; Granatstein, 1998; Legault, 1997) have suggested that the state via public schooling (multicultural education, regional school history) encourages students, particularly those from ethnic minorities, to maintain a segregated citizenship. Rather than promoting adhesion to a common national culture, these critics suggest that our public institutions favour the formation of ‘self-contained ghettos’ alienated from the Canadian mainstream. For example, Granatstein (1998) contends that most students are “culturally illiterate” because Canada’s public schools have given up teaching Canadian national history (p. 11).

9.1 On nationalism and patriotism

At the beginning of this research, my assumption was that in this era of globalization, internet communications, and international pop music stars, teenagers have ceased to care about
theoretical concepts, such as nationalism and patriotism, introduced in their social studies and history programs. Students I met proved that I was wrong. The majority of them, whether in Québec or in B.C., attached importance to nationalism and patriotism for their lives, both as individuals and citizens. They also suggested that democratic citizenship needs to rely on a sense of common belonging and membership.

In the B.C. case study, a majority of respondents (immigrant and Canadian-born) believe that it is important for Canadians to acquire a sense of community allegiance, to share a national identity respectful of Canada's diverse past, institutions, and people. In other words, they seek a national identity no longer based on ethnic but civic principles that will rally all Canadians despite their distinct religion, color, or language. The following statement from a Canadian-born student is telling.

We've always kinda struggled in Canada [with] what is a Canadian, so I think we've kinda taken things [pause] from all these different countries, since we have so many different people in the country. And we've kinda made our own national identity [...] related to many different people. (student, female)

For these students, the process of building a national identity is in constant flux since people of different backgrounds interact with one another, forging a 'new' national identity based on what Canadians believe they share as a political community. In other words, their nation is no longer a nostalgie passéiste (backward nostalgia) to use Létourneau's expression to be carried over or a moral obligation to past actions and historical figures. It is an active, ever-changing community oriented to the future.

But others, mostly English-speaking Canadian-born students, stressed the necessity of having a national identity based on a shared language (English for English Canada) so as to create a common public sphere for citizens and favour the integration of immigrants into the
Canadian mainstream. They view the concept of national identity as necessary to maintain a common language and a public culture, hence avoiding the segregation of their school, city, and (perhaps) Canadian society at large, into ethnic 'ghettos.' As suggested by Resnick (1994), language is a central facet of national identity. All nationalities have a public language that citizens speak. One Canadian-born student comments on this view.

Well, I think now with the huge growth of the Asian community, I'm kind of [pause] not angered but disappointed how a lot of the malls and the new Chinese stores, instead of trying to learn English, they just put up all of their signs in Chinese. For example, I was walking down the street [in the city], there was even a store that said “We speak English” […]. I find it kind of weird how everything is in Chinese with the little sign saying “We speak English.” I think they need to have more of an effort to change into learning the language and culture of this country. (student, male)

These student interviewees believed that Canada, despite its multi-ethnic origins and past, is not, as Resnick (1994) has noted, some ‘tabula rasa’ or blank sheet to be modified every time a new cultural group comes along. They implicitly reason that English has a particular place in Canadians’ imaginations and, immigrants living in B.C. or elsewhere in Canada have to understand that their native languages can never aspire to the status of an official one.

I think English kind of joins together […] especially in a school where that’s supposed to be the language. You have to make the effort in order to bridge […] just to link everybody together. (student, male)

Saying these students see their language as an element of continuity for their collective identity is not to say, however, that B.C. student interviewees identified exclusively with
English-speaking Canadians. When asked to identify ‘good’ Canadians, some students provided names or descriptions of people who were from various cultural and linguistic backgrounds. They were cited not for their historical or cultural similarities but for what they have done or what they inspire.

We’re are multi-faceted, so one of the ideal Canadians, a model citizen would be well-educated, that’s an important part, would have the understanding of others, hard-working [...]. A Canadian should [also] own a big winter coat and has to understand things about his country, about what we are. (student, male)

A good Canadian for me [...] I could say one for sports: Patrick Roy and [perhaps] all the old Canadiens. They are models because they’ve done what they’ve loved [hockey] and they’ve kept doing it and kept doing it. (student, male)

Despite the fact these students live on a corner of land where it rarely snows, some of them still identify passionately with winter sports and ‘Hockey Night in Canada.’ One immigrant student, born in Mexico City, told me that he has learned to become Canadian by watching hockey on television.

I think, personally, for me, it has been Hockey Night in Canada, just watching every Saturday night, all the games all the time. The way they [commentators] have such a pro-Canadian [description] [...] that has kinda showed me more of the patriotic and the Canadian way of doing things. (student, male)

In the Québec case study, student interviewees also have clear ideas and feelings about their nation. After all, Canadian nationalism was invented by French-Canadians. But today, their
national identity no longer refers to the apostolic-backward past of French Canada but to their modern multi-ethnic society. No reference to French-Canadian 'martyrs' like Dollard Des Ormeaux, who continues to be celebrated in Québec as an equivalent of the Queen, or nationalist figures such as the Patriotes. Their names are not only foreign to students’ collective memory but totally insignificant for them today. In other words, these people have no clear impact on their collective identity and, as such, are not perceived as necessary for the links they make between the past and the present. For one immigrant student from Africa, there is no typical portrait of a ‘good’ Canadian or Québécois in this multi-ethnic context.

T'as pas vraiment une image d'une personne typique [ici] je dis qu'on est diversifié et on a pas à aller identifier un tel précisément. (student, female)

One Québec-born student adds that the actual diversity of Québec population and the many ways of life now found among Québécois make it impossible to come down to a single model of a good Québécois.

Moi je pense pas qu'il y a une personne qui peut représenter le Québec vraiment. Il y a tellement de gens qui pensent de façons différentes, qui agissent de façons différentes. Il y a une si grande diversité dans la population qu'on peut pas prendre quelqu'un puis dire qu'il représente le reste, c'est impossible. (student, male)

Another Québec-born student made similar comments, noticing that there is no distinction between so-called ‘pure laine’ and others in Québec, as premier Parizeau implied in his infamous referendum speech.

Quelqu'un qui n'est pas né ici, qui n'est pas Québécois de parenté ou pure laine, va être quand même Québécois [...]. (student, female)
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Saying that Québécois have adopted, like their counterparts in English Canada, a more inclusive and democratic national identity should not eclipse the fact that national identity in Québec continues to stir up heated discussions about the nature of this 'nation.' Does Canada include Québec? Is Québec a distinct national entity of its own? If so, what distinguishes this Québec nation? For some student interviewees, particularly but not exclusively immigrants, Canada is their nation-state; and Québec the provincial-territorial entity where they happen to live. As a result, being Canadian inevitably implies being Québécois for them. The two entities are not mutually exclusive. On the contrary, one includes the other; and, in the present context, there is no need to make an definite separation between the two. Two immigrant students, one from Portugal, and one from Algeria, put it this way:

Quand on fait partie du même pays, que je sois québécoise ou canadienne c'est la même chose. (student, female)

Moi je me dis que si le Québec était un pays, je serais Québécois. Mais comme je suis ici au Canada, je suis citoyen canadien. Je veux dire, c'est stupide, c'est juste une province et elle fait partie du même grand pays qui fonctionne bien. (student, male)

Two Québec-born students offer similar statements, one even rejecting any particular attachment or feeling to an exclusively Québec nationhood. For them, Québec is not, sociologically speaking, a nation but a (predominantly francophone) province. Both students do not think of themselves, linguistically or culturally, as forming a national community of their own.

Ben d'après moi, je reste toujours un Canadien parce qu'on est, sur papier, Canadien [et] tant que le Québec n'est pas séparé, on va rester Canadien. (student, male)
Il y en a beaucoup qui aime le Québec. [Moi] je m'affiche comme Canadien.

J'aimerais mieux parler anglais, ça me dérangerais pas. Je me sens pas Québécois, genre, je ne vais pas célébrer la St-Jean full fier [sic], ça me dérange pas du tout! (student, male)

Others do not see things the same way. This is mostly (but not exclusively) the case of francophone, Québec-born students who attach a vital importance to their national province. For them, Québec is not only a particular geographical place in their world, but also a sociological, and potentially politically sovereign, community of its own. For the following student, Québec represents a secure horizon necessary for her existence as a francophone person. Outside this imagined community that she views as a ‘big family,’ the world appears to be strange, different, if not totally foreign.

Moi j'aime beaucoup le Québec. J'aime ça parce que je trouve que c'est comme un pays, on est une province, mais je trouve qu'on est vraiment à part du Canada. Parce que si tu sors du Québec, t'as l'impression d'être dans un autre monde, d'après moi. T'as l'impression de changer de pays même si tu restes au Canada. (student, female)

Another Québec-born student adds that he feels so fortunate to be able to express himself and have a meaningful existence in a community that is so different, so ‘distinct’ from English Canada, which he equates to ‘Canada.’ For him, political sovereignty would represent the incontestable sense of power and self-accomplishment that is still missing to Québec.

Je trouve ça heureux qu'on parle encore le français ici au Québec. On est différent, on est unique. Si on devenait un pays, en plus, ça serait vraiment le “fun” comparé au Canada car eux autres parlent anglais. (student, male)
It is well-known that Québec nationalist — and even sovereignist — attitudes are asymmetrically distributed in the Québec population. They are mostly found in the francophone communities, especially in more homogeneous rural regions outside Montréal. Although Québécois of all origins may feel strongly attached to Québec, immigrants often see “the abandonment of Canada and the movement toward a unilingual society as a loss, not a gain” (Webber, 1999, p. 94). So Québec nationalists have striven in recent years to open the movement to all Québécois. Some nationalist historians (see Comeau & Lefebvre, 1997) have also proposed to redefine ‘national’ history (l’histoire nationale) in Québec to make it more inclusive. All these initiatives culminated in the creation of a national forum on ‘Québec citizenship’ in September 2000. Some see this initiative essentially as a strategic effort by the PQ to gain the necessary vote for a possible winning referendum. Whether this is true or not is not at issue here. The crucial point for this study is that I found that Québec nationalism has surprisingly attracted certain immigrant students who knew little or nothing about this historical issue before moving to Canada. This is particularly surprising when considering that the actual citizenship education programs have been blamed by the Task Force on the Teaching of History (1996), not without reason, for their lack of consideration of ethnocultural groups that have helped shape Québec and Canada.

One who arrived in Canada in 1990 was totally opposed to Québec nationalism at the point of immigration. After 10 years in Montréal, he believes secession is the only possible long term solution for the future of Québec as a distinct political community.

Moi avant j’étais contre la séparation du Québec, maintenant je suis de plus en plus vers cette option parce que si on se séparait, à long terme, ça serait une bonne chose je crois. (student, male)
National identities are in large part created by national feelings, or what Taylor (1996) calls "patriotism" (p. 119). People, he states, can only rule themselves and be free if they are regrouped in their patria (nation). So the ideal in democracy demands that patria be given some sort of political personality. A nation and its institutions require citizens who have a sense of belonging to the group (loyalty), a sense of identification with the polity, and a willingness to sacrifice for its sake. The attachment of people to their nation and state help them to understand why people owe obligations to their compatriots that are more extensive than those they owe to mankind in general. Put simply, patriotism helps understand why being asked to die for the sake of the nation is perceived as more significant (and noble) than being asked to die for the telephone company (see Callan, 1997, p. 127).

Surprisingly, it is not in good or prosperous times that citizens really need strong emotional commitment, but in periods of difficulty and distress. It is during conflicts or disasters such as floods, earthquakes, and storms that patriotism helps facilitate personal relations and mutual attachment among national citizens. It binds individuals to their nation and reinforces mutual commitment. "Without a feeling of being Canadian," Howard (1998) claims, "citizens would not want to contribute to the community or change things that might need changing" (p. 141). But the problem with national feelings is that it is not easy to pin down exactly what they entail. They are not 'generalizable.' So I asked students to define or characterize their patriotism.

In the B.C. case study, some student interviewees offer comments on patriotism like the following one:

I think patriotism is good [...] because you're supporting your country and you're not just kinda sitting there [pause] stupidly watching things go by.

(student, female)
Others say they think it is important to feel Canadian, to manifest what Tomkins (1977) calls a "national consciousness" (p. 9), because patriotism, they argue, is a set of social commitments necessary for the survival of Canada. Furthermore, they add that Canadian citizens should exhibit a certain level of pride about living in such a free, democratic country. This last point might even be truer for immigrants who have voluntarily left their home countries to establish themselves in Canada. As Derriennic (1995) rightly argues: "le patriotisme de l'immigrant est tellement naturel et compréhensible [...]. En n'aimant pas le pays où il a immigré, c'est toute sa vie qu'il condamnerait" (p. 28). One immigrant student (from Taiwan) supports this argument by offering certain patriotic characteristics he believes are typically Canadian.

I agree we have to have some love toward the country and support national events that are going on. That kind of thing adds to the atmosphere. [We need to] be patriotic, open-minded, and accepting for being Canadian. (student, male)

Another student, Canadian-born this time, puts it this way:

It's good to be happy that you live in Canada. We should be more happy.

Canada is a great country to live in. We should be maybe [pause] making and recognising it just a little bit more than we are. (student, female)

One Canadian-born student adds that his patriotic feelings have been greatly influenced by previous generations, by teachers and their teaching styles, and by socialization with peers. He also views his social studies classes as a way to create a sense of belonging to Canada.

I think a lot of where we get our pride for our country is from the attitudes of all the people like our teachers, our parents, [pause] our friends, media, that kind of thing. And, in Social Studies, the recurring themes, like the great
things that Canada does, make you feel good about your country. It has a good image internationally and does a lot of good things around the world. (student, male)

While all these students believe in the ‘virtues’ of patriotism, they were quick to add that they reject all forms of extreme patriotism, viewing them not only as potentially dangerous but as anti-Canadian. They talk about the fact Canada, unlike the United States, has historically adopted a ‘quiet patriotism,’ a peaceful and personal sense of belonging to Canada. The following comments from two Canadian-born students on Canada and the United States are telling.

[In the United States] they’re so proud of like their country. [In Canada] we’re kinda not very [pause] strong about our country. We don’t sit there and sing the Canadian anthem, like every class, like maybe the States people do. I think Canadians are [pause] strong in their own way, they just do it quietly […].

[Americans] are aggressively involved in their country. They’re really violent. It’s not a very stable country, although they claim to be that kinda thing. If we’re patriotic, it’s not bad but if you get violent with your patriotism [pause] then that’s bad. (student, female)

[In Canada] we have like Canada Day every year, so I mean that’s basically what we have […]. We respect Canada. [But] I mean down south they kinda have July 4th every day. You don’t want too much. (student, male)

This understanding of a quiet form of patriotism corroborates the view of the author of the history textbook that “[for Canadians] flaunting symbols might be called embarrassing and therefore un-Canadian” (Morton, 1993, p. 60).
In the Québec case study, student interviewees exhibit divergent views on patriotism. For some, their emotional attachment to the nation, including the state, is exclusively toward Québec. I found no mention at all of Canada or the multinational state they share with other Canadians. All their pride and patriotic emotions are invested in their national (francophone) province.

Moi je suis fière d'être Québécoise. Moi j'aime le Québec, et je suis fière d'être au Québec. (student, female)

J'aime le Québec! Le Québec, c'est comme un pays pour moi [...] (student, female)

Le patriotisme c'est l'attachement à la culture d'où on vient et je pense que pour le Québec c'est assez important [...] (student, male)

For one Québec-born student, patriotism is even perceived as a necessity for personal and collective affirmation.

D'après moi c'est bon [le patriotisme]. Moi je dis qu'il faut l'être parce qu'il faut s'affirmer dans la vie. Il faut avoir un point de vue et le dire. (student, male)

One student even suggests that the grade 10 history program, put forth by the government of Québec, legitimately encourages the development of certain nationalist attitudes so as to counteract ‘external’ pressures.

Moi je pense que puisque c'est le gouvernement du Québec qui a conçu le cours d'histoire et puisqu'il fait le programme de toutes les études, il y a
probablement tendance à tirer un peu en faveur du nationalisme québécois
pour balancer le flot de toute ce qui vient d'ailleurs. (student, male)

The history textbook used by my Québécois informants (Cardin et al., 1984) offers a definition of patriotism associated with Québec nationalism. In their analysis of the rebellion of 1837-1838, the authors argue that a patriote is someone who loves and defends his patrie, his nation (see Cardin et al., 1984, p. 242). More interestingly, they present a picture of Louis-Joseph Papineau with the comment: In his day, Papineau was considered by the population a skilful orator who had no difficulty stirring up crowds. People made him a cult figure. These days, do you know politicians who can provoke such enthusiasm? (Cardin et al., 1984, p. 248).

Others have rejected this uniform patriotism, which has led sovereignists to conclude that Canada is not a ‘real country’ because citizens cannot have dual allegiance. They have developed a sort of dual and reflective patriotism which gives greater place to diversity, accommodation, and (perhaps) reason. Without rejecting their national feelings toward Québec, their emotional attachments are coupled with the necessity of considering the larger political world in which they find themselves, namely, Canada. Put differently, these student interviewees have a manner of belonging that is not uniform but connected to various interrelated communities in which they live. More importantly, one Québec-born student, who identifies himself both as Québécois and Canadian, argues that the cohabitation of French and English-Canadians through the past centuries makes it extremely difficult to build two opposing imagined communities and patriotism.

Je m'identifie d'abord comme Québécois ensuite si les gens ne savent pas de quoi je parle, je dis c'est au Canada [...] D'un côté je suis séparatiste de coeur. Mais de l'autre côté je suis fédéraliste parce qu'à la fin ça donnera rien [de] se séparer. A la fin, je trouve que ça n'a pas de bon sens de dire qu'on est
totalement pareil ou totalement différent parce qu'on peut pas rester là 300 ans ensemble sans finir par penser un peu de la même manière. (student, male)

If national feelings favour social cohesion, equality, trust, and commitments within the community, they also generate a feeling of exclusion by making explicit reference to ‘us’ vs. ‘other’ (Taylor, 1999). We are, in a way, what others are not, or vice versa. The idea of nationalism, and the refusal of incorporation into another group, arises from the need for difference. In the Québec case study, some immigrant student interviewees refer to the distinction Québec nationalists have tried to create between ‘sovereignists’ and ‘federalists’ and between ‘Québec’ and ‘Canada.’

Il y en a qui disent ici : “Ah, moi je suis Québécois, je suis pas Canadien parce qu'ils n'aiment le reste du Canada,” puis il y en a d'autres qui disent: “Moi je suis Canadien, je suis pas Québécois.” (student, male)

English-Canadians — perhaps because of their language — have historically been more preoccupied than French-Canadians with the influence of the United States on Canada, constantly asking for measures to preserve and strengthen their ‘Canadianness.’ The very existence of Canada, Cook (1995) claims, “was an anti-American fact” (p. 177). A modest country like Canada, standing in close proximity to the American giant, has always lived under the threat of absorption. As a result, English-Canadians have been educated to be ‘anti-American’ and to believe that the United States is an unstable and turbulent country — to say nothing of expansionist — with extreme patriotic sentiments (see Francis, 1997). As noted in an editorial in the Toronto Star in 1972: “American textbooks […] can be an effective insidious instrument for Americanizing the thinking of young Canadians at the most impressionable period of their lives. They can instill the idea that the United States is the centre of the world […]” (as
quoted in Tomkins, 1977, p. 11). One B.C. student, of German-Chilean origins, comments on this attitude in English Canada.

You don’t see movies made in Canada like ‘Independence Day,’ and things like that. It’s a very American characteristic that hasn’t seemed to have been taken [up] by the Canadians [sic]. (student, female)

But despite what people may think, Americans and Canadians have a lot in common — especially with the Free Trade Agreement (FTA), the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), and the infiltration of American programs in radio and television networks. Some commentators have even suggested that students know more about Bill Clinton and Davey Crockett than they know about Jean Chrétien and Louis Riel (see A.W. Johnson in Jackson & Jackson, 1997, p. 124; Granatstein, 1998). Supporting this view, one Canadian-born student in B.C. has this to say:

I watch mostly American sports usually because there’s like one Canadian tv station on the air on tv. The rest are all American [...]. They’ve kinda made their way onto Canadian networks. (student, male)

Commenting on the influence of the United States on Canadian identity, another student (from Taiwan) adds:

We get bombarded by all this American media and such, we want to have our own national identity, but maybe the lack of one-faced identity is our identity.

(student, male)

But, surprisingly, some B.C. student interviewees were well aware of the influence of the American culture on their collective identity, viewing it as a threat to Canada’s destiny. Although
American media have a significant impact on their personal development and understandings of their place in the world, they stress the need for keeping certain values and attitudes they believe are typically Canadian. These students express this point of view as follows:

I think we’re not as violently oriented as the States. I think we try to work things out more diplomatically. I think people are more understanding of other cultures. (student, female)

I think a good Canadian is somebody who’s [pause], I guess, known for being polite. So I think a really polite person is really good. (student, male)

The following comment from a B.C. student who has experienced both American and Canadian systems of education is also very telling:

I went to Kindergarten or Grade 1 in the United States and every day we were like singing the national anthem and to the flag I pledge allegiance. Here in Canada we don’t do that but we’re still very, very patriotic, I think that’s good because you don’t force it upon the kids.1 (student, female)

In Québec, attitudes toward the United States contrast somewhat with English Canada. If some student interviewees clearly express their concerns with regard to the increasing Americanization of their society, with comments like “we are more and more American,” a majority of students do not see the ‘American giant’ as much of a threat as English-Canadians do. Perhaps they think of their French language as being a sort of ‘invisible shield’ that protects their national culture from the United States. As Ignatieff (1993) puts it, “[t]he French language allows Québécois a degree of cultural self-assurance toward the Americans that English-
Canadians can only envy” (p. 155). When asked about the influence of Americans on their lives, one Québec-born student had this typical comment to say:

Moi je pense que c'est vraiment différent [au Québec], c'est surtout la langue qui fait une barrière entre la culture américaine qui traverse le reste du Canada puis un petit peu au Québec. (student, male)

9.2 On Québec, B.C., and Canada

The B.C. social studies grade 11 program has in its rationale that the goal of the program is “[to prepare] students for their future lives as Canadian citizens” (B.C. Ministry of Education, 1997, p. 2). In Québec, the grade 10 history program also has for a key objective: the development of responsible citizens (MEQ, 1982, p. 13). Yet, the main impediment to Canada’s future, I have argued, is that Canadians have different understandings of citizenship, associated with their divergent conceptions of the nation and the state. While for a majority of English-Canadians Canada is a multicultural nation-state, most Québécois, in sharp contrast, believe they are part of a distinct national group within a multinational state. Their primary allegiance is to Québec and to Québécois, not to the country as a whole. Therefore, their participation in, and allegiance to the state is conditional, depending on how well the state serves the interests of Québécois.

One way to favour stability and unity in Canada, I have also argued, is to find new political arrangements and forms of citizenship which recognize explicitly not only our multicultural but also our national differences. So I asked B.C. student interviewees what they thought about Québec and Québécois. I wanted to know if, based on their knowledge, representations, and experiences in school, they were disposed to accept that some groups of Canadians, like Québécois, view themselves as distinct nations and want to be recognized as such.
The comments of students, in this section, are difficult to present since several participants had mixed — if not confused — understandings of Québec and Québécois, and sometimes contradictory arguments. For instance, certain informants were ready to accept that Québécois feel 'distinct' in Canada, but later in the discussion firmly rejected all forms of 'asymmetrical' federalism or 'differentiated' conception of citizenship. This situation, I believe, might be related to the fact that many British Columbians — as well as English-Canadians in general — are confused about the meaning of the terms 'distinct' and 'nation.' And, as I have showed earlier, social studies programs, textbooks, and practices do not help the discussion. Rather, they obscure the tensions between Québec and English Canada in discussions about cultural pluralism, multiculturalism, and regionalism. Nonetheless, I will try to show that comments from B.C. students on the questions of Québec and Québécois are diverse but fairly consistent with the representations of British Columbians in general.²

Most Canadian-born student interviewees view their country as a nation-state and systematically oppose any recognition of distinct national groups within Canada since this would go against their deep national beliefs. For them, Canada is a nation in the political, constitutional, and legal sense. Unlike Québec nationalists, these students lack a clearly defined notion of a people or an imagined community. All those living in the particular socio-geographical space, called Canada, are part of their nation. More importantly, this principle seems to be a 'non-negotiable' requirement for the survival of the country as a whole. As one Canadian-born student puts it:

Our position is firm. We say, "No, you don't go, because you're part of us and we love you." We can't change our position […]. It's like "We'll fight to the last man" kinda thing […]. To me it's not a debatable issue because, you know, the country exists as a country, you don't split up the country! (student, male)
Kymlicka (1998) has noted that this state-based nationalism in English Canada is, from one perspective, somewhat admirable. It encourages Canadians to avoid most of the vices that accompany some forms of ethno-linguistic nationalism like xenophobia. But from another perspective, this tendency to oppose different forms of nationalism and citizenship within a single state blinds them to the very fact that some Canadians do not understand their nation, their state, and their citizenship the way the majority does. As a result, these student interviewees do not realize that Québécois want to be recognized as a 'nationality-based unit' with a distinct societal culture. The commentary of the following students is telling:

Why should they be allowed to consider themselves as different [...] if they are part of us? (student, female)

I'm not sure exactly sure how come a lot of people [in Québec] want to separate, how come they're not feeling as pleased with Canada as we are [...].
(student, female)

Many British Columbians, including politicians and opinion-makers, have expressed similar views about Québec in the past. For Cyril Shelford (1991), a cabinet minister in the premier W.A.C. Bennett years, “it’s time we forget about special rights and all become just Canadians — and proud of it” (p. 79). In 1995, the leader of the opposition (and likely the forthcoming B.C. premier) claimed that “Distinct Society. I don’t have a clue what it means and won’t agree to its entrenchment” (as quoted in Resnick, 2000, p. 24). More recently, former premier Glen Clark stated in 1996 that “I don’t think there should be any special status for Quebec” (Ibid, p. 24). In his analysis of British Columbians’ reactions to the Calgary Declaration (of 1997), Resnick (2000) found that several participants were confused about the meaning of the
terms 'distinct' and 'unique' for Québec. More importantly, they feared that recognizing a 'distinct' Québec could only increase the fragmentation of Canadian society.

Mobility rights, pan-Canadian social developments like medicare and equalization payments to which all Canadians — or more precisely all provinces — are entitled, have contributed in many ways to create not only a state-based nationalism (after World War II), but also a belief among many British Columbians that Canadians have all contributed, in one way or another, to their representation of Canada and Canadian citizenship. For example, francophone Québécois of the 19th century, are considered by some B.C. students as 'fathers' of this pan-Canadian nation. As one Canadian-born student puts it:

I just visited there [Québec] a couple of months ago. I assume that it's quite different, and French definitely comes before English in all things. But it's very bilingual. I'm not exactly sure how come [pause] a lot of people want to separate, how come they're not feeling as pleased with Canada as we are. They were kinda the original Canadians, so they're kinda more rooted in Canada than we are over here in B.C. I would think that they would want Canada to kinda come together and work this problem out, stay as a strong nation that we are. (student, female)

Almost half of student interviewees were ready to accept that Québécois feel 'distinct' and share some provincial powers, but just like British Columbians may feel they have a regional-provincial identity shaped by geographical, economical, and historical trends. As one student notes:

To us it's not a matter of French versus English, it's more an East-West kinda thing. I see like us drifting away from East Coast [...]. [The problem is that]
we're studying Québec within our own country which is like several-countries-big. (student, male)

This regional-provincial vision of Canada is clearly expressed in the authorized B.C. social studies (grade 11) textbook on government, which makes some parallels between Québécois and British Columbians. The authors write:

Many Canadians, when in Canada, tend to take on a provincial identity and to refer to themselves as British Columbians or Ontarians, Newfoundlanders or Québécois. When travelling overseas, however, they take on a national identity and call themselves “Canadians”. In fact, most Canadians have both a national and a provincial sense of themselves. (Bartlett et al., 1989, p. 170).

Resnick (2000) found similar statements in the discourse of B.C. political leaders and opinion-makers. For example, former premier Rita Johnston stated in 1991 that “British Columbia and Quebec have much in common” (as quoted in Resnick, 2000, p. 26). In the same way, the minister of intergovernmental affairs, Andrew Petter, argued in 1997 that “British Columbia is a province that has long aspired, like Quebec, to have greater autonomy and self-determination [...]” (ibid., p. 26). Perhaps the most telling remark came in an editorial of the Vancouver Sun in 1998 which stated that “[n]either Ottawa nor the other provinces should concede special leverage to Quebec. It is just another province, like BC, trying to get more out of Ottawa” (Vancouver Sun, 1998, p. A18).

What seems to be clear from all these statements is that B.C. regionalism helps students draw some parallels with their counterparts in Québec also asking for more autonomy and respect from the federal government. But, as Simpson has argued — writing about British Columbians’ responses to the Calgary Declaration — this regional understanding of Canada in 281
the west is far from accommodating Québécois, who ask for a recognition of their 'national province.' As he puts it:

Nine of 10 British Columbians [...] believe it is important that Quebec remain in Canada [...] Equalization, which takes money out of B.C. for redistribution elsewhere [in the nation], was supported by 81 percent of respondents [...].

[But] the declaration, in the words of one wise observer, is simply a "candle in the window" for Quebec [...]. (as quoted in Friesen, 1999, p. 176).

Of these student interviewees, some were ready to grant, in one way or another, some forms of recognition or power to Québec only. They thought status quo was no longer acceptable and that Canadians really needed to take actions to solve the 'unity problem.' These students rooted their claims on different grounds which I labelled 'multicultural' and 'multinational' in reference to the two conceptions of citizenship elaborated earlier in this thesis.

Most B.C. students who were ready to grant some form of recognition to Québec believe that multiculturalism is the solution. They argue that while our society is increasingly diversified, the Canadian state has responded remarkably well to cultural pluralism with the policy of multiculturalism. For them, cultural identities are central to citizens' survival; losing one's culture and, thus, assimilating with the mainstream is something that we cannot reasonably ask people to accept. Proponents of a multicultural citizenship argue, therefore, that in this country — seen as the 'great Canadian mosaic'— we need to accommodate Québécois because of their distinct culture in Canada. One student comments on this multicultural approach to Canadian citizenship.

I'm very biased from the West Coast. We see that we're giving concessions to them [Québécois] all the time, but yet, they're still the original Canadians and they set up this nation. We think that Canada equals multiculturalism almost
if the two main cultures in a multicultural society cannot live with each other, then what does that say about multiculturalism at all? So maybe they should try to prove that this can work. (student, male)

From this perspective, Québécois (with their distinct culture and language) are seen as one historical ‘ethnic group’ that helped shaped this nation. In trying to build a homogeneous state, they believe that Canadians undermine their chances of adequately including ‘marginalized’ ethnic groups. As a result, multiculturalism, with its emphasis on recognizing the importance of preserving and enhancing the ethno-cultural heritage of Canadians, offers a better solution for all Canadians, including immigrants and Québécois. Relying on their positive experience in Canada, they infer that multiculturalism can work for Québécois too.

Personally, I don't see much difference between them [Québécois and English-Canadians]. I mean, it's just a different culture, but does that mean that it shouldn't be accepted within Canada? Because if they have kinda founded our history, don't they have the right to keep their culture as well? That's how I see it. (student, female)

In the Québec case study, some immigrant students came up with similar statements, arguing that in the present context there is no need to secede even if francophone Québécois represents a minority in Canada. In other words, they do not view secession as a necessary condition for the survival of Québécois.

Je ne sais pas c'est quoi le but de se séparer du Canada au complet. Je sais qu'ils [souverainistes] veulent faire un pays, ils se sentent minoritaires, mais en se séparant du Canada ça va donner quoi au juste? Tu vas être dans le gouffre total. (student, male)
I showed earlier (in section 6.2) that the emphasis on multicultural education in social studies programs has largely contributed to the belief that multiculturalism provides a unique way for various ethnic groups to express publicly their cultural particularities without fear of discrimination or prejudice. It helps to increase tolerance among people who hold different and sometimes competing ideologies, and encourages integration into a common citizenship. From that perspective, we can argue that multicultural education favours, in a certain way, the recognition of Québec’s distinctiveness by encouraging students to respect and even appreciate different cultural ideologies within a single state.

I think [multiculturalism] is good because you get to [pause] meet new people from other places, learn about [pause] them, and about their language or country or where they came from, and what it was like back in their own town, or city, or school. Ah, it’s good, it gives you an open mind. (student, male)

Put differently, multicultural citizenship helps accommodate diversity in Canada. It makes people of various origins feel more comfortable within our institutions, as well as more aware of the negative consequences of cultural oppression. As one student puts it:

From what I’ve heard, I think [secession] is because they are feeling that their culture is becoming [pause] sort of pushed into the ground. And so, I think that’s sort of a shame for us because it is a culture that’s rich in the history of Canada. (student, female)

Still, one major difficulty with this view of Canada, as Taylor (1993) notes, is that it acknowledges only what he calls the “first level of diversity” (p. 182), that is, a respect of cultural diversity within the limits of the nation-state. Indeed, proponents of multicultural citizenship do not necessarily question the nation-state model to justify their socio-political
arrangements. They often assume that accommodating diversity does not imply re-evaluating the concepts of nation and state, but only making both more attentive to and respectful of pluralism.

Consequently, if multiculturalism helps students to appreciate Québec as a distinct ethnic group, it cannot explain why they are entitled to certain collective rights (self-government, language, education) that are not offered to others. This is the reason why Kymlicka (1995) makes a clear distinction between multicultural or ‘polyethnic’ rights and national rights. Ethnic groups, he asserts, want some form of recognition and ‘group-differentiated’ rights. But what they seek are rights intended, “to help ethnic groups and religious minorities express their cultural particularity and pride without it hampering their success in the economical and political institutions of the dominant society” (p. 31). In other words, these rights are intended to promote integration into the larger society (or nation). They are not rights for national groups for political autonomy. This distinction between multicultural and national rights is often neglected in multicultural education. The consequence is that students tend to confuse the two, believing that Québécois can be accommodated by multiculturalism in Canada.

Finally, two students were ready to accept that Québec is a distinct ‘nation’ in Canada. They support a multinational view of citizenship. One student, originally from Québec, had a good knowledge and experience of this ‘national province,’ which helped him to accept its distinct national character.

I pretty much go there every year kinda thing [...]. I can understand if you never went there and say “Well, who cares if they separate?” But, I mean, once you’ve been there you can’t really say “Yeah, I want them to separate” [...]. [So] I can understand them wanting to preserve their French culture, their French language. But I don't think that [secession] is necessary. I mean, they can have their own distinct society. Well, I don't know [pause] [...]. It's kinda hard to say, but yeah I can live with it. (student, male)
The other student was from Africa (Kenya). She had never been to Québec and all she knew about Québécois was from her limited experience in B.C. As she puts it:

Personally, I wish I knew them [Québécois] because I know so little. I don't know barely anything. (student, female)

One of these student interviewees suggests that Canadian citizens have to accept Québécois for who they are, although she raises the point that most Canadians, in her experience, are not ready to face that reality yet. A great majority of Canadians, she believes, continue to support a traditional view of Canada.

I wouldn't have a problem with that [accepting them as a distinct nation]. But I don't think we're that accepting of each other yet [...]. I think that [it] would be sad [if they separate] because, like, we've been a country for so long. And then, to separate now because we just can't agree on those things [pause], I don't think that's fair. (student, female)

Finally, if these two students thought that Canada could include more than one nation, surprisingly, they refused to view themselves as members of a distinct 'English-Canadian' nation. They were exclusively inclined to acknowledge that others, like Québécois, view themselves differently, that these people could be Canadian because they belong to a nation constituting Canada. One student comments on her national identity.

Like, we're all Canadians. OK, I am originally from this country or that country, you know, but we're all Canadians here. (student, female)

This finding confirms Taylor's (1993) and Kymlicka's (1998) arguments. Both argue that English-Canadians are not linguistic nationalists. "English-speaking Canadians," Kymlicka
(1998) argues, "have little or no sense of group identity" (p. 155) despite their regional or provincial allegiance. Since they are part of the majority culture, they do not feel the need of adopting a conception of nationalism that would exclude certain Canadians. Most of them think the federal system protects their national interests — but not always their ‘regional’ ones — and allows for some provincial or regional variations. In other words, there is no need for them to create a nation, with separate national institutions, to protect their ‘common good’ (such as the English language, unrestricted mobility rights, social entitlements). I agree with Kymlicka that were it not for Quebec, Canadian federalism would have probably succumbed to a much more centralized federal system, just like the American federation.

In conclusion, I asked Quebec students interviewees what they thought about B.C. The intent of this question was not to discover if they view this western province as a ‘distinct’ nation, since they do not, but to understand more about their social, geographical, and political representations of Canada. For most of them, even those who had visited the province, B.C. is depicted as a an exotic region, a ‘green place’ of grandiose panoramas with giant old growth trees, the Pacific ocean, the Coastal mountains, and grizzly bears. Its mild winter, compared to the harsh Quebec ones, was also mentioned repetitively with a tone of envy.

Quand je suis allé [à Vancouver], le paysage c'est vraiment extraordinaire.

T'as beaucoup de places vertes, des montagnes […]. (student, male)

Je retiens que la Colombie-Britannique c'est une province pluvieuse, et surtout qu'il y a plus d'arbres [qu'ici]. (student, female)

Others stress its booming economy, job opportunities, skyscrapers, and multi-ethnic population. The recent arrival of illegal immigrants (aliens) on the West Coast was also noticed by certain students who viewed it as an ‘Asian destination’ in North America.
C’est vrai c’est l’océan pacifique, les belles montagnes et tout ça mais ils ont une bonne économie, des beaux “buildings”. Ils ont aussi beaucoup d’ethnies, des personnes de l’Asie et tout ça. C’est vrai que des fois les personnes arrivent comme immigrants illégaux, mais ils ont une bonne économie. (student, male)

[En Colombie-Britannique] il y des “jobs” et des quartiers avec beaucoup de Chinois et puis des montagnes. (student, female)

One immigrant student believes the climate, the easygoing way of life, and the multi-ethnicity of B.C.’s population make it a welcoming environment for people like him.  

Je vois Vancouver, la Colombie-Britannique, comme un endroit où il fait bon vivre. Il fait beau, il fait chaud, il n’y a pas de neige en tant que tel puis c’est comme [pause] je pourrais dire que si j’irais là-bas [sic] je me sentirais déjà accepté. (student, male)

Others, finally, argue that all they know about British Columbians are stereotypes because they either do not have much information about this English-Canadian province or have never been ‘there.’ One student adds that because they do not learn B.C. history, they have great difficulties understanding this distant western province.

Je ne connais pas grand chose [de la Colombie-Britannique]. A part que ça été reliée avec le chemin de fer. Moi j’ai les rocheuses [comme image]. Je sais, c’est un stéréotype pas mal. Mais on [ne] connais pas grand chose […].

(student, male)
Je pense toute suite à la mer parce qu'il y a la mer à côté. J'ai toujours aimé la mer. Deuxièmement je vais penser aux rocheuses et, peut-être quelques villes qui vont me sauter au visage. Mais après ça, on ne connaît pas leur histoire.

(student, male)

Analysis of the grade 10 history program confirms that B.C. does not appears at all in the document. It is always implied in the objectives dealing with ‘Canadian realities,’ ‘Canadian regions,’ or pan-Canadian events like the ‘territorial expansion’ or policies such as the ‘National Policy.’

During my research, I realized that students, whether in Québec or in B.C., have little experience of their country as a whole. If they are increasingly mobile, this mobility does not seem to be horizontal (east-west) or strictly oriented toward Canada. Ironically, in this period of globalization, characterized by greater mutual exchanges and unrestrained mobility, students do not necessarily travel more within their own country. Not so long ago, for example, it would have been totally unrealistic for a single researcher to conduct a doctoral research of two Canadian cases separated by over 5000 km. In this research, I was able to visit both schools within 24 hours; something no student interviewee ever experienced.

When I asked where they had been, only two Québec students said they had visited B.C. and only two B.C. students lived in or visited Québec. Students, and perhaps Canadians in general, seem to be more interested in travelling internationally or simply heading south rather than (re)discovering their country. One Québec-born student, commenting on his experiences in Canada and the United States, argues that Vancouver is so foreign to him that it is virtually part of another country.

Je suis déjà allé là une couple de fois [au Canada anglais], souvent aux Etats-Unis pour des petites vacances de temps en temps. J'avoue que ça fait bizarre
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d'entendre Vancouver, on dirait que c'est dans un autre pays. Mais dans le
fond, c'est le même pays, c'est ici, c'est au Canada […] (student, male)

One B.C. student, whose parents have been to Québec, puts it this way:

Last summer, like, my parents went to [pause] visit the east side of Canada and
then the tour guide could speak fluent English but when they travelled to
Montreal [pause] they had a hard time. They really had a hard time with the
language. So, I don't know too much about people in Montreal. But besides
Montreal, they went to Toronto and Ottawa and they think that those places
are great! (student, male)

9.3 Conclusion
In this chapter, I have presented B.C. and Québec students' understandings of
nationalism, patriotism, and national identity. I have shown that in both cases, students do accord
an importance to those theoretical concepts despite some popular myths around their too
individualistic or segregated sense of belonging. Much of the critique around students' collective
identity may come from the fact that students suggest a very different conception of the nation
than the older ideals used in Canada or even in their history/social studies classes. In this sense,
the matter at hand is not so much their lack of national identity and patriotism but their twenty-
first century views of Canada, Québec, and citizenship. These student interviewees have adopted
more inclusive and democratic collective identities, which no longer refer to a backward
nostalgia to be carried over or to a moral obligation to old allegiances and historical figures and
events. These heroes and events have no clear impact on their collective identity and, as such, are
not perceived as necessary for the links they make between the past, their present, and their
future.
From one perspective, this modern nationalist attitude among students is remarkable. It has freed them from a static, non-interpretative vision of history, not open to discussion or criticism. In rejecting the role of certain past historical figures or patriotic events, students have greater chances to avoid what Létourneau (1998) calls "la vénération des origines et le culte des ancêtres" (p. 414). But, from another perspective, it has placed students in a precarious historical situation. Many have great difficulty understanding that knowledge of the past is necessary if we are to get to the bottom of the social, political, national, and educational questions Canadians face today. In other words, to prepare 'their' future, young citizens inextricably need to learn from the past in school. But to accomplish this task, as Dumont (1997) notes, history/social studies teachers must have the adequate training in the discipline.

Similarly, saying that B.C. and Québec students have adopted more inclusive and future-oriented forms of national identity and patriotism should not hide the fact that some students on both sides have different understandings of their nation. While a growing number of immigrant students, and certain Canadian-born ones, imagine their country as a multicultural nation-state, a relatively important number of francophone Québec-born, as well as certain immigrant, students view their province as their 'true' nation, and potentially sovereign state. For them, Canada is not a traditional nation-state, but a clearly multinational state.

Nonetheless, unlike the earlier theoretical discussion of multicultural and multinational citizenship (chapter 1 and 2), it is not so clear from this chapter that B.C. and Québec student interviewees have adopted totally distinct conceptions of nationalism, patriotism, and citizenship. In fact, there are several parallels between the views of B.C. and Québec informants; parallels that, in my opinion, largely emanate from what Létourneau (2000b) calls the "réalité des ancrages multiples et croisés" (p. 115) of Québec and English-Canadian citizens. Student interviewees now have multiple attachments, experiences, historical references and links, as well
as political aspirations which allow them to imagine (and live in) political communities that are not necessarily well articulated in political theory.

Yet, this complex reality should not eclipse the fact that very few B.C. students are ready to accept and support officially the multinational character of Canada held by most Québécois in general. Beyond multicultural education, programs and teaching practices seem to have done little to enhance empathy or to change the views of English-Canadians on Québec and Québécois. For students and also social studies teachers of the West Coast, Québec’s aspirations are often confused with the discourse of regionalism. Territorial tensions between ‘Western’ and ‘Eastern’ Canada make several students feel that Québécois are asking for more power just like B.C. wishes to have a stronger voice and a better representation in the political system. The actual level of knowledge of Canadian history and politics among students does not really help the situation. Many B.C. student interviewees confess they do not feel prepared to make informed decisions on many political issues such as Québec nationalism. They believe they simply do not know enough about current issues that affect their lives as citizens. And, as one B.C. social studies teacher confessed, as long as Québec is viewed in citizenship education as une province comme les autres, there is no evidence suggesting that the situation will change for the better in the near future.

I don't feel as if I've learned that much about [Québec]. I mean, we're kinda aware that there's a problem, but it's kinda over there. I don't really know the exact details of what's going on, so I think that we're more concerned about B.C. and Canada as a whole. Maybe the Education, the Ministry of Education, doesn't feel that Québec, the province, deserves a whole big chunk of time in the curriculum, although it's kinda a pressing issue right now. (student, female)
Last year, we talked about [Québec] quite a bit, about the separation issue, and just the fact that there was an election. But not really the issues behind the issues. So, I really have no idea why they want to separate.

(student, male)

In the same way, Québec history programs and teacher informants do not offer clear understandings of the different regional views of English Canada. The way the grade 10 history curriculum is designed (Québec vs. Canada) and taught in class does not really help the situation in Canada. In my opinion, it is clear that cosmopolitanism, and its recurrent emphasis on greater mutual exchanges, unrestrained mobility and rights, and post-national identities, as well as our recent experience with multiculturalism have not necessarily helped the national unity question in Canada. On the contrary, the nature of history and social studies education in both Québec and B.C. may have unintentionally contributed to a drift toward very different conceptions of the imagined community that has resulted in our current political malaise. It is ironic that in 1968 Hodgetts came to the conclusion that French and English-speaking Canadian students were raised on different views of Canadian history and could not possibly understand each other fully (Hodgetts, 1968, p. 80).

1 This comment was taken before the government of Ontario ruled, in a new regulation to make schools ‘safer,’ and encourage respect, that in order “to promote good citizenship and encourage a respectful learning of environment, students in all publicly funded schools across Ontario will be singing O Canada as part of opening or closing exercises” (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2000, p. 1).

2 For a detailed analysis of British Columbians’ views on Québec, including policy-makers and political leaders, see chapters 2, 3, and 4 of Resnick (2000).
CHAPTER 10

X. CONCLUSION

In this concluding chapter, I will first provide a brief review of the problem investigated, the purpose of the study, and the justification for investigating it. I will also re-examine the qualitative methods used for this multiple case study as well as the limits of this research (section 1). Then, I will discuss the findings of this research by trying to answer the question: what do we learn from these two case studies? (section 2). Finally, in the last section, I will briefly discuss the implications of this study for citizenship education in Canada and for further research in the area (section 3).

10.1 Review of this study

In this thesis, I have argued that the future of democracy is dependent on the education of young citizens. The civic competencies that permit citizens to think, deliberate, participate, and ultimately live democratically are not innate; they have to be learned. Citizenship education helps develop in the students these competencies essential to citizenship in democracy. Canadian schools, and more specifically school subjects such as history and social studies, have thus been identified by the state as the critical link between education and citizenship, and the locus from which democratic citizens emerge.

Yet, the increased pluralism in Canadian society and the resurgence of Québec nationalism influence critically the way English-Canadian and Québécois citizens understand their citizenship in this country. The consequence for today is that there is no general consensus in Canadian education on the values, ideals, and practices that citizenship education should embody. Faced with such challenges, which citizenship concept is appropriate for citizenship
education? I believe that Canada, with its nationally divided and ethnically diverse population, provides an interesting laboratory for analyzing future conceptions of citizenship education.

Based on a review of literature in political theory, I have shown that two emerging concepts of citizenship seem to drive the political agenda and influence conceptions of citizenship and citizenship education. On the one hand, many Canadians (particularly in English Canada) have developed in the last thirty years a 'multicultural' conception of citizenship closely tied to the development of the Canadian state and a pan-Canadian civic nationalism. This citizenship is also strongly influenced by the adoption of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, along with a federal policy of multiculturalism. These people now group themselves around a vision of the nation that includes all Canadian members, whatever their language, culture, or origins, from sea to sea. Their loyalty to Canada is premised on the view that all Canadians form a single nation-state and that citizenship education should act to promote that 'reality.' From this perspective, there seems to be no incompatibility between regional/provincial attachment and interests (as in B.C.) and the formation of a strong national identity and patriotism.

On the other hand, many Québécois (particularly francophones) claim they have not been well served by this approach to citizenship. Instead of seeing their country as a multicultural nation, they view it as a 'multinational' state, that is, a state made up of two distinct national entities. These people have developed what I have called a 'multinational' citizenship since they belong to both a nation and a state, but not to a traditional nation-state. Their citizenship is officially Canadian, but their sense of belonging to the state is combined with a strong attachment to and participation in their national province, Québec. For them, the nation and the state are, therefore, conceptually distinct. This, I have shown, contrasts drastically with the regional/provincial attachment and vision many Canadians (including British Columbians) have of their country.
Faced with such a situation, I have proposed to define citizenship as a desirable activity where the quality of one’s citizenship is a function of rights, participation, and membership in the affairs of the communities and state to which one belongs. From this definition, citizenship is not simply a status conferred by the state but an activity which takes into consideration the divergent conceptions Canadians may have of their country. Similarly, the key concepts (citizenship rights, pluralism, participation, identity) contained in the development of citizenship (chapter 2) and the literature review (chapter 3) were used as sensitizing concepts in this research.

Because no one is born into a particular conception of citizenship, citizens must develop the necessary civic competencies or ‘virtues’ to play an active role in public affairs. I have shown that public education has historically placed a significant role in this ‘political enterprise’ (Oldenquist, 1980). The task of educating everyone to become citizens was too important and too vital to be left to the private sector. For various moral, political, and educational reasons, school subjects such as history and social studies were assigned a prominent role in this enterprise (see Clark, 1997). All these subjects were designed, not only to convey knowledge, but to create a sense of national identity and patriotism (Osborne, 1997b).

Until the 1960s, this national identity was defined essentially in ethno-religious terms, defining either the French-Canadian *pures laines* (‘pure wool’) or the British-Canadians. In the late 1960s, all citizenship education programs in Canada moved away from the earlier rhetoric of ‘Anglo-conformity’ or French-Canadian nationalism and accepted that Canada was a country of cultural, religious, and regional differences. Human rights and law-related education have also received increased attention in the official curriculum in the last thirty years. They were seen as new elements in the definition of citizenship and citizenship education.

Yet, studies have shown that citizenship education continues to rely heavily on a traditional conception of Canada based on the nation-state (see Sears et al., 1998). The country is
still viewed as a nation made up of ten equal provinces having no need to recognize the special
demands of Québécois or aboriginal peoples. Canada and Canadians, for Sears and Hughes
(1996), are still presented in ‘conservative terms’ in citizenship education. None of the official
curricula analyzed in English-Canadian provinces encourages teachers or students to reconsider
their understandings of Canada as a multicultural nation-state. Rather, they obscure the tensions
between Québec and English Canada in discussions about multiculturalism, diversity, and
regionalism. Similarly, some commentators (Granatstein, 1998; Nemni, 1996) have argued that
Québec citizenship education programs and textbooks are constructed to favour the formation of
Québec sovereignists at the expense of any feeling of attachment to Canada.

Unfortunately, recent studies in citizenship education discuss the issue essentially in
terms of policy statements and curricula. Since the publication of Hodgetts’ report on civic
education over 30 years ago (Hodgetts, 1968), “we have very little information on what is
actually going on in [English-Canadian and Québec] classrooms, or on how students or teachers
see the things” (Osborne, 1994, p. 27). Most recent studies are concerned with official curricula,
policy statements, and textbooks, which often convey to students some forms of ideal
citizenship. Very few scholars in the last decades have spent time in English-Canadian and
Québec classrooms studying citizenship education, and more importantly, how these ideas
become part of students’ lives. Instead, studies have attempted to reduce the problem to content
analysis and to equate official curricula with the taught and the learned curricula (Cuban, 1993).

For Sears (1996b), there is some indication that classroom practice may not be consistent with
policy in citizenship education. Literature in this area confirms that there is a gap between
‘policy’ and ‘practice.’ As a result, what goes on in classrooms with regard to citizenship
education “is an area in which extensive study is needed” (Sears, 1996b, p. 125).

Research in cognitive development has transformed the way educators understand
teaching and learning. Proponents of socio-constructivism have questioned the traditional
behaviourist approaches to education. They have shown that studying official curricula or history or social studies teachers in class may help to know more about what is going on in school, but cannot explain how students think and understand complex concepts such as citizenship.

The purpose of this dissertation was to describe and understand (1) what teachers formally and informally present to high school students in citizenship education, and more importantly (2) what students learn from these classes in B.C. and Québec. This research was a qualitative inquiry (Eisner, 1998; Glesne & Peshkin, 1992), using a multiple-case study design (Yin, 1994). Two multi-ethnic high schools, one in Québec and one in B.C., provided a window into history and social studies classrooms. These classes were used to examine how students construct and understand their citizenship in light of their schooling experience. The choice of multi-ethnic schools was related to my interest in pluralism and nationalism in education. In this study, 'multi-ethnic' referred to schools where the dominant language spoken is either French or English, and the student population represents the cultural diversity of Canadian urban centers. The classrooms were chosen since much of the burden of Canadian citizenship has officially been assigned to history (grade 10) in Québec and social studies (grade 11) classes in B.C. (see Osborne, 1996; Laville, 1997).

The study involved volunteer participants in classes of grade 10 (in Québec) and grade 11 (in B.C.) since history and social studies programs presenting Canadian content on citizenship are in large part found in those levels (see MEQ, 1982; B.C. Ministry of Education, 1997). For each case study, staff members were also included to provide a better understanding and analysis of the settings in which citizenship education classes are found. No specific information was recorded on the reasons why informants (students, teachers, staff) decided to participate in this thesis.
10.2 Review of the findings

The purpose of this dissertation was to describe and understand (1) what teachers formally and informally present to high school students in citizenship education, and (2) what students learn from these classes in B.C. and Québec. Findings will, therefore, be reviewed in this section according to these two broad categories: the teaching of citizenship and the learning of citizenship.

10.2.1 The teaching of citizenship

The dominant point that, I believe, emerges from this thesis is the importance of ‘citizenship’ in history and social studies education. In both sites, documents and interviews recurrently emphasize the idea that citizenship education is the raison d’être of those school subjects. In Québec, this link between history and citizenship is so strong, so necessary and indisputable, that following the recommendations of the Task Force on the Teaching of History (1996) and the Task Force on Curriculum Reform (1997) the term ‘citizenship education’ will officially be part of all history courses (from grade 3 to grade 11) in the new programs that will be implemented by the Québec Ministry of Education. Similarly, the B.C. Social Studies Task Force (B.C. Ministry of Education, 1999) has argued that the subject of social studies has to address more explicitly social responsibility and citizenship because they are part of its rationale: prepare socially responsible citizens.

What this finding suggests is that history and social studies courses represent for both the state and teachers involved in this research two aspects of a single civic and political project, that is, to create citizens. But, this is not very revolutionary. When we look at the creation and evolution of those two school subjects in Canadian education, we see that history and social studies are part of the school curriculum primarily for political and civic reasons. Davis (1995) found that social studies were created largely “to stress citizenship education” (p. 23). Relying on
thinkers such as Dewey, progressive educators of the 1920s thought that students of the Western world urgently needed to get involved in the community and learn about democracy, social problems, and civic responsibilities. In 1968, the ‘B and B Commission’ concluded: “The study of the past goes beyond the abstraction of a liberal education […] Students are taught history because societies believe that it provides a desirable and necessary training for future citizens” (Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, 1968, pp. 282-284).

What is more interesting is that Davis and others (see Granatstein, 1998; Osborne, 1996) have claimed that the 1990s were characterized by the ‘disappearance’ of history and citizenship education in Canadian schools. “The 1990s” Osborne (1996) argues, “saw an explosion of debate about citizenship among philosophers and political theorists, but none of it touched education” (p. 54). This thesis provides contrasting results. Ministry documents, textbooks, and teacher informants, whether in B.C. or Québec, all lead to the conclusion that citizenship education is not ‘absent’ or ‘dead’ but present and alive in class. Far from displacing citizenship and history from school, globalization, multiculturalism/interculturalism, race relations, law-related education, and nationalism have in many ways contributed to the emergence of different forms of citizenship education that did not exist in the past. In this thesis, Québec history teachers and B.C. social studies teachers clearly recognized not only that citizenship is central to their teaching but that teaching is influenced by cultural and political ideologies. Québec nationalism, for one MSS history teacher, is not only present in the grade 10 history program, but part of his own understanding of history, citizenship, and education.

In my opinion, what is at issue is not the disappearance of citizenship education in school but the kind of citizenship education Canadian students receive in class. The teaching of citizenship in Canadian schools is no longer understood (at least rhetorically) as the passive transmission of a narrow conception of the nation and the state not open to conflicting interpretations. Some wrongly interpret this as an absence, or worst a failure of education for
Supporting Joanne Burgess' views on the poor results of first-year (university) students in Canadian studies, Granatstein (1998) concurs that “it is not the students but Canadian history courses in our high schools that have failed. And this failure we as a nation cannot afford” (p. 8). This view raises a number of troubling questions about citizenship education. For one thing, this way of understanding national history and citizenship in school has historically resulted in the promotion of a traditional teaching of (narrow) historical narratives, devoid of life or interest for students, what Dumont (1997) calls l’histoire-connaissance. Historical knowledge appears to something fixed by the authority; and this often leads students to believe there is only one ‘true’ story of the past to master. Also, there is no evidence suggesting that such an approach to history/social studies education does allow students to develop the various civic competencies needed to play an active role in democracy. On the contrary, studies (see Wertsch, 2000) have shown that students can ‘master’ historical narratives, that is, knowing how to use it (e.g., for an exam), without necessarily developing the ability to think, analyze, and criticize.

As a result, some Canadian scholars (Martineau & Laville, 1998; Seixas, 1997; Osborne, 1997a, 1997b; Sears & Hughes, 1996) have proposed making history/social studies education more in tune with the practice of democratic citizenship. The goal is to focus on the acquisition by teachers of the necessary abilities to help development in the students their own social, political, and historical orientations. As Osborne (2000) puts it, “the most urgent priority is to help history [and social studies] teachers teach their subject” (p. 432). Supporting this view, Seixas (2000) argues that history/social studies teachers not adequately trained in their subject tend to teach history/social studies as ‘fixed knowledge’ not open to conflicting interpretations and analysis (and too often from the prescribed textbook only). The result is that students are likely to receive it passively, often through traditional lectures, and subsequently develop negative attitudes toward history or social studies in general. More importantly, students taught
this way could withdraw from civil society convinced they do not possess the necessary
cOMPETENCIES TO PARTICIPATE ACTIVELY IN PUBLIC MATTERS (SEE ALSO MARTINEAU, 1999).

History/social studies teachers I met, whether in Québec or in B.C., talked about the
necessity in a democracy of introducing students to the methods and finding of history, and to
help them develop their own social, political, and historical orientations. But, at the same time,
they also recognized the difficulty of using these methods in their history and social studies
classes. If they sometimes use activities and the inquiry method, which call on students’ ability
to analyze and criticize, their teaching styles continue to be influenced by the behaviourist
paradigm, focused on the narration of particular historical accounts. Textbooks, worksheets, and
video clippings are not only perceived as necessary teaching aid, but often the only guides to
their lessons.

In the same way, the ethno-cultural and linguistic backgrounds of teacher informants (all
white, Canadian-born francophone or anglophone) reinforce certain conceptions of the nation,
the state, and citizenship. These conceptions are not always perceived by immigrant students or
students from ethnic minorities as being fully inclusive. During my observations, I found that
immigrant students do not participate actively in class. In both cases, the causes were (for
teachers and staff) linked to language adaptation. I believe, however, that the teaching
approaches of teachers, as well as the ways programs are elaborated (in B.C. and Québec) do
have a certain incidence on their participation and learning in class. As Osborne (1991) notes:

[T]eachers have a duty to connect what they want students to learn with their
existing knowledge and experience. It is not acceptable to treat the curriculum
as a given and then to find some way to push it into students […] . It must be
organized, and reorganized (and, where necessary, abandoned) so that they
find it accessible, worthwhile, and even interesting. (p. 149).
In my opinion, this is one reason why the Québec Ministry of Education (1998a) has mentioned in its policy statement on educational integration and intercultural education that school staff must urgently be trained adequately to meet the educational challenges associated with ethnocultural, linguistic, and religious diversity. In B.C., the 1999 Social Studies Task Force concluded that teachers avoid controversial and current issues related to race-relations, multiculturalism, or immigration. Part of the problem, the committee members argue, comes from inadequate support (from the school system) and training (see B.C. Social Studies Task Force, 1999, p. 3).

Finally, the two cases provide interesting findings with regard to programs, textbooks, and classrooms. In many ways, the programs and textbooks used in both PSS and MSS history and social studies classes have evolved considerably in the last thirty years. In 1970, Trudel and Jain (1970) found in their analysis of history textbooks that French and English-Canadians had totally different versions of Canadian history, with a focus on divergent periods, events, and personages. In both communities, textbooks usually presented a single, non-controversial, noninterpretative factual historical narrative, too often centered around the exploits of white, English/French, Protestant/Catholic, males. The history and social studies textbooks used in both schools now have little in common with those of the 1960s. If (divergent) political ideologies continue to have an influence on the construction of programs and textbooks, there is greater consideration for divergent points of view, minorities, historical methods, and students' own understandings. Various graphs, pictures, clippings, activities, and scenarios are included in both Québec and B.C. textbooks to help students develop their knowledge, abilities, and skills.

Similarly, Québec history and B.C. social studies programs are designed in a more constructivist way by paying attention to the study of evidence and the necessity of thinking historically. They also provide teachers with various activities, approaches, and supplementary information that can potentially be used in their own classes.
While there are similarities between the two cases (in terms of teaching), some contrasts are manifest. I found, for example, that B.C. social studies programs implemented in 1997 were more in tune with the multicultural reality of Canada than the Québec grade 10 history program (elaborated in the early 1980s). New programs will be implemented in Québec between 2001 and 2005. But, for the moment, what the grade 10 history program students learn in class is clearly outdated. Similarly, the Québec history program continues to have a Québec vs. Canada approach to history, while in B.C. the province is included in the program within the study of Canada. In other words, for British Columbians the study of their province and state is not seen in a dual mode as in Québec; both the province and the state are seen as complementary. There is little evidence that future programs in Québec and in B.C. (or English Canada in general) will get closer on this last point. Both political and ideological factors continue to play a key role in the elaboration of curricula, particularly in the area of citizenship education.

Finally, I was surprised to find in all classrooms visited an environment much more conducive for learning history, social studies, and citizenship than the barren, cold, white rooms described in Hodgetts' report. In all of them, there was much evidence showing visitors like myself that history or social studies were being taught in them. Despite an incongruous fountain found in one Québec history classroom and the right-angled walls and low ceiling of one B.C. portable, teachers tried to equip their classrooms to facilitate the teaching and learning of their subject. Posters, maps, thoughts, bookshelves, plants, 'creative' colors (pink, blue) all provided an overall tone which gave each room a personality.

In B.C., despite the individuality of each classroom, I felt that they all reflected a certain British Columbian atmosphere which was represented in the images of nature, sports, and Canadian institutions. In Québec, I was amazed by the fact that classrooms had a much more political tone with posters, thoughts, and maps centered around issues of nationalism, identity, and language. That being said, I also found in both cases that the use of blackboards and chalk,
as well as traditional classroom settings (individual desks in rows) were the norm in most classes observed. Rarely were students placed in a 'laboratory' setting to work in group or to share their ideas in a semi-circle arrangement. Such a setting, according to some (see Levine, 1998; Freie, 1997) would help students learn more adequately about community, dialogue, respect of different view points, and other fundamental aspects of democracy.

10.2.2 The learning of citizenship

Citizenship education takes on its full meaning when those who learn it in class can express their own views, concerns, and understandings. Learning, I have asserted, is far more complex than reproducing what is taught. It implies thinking, understanding, and reconstructing. The goal of this thesis was to know more about what students take with them when they leave their citizenship education classes. In this last part, findings will be reviewed according to the sensitising concepts presented in chapters 6, 8, and 9.

Some commentators have recently claimed that young Canadians tragically suffer from a lack of civic and historical knowledge and interest in Canada. Results from various ‘scientific’ surveys are used to support their point. As Osborne (2000) has noted, there appears to be something generational in the way a new citizenship crisis among youth reappears every now and then in Canadian education. However, B.C. and Québec students I met do not support such alarming conclusions. Their understandings of the nation, state, and citizenship have little in common with the criticism of some on their level of civic ignorance and apathy. Although my results are based on students’ own perceptions and cannot be generalized to the entire Canadian student population, I believe they offer hope in several ways.

The first aspect of citizenship that I discussed with students was citizenship rights. The intent was not to assess what they know exactly about rights (civil, political, social), but to understand more about their conceptions of rights and citizenship in democracy. In both cases, I
found students who had developed an attitude toward citizenship rights fairly consistent with the liberal democratic principles that underlie our political culture. For them, a country cannot function democratically without due respect to the equality of individuals (regardless of gender, ethnicity, and so forth). In their interviews, they repeatedly stressed the rights, freedoms, and opportunities they have in this democratic country. No distinction was apparent between Québécois and British Columbians on this point. The Charter of Rights and Freedoms was often given in example by students as a symbol of respect for rights and freedoms. For some immigrant students, their experience in their home-country gave them a means of comparison between here and there, between liberal democracy and (too often) oppression and dictatorship. From this point of view, it is clear that these ‘new’ Canadians exhibited a certain pride (and loyalty) with reference to living in Canada.

As other studies (see Sears et al., 1998) have shown, these findings are fairly consistent with the views expressed in citizenship education programs in Canada. I have confirmed that both Québec history and B.C. social studies programs and textbooks have explicit references to citizenship rights. Class observations and interviews with teachers also determined that rights are also an important aspect covered in class; so important that two teachers (one in Québec and one in B.C.) claimed students have become aware of their inherent democratic rights even in the school system. They are more conscious of what is legally and morally acceptable for their development and autonomy.

I also found in this section that several students, particularly in B.C., implicitly talked about the social rights provided through the welfare state. In making comparison either with the United States or their home-country, they suggested that Canada has a better public education system and medicare system. Certain scholars (see Gilbert, 1996) have argued that in a welfare state, while all three types of rights (civil, political, social) are important, it is the third one which
usually holds the greatest potential for citizens because it related to “the equitable redistribution of access to normally expected levels of wellbeing” (p. 51).

In terms of participation, I found that in both cases the large majority of student informants regarded participation in public affairs as an important civic responsibility. They emphasised the necessity of voting, when they become full citizens, and caring for the good of their communities (school, local, provincial, national, global). No distinction was made between their province or their state, even in Québec. Some talked about the beliefs that each citizen can make a difference in the political process. Others stressed the importance of exercising a right that is central to democracy. Those who held that full citizenship implies participation also had a sense of political trust and confidence in our democratic institutions and representatives. Some, in Québec and in B.C., suggested that Canadian politicians, compared to other countries, are less corrupt and doing a much better job for their fellow citizens. On this last point, immigrant students, for various reasons, tended to be more enthusiastic about the democratic nature of Canada than Canadian-born students.

When looking at the documents, I found that the grade 10 history program in Québec and the grade 11 social studies program in B.C. offer some references to ‘active’ or ‘responsible’ citizenship in their rationale and detailed objectives. However, both have been severely criticized recently by various commentators (particularly during the reform of education in Québec) for their lack of clear emphasis on active citizenship skills (see B.C. Social Studies Task Force, 1999; MEQ, 1998a, CSE, 1998). As a result, both Ministries claimed that major changes will be made to history and social studies programs in the near future.

In this context, it is not surprising that some student informants (a minority) in both cases were categorically cynical about our politicians and democratic institutions. For one B.C. student, political parties, elections, and politicians are part of a ‘masquerade.’ For others, as in Québec, politicians are elected, but corruption and lies often motivate their personal aspirations.
In my opinion, if these young people do not change their minds, they sooner or later will join all those Canadian citizens who believe that our representatives are crooked, with no moral ideal. These people have, in many ways, lost confidence in our institutions and implicitly decided to put their efforts in their private affairs. They are referred to as ‘atomized individuals’ in Barber’s analysis of citizenship education in the United States. I have noticed that all these students were generally those who expressed a relatively narrow and limited understanding of politics and civic participation, reducing everything to ‘elections’ and ‘referenda.’ For Barber (1992), these individuals are also people ‘without strings, without givens, and ultimately, without responsibilities.’

I have argued, however, that democracy is much more than a mere system of government in which people can participate every four or five years in the selection of their representatives. In a participatory democracy, the commitments of citizens (including students) go well beyond participation in electoral/referendum process. It is ultimately a ‘way of life’ based upon moral principles concerning how citizens ought to live democratically. The central idea is that people should be closely and extensively involved in voicing their opinions and making decisions that affect collectively their lives and freedoms.

Based on this conception of democracy, I asked students if they were engaged in their school and community. Again, my intention was not to assess the influence of student participation on public decisions, but to understand more about their commitments as young citizens. In both schools, I was surprised in my observations, as well as in my interviews, by the level of involvement of student informants in school and community affairs. Most of them, whether in Québec or in B.C., declared a moral responsibility to participate in the life of their school or their neighbourhood. Similar observations were made by school administrators interviewed at MSS and PSS. Newsletters, posters in the school, and local newspapers often highlighted the activities and success of students in various sports, clubs, and organizations.
One B.C. student linked this level of participation to the fact that they are the senior students of their school and feel an obligation to be involved, and to play a leading role. Others felt that participation in school activities (dances), organizations (student council), sports (basketball), and clubs (multicultural/intercultural) were important for developing democratic skills and acquiring a sense of belonging to the group. A small number, finally, mentioned they prefer to participate in more 'personal ways' in the school life (peer tutoring, foreign language assistance) or simply concentrate on their own academic achievement.

I recognize that the student informants, who voluntarily agreed to participate in the study, were possibly part of the group of students in school who tend to be more active and outspoken than the majority. This would help explain why so many of them were engaged in their school life. Yet, it is difficult to advance clear conclusions on this point because teachers and administrators who also participated in the study corroborated their comments. And, my observations also led in the same direction.

Having reviewed citizenship rights and participation, I will now move on to the two sensitising concepts (cultural pluralism and identity) which, I believe, provide more contrasting conclusions. In both cases, citizenship education programs agree with the necessity of being committed to cultural pluralism for creating an inclusive democratic citizenship. Textbooks and, in some ways, teaching practices are also sensitive to the necessity of recognizing the diverse, multi-ethnic heritage of Canada. Yet, the approaches taken by both provinces to deal with cultural pluralism have been different. Following the adoption of the federal Multicultural Act in 1988 and the B.C. Multicultural policy in 1990, multicultural education is today integral to social studies education in that province. Prescribed textbooks at PSS support in various ways multicultural education.

B.C. student informants are children of the 'multicultural era.' For most of them, all they know about Canada and Canadian is multicultural. One or two immigrant students even learned
in their home-country the consequences of intolerance and extreme ethnic allegiance. In this context, it is not surprising that students, whether Canadian-born or immigrant, thought multiculturalism was the solution to cultural pluralism. They rejected ‘Anglo-conformity’ as the only way of being good citizens, good Canadians. They did not see multiculturalism as a way of segregating people according to their ethnic background. Student interviewees, particularly immigrants, found a compatibility between multiculturalism and common citizenship. On the one hand, multiculturalism allows people to express their ‘double-sided’ or limited identities without fear of public discrimination. On the other hand, it encourages people to progressively adapt to the dominant society.

In this context, student informants did not express any discontent about color, dress, or mental characteristics of immigrant students or students from ethnic minorities in their interviews or in my observations in class. I found, however, that language segregation was a key factor in reinforcing prejudice in B.C. The administration as well as the multicultural club of the school took the situation very seriously. Various activities and information sessions were prepared on multiculturalism and anti-racism. But, studies have shown that such initiatives are often superficial and do not necessarily lead to better understanding of diversity and anti-racism.

Yet, immigrant students I met expressed no feeling of having been discriminated against in school. These findings, I believe, corroborate the conclusions of other studies showing that “a lot has happened in citizenship education over the past 25 or 30 years” (Sears, 1994b, p. 122).

In Québec, the approach to cultural diversity has been different than that of B.C. (or English Canada in general). Québec has always feared that multiculturalism would reduce the national culture of Québécois to one of the various cultures forming the ‘Canadian mosaic.’ As Balthazar (1996) puts it, “Quebeckers have […] reasons to suspect multiculturalism, for it has been presented as if the Francophones’ culture was just one of the various cultures that form the Canadian mosaic” (p. 93). As a result, Québec has adopted a policy of ‘interculturalism’ more
consistent with Québécois’ understandings of Canadian citizenship. A comparison between the Québec policy and the Canadian policy of multiculturalism shows many similarities. The Québec policy, however, makes the limits of diversity more explicit, focusing on the ‘non-negotiable’ requirements such as the French language embedded in the moral contract.

Although the grade 10 history program was elaborated before the implementation of the policy, it supports some of the goals of interculturalism. For example, one of its learning outcomes is to help students be aware of the diversity of Québec population and of citizens’ belongings. Yet, the program developed almost 20 years ago has been strongly criticized by the Task Force on the Teaching of History (1996) for its lack of emphasis (in all the modules) on the contributions of ethnocultural groups in the shaping of Québec and Canadian history. The report legitimately recommended, therefore, that the new programs pay special attention to the historicity of the presence of ethnocultural groups in Québec and Canada. Similarly, it rightfully suggested that teachers (mostly white francophone) adapt their teaching practices to the ethnocultural values and attitudes of the student-body, particularly in the Greater Montréal Area where most immigrants settle. In this context, student informants recognized that they probably learn more about interculturalism through different agencies of interculturalism such as the school environment than in their citizenship education classes.

I found that both Québec-born and immigrant students have developed an attitude toward cultural pluralism that is similar to that of students in the B.C. case study. For these students, Québec is no longer a province of white, francophone, pure laine and Catholics. Their classrooms, school, neighbourhood, and city represent for them a rich multi-ethnic environment where students can learn from people of various ethnocultural and linguistic backgrounds. From this point of view, the difference between Québec and B.C. student informants is not so much in terms of attitudes found in the two groups (since they are relatively similar) but in the nature of the society in which they live. In the Québec case study, most Québec-born francophone, and
some immigrant, students talked about the necessity of preserving or adopting French as the common public language. This ‘non-negotiable’ requirement is perceived as essential to maintain a cohesive (national) society: la société québécoise. In B.C., some student informants also talked about the necessity of a common public language: English. But unlike the Québec case study, this requirement, implicit in multiculturalism, is not so explicit in educational policies and practices. As the language of English-Canadians seems already protected (by the fact they are the dominant linguistic group), most anglophones do not think their language needs to be protected. And, as long as they feel it is not threatened they will not consciously take measures to protect it.

That being said, I believe both B.C. and Québec student informants are tolerant and open to multiculturalism/interculturalism not so much because they have been told to be in class, but because the multi-ethnic world they live in demands it. If we consider students’ comments on their history/social studies classes and teachers, the socio-educational environment in which students find themselves may, in fact, have a greater influence on their attitudes or, at least, provides a better explanation why these students have adopted a more liberal-democratic and inclusive citizenship. In this context, as Dyer (2001) observes, there is a huge gap between large, multi-ethnic cities (where most immigrants settle) and the fairly small, homogeneous white francophone/anglophone rural communities. As he puts it:

In an era when there is no longer any free land to settle, virtually no immigrants are going into our rural areas. Immigrants go where the jobs are and where there is already some support system in terms of people who share their language and values. As a result, a huge new gulf is opening between urban and rural Canada [...] The cities now have a polyglot multicultural population, while the small towns and villages are still inhabited almost exclusively by the old mono-ethnic population. This is bound to exacerbate old divisions in a country as intensely regional as Canada. (Dyer, 2001, p. 50)
With such a situation, the Ministry of Education (1998a) has recently noted in its policy statement on educational integration and intercultural education that all educational institutions in Québec urgently need to include ethnocultural minorities more adequately in their procedures, curricula, and staffing.

The last aspect of this study dealt with national identity and citizenship. It is, in my opinion, in this section that student informants had the most telling (and sometimes contradicting) views on their nation, country, and citizenship. I was surprised to find in both cases that student informants accord an importance to the nationalism, patriotism and national identity despite some popular myths around their too individualistic or segregated sense of belonging. I believe much of the criticism around students’ collective identity may come from the fact that students suggest a very different conception of the nation than the older ideals used in Canada. In this sense, the matter at hand is not so much their lack of national identity and patriotism but their twenty-first century views of Canada, Québec, and citizenship. As I have shown in my discussion on multiculturalism and interculturalism, these student have adopted more inclusive and democratic collective identities, which no longer refer to a backward nostalgia to be carried over or to a moral obligation to old allegiances and historical figures and events. These heroes and events have no clear impact on their collective identity and, as such, are not perceived as necessary for the links they make between the past, their present, and their future. From one perspective, this modern nationalist attitude among students is remarkable. It has freed them from a static, non-interpretative vision of history, not open to discussion or criticism. In rejecting the role of certain past historical figures or patriotic events, students have greater chances to avoid what Létourneau (1998) calls “la vénération des origines et le culte des ancêtres” (p. 414). But, from another perspective, it has placed students in a precarious historical situation. Many have great difficulty understanding that knowledge of the past is necessary if we
are to get to the bottom of the social, political, national, and educational questions Canadians face today.

But saying that B.C. and Québec students have adopted more inclusive and future-oriented forms of national identity and patriotism should not hide the fact that some students on both sides have different understandings of their nation. While a growing number of immigrant students, and certain Canadian-born, imagine their country as a multicultural nation-state, a relatively important number of francophone Québec-born, including certain immigrant, students view their province as their ‘true’ nation, and potentially sovereign state. For them, Canada is not a traditional nation-state, but clearly a multinational state.

Nonetheless, I found that the theoretical discussion on multicultural and multinational citizenship in political theory (presented in the first chapters) does not reflect adequately all the complex views expressed by my student informants. It is not so clear to me that B.C. and Québec student interviewees have adopted totally distinct conceptions of nationalism, patriotism, and citizenship. In fact, there are several parallels between the views of B.C. and Québec informants (particularly among immigrant students). Student interviewees now have multiple attachments, experiences, historical references and links, as well as political aspirations which allow them to imagine (and live in) political communities that are not necessarily well articulated in political theory.

Yet, this complex reality should not eclipse the fact that for students of the West Coast, Québec’s aspirations are often confused with the discourse of Canadian regionalism. Territorial tensions between ‘Western’ and ‘Eastern’ Canada make several students feel that Québécois are asking for more power just like B.C. wishes to have a stronger voice and a better representation in their Canadian political system.

This understanding of Canadian citizenship has emerged, particularly in English Canada and among immigrants (since the 1960s) from a modern state-based nationalism which gives
pride of place to the development of mobility rights, pan-Canadian social developments (medicare) and equalization payments to which all Canadians — or more precisely all provinces — are entitled, and the adoption of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms and a Multicultural policy (in 1971). I have shown that the grade 11 social studies program, prescribed textbooks, and teaching practices at PSS are supportive of a multicultural citizenship. Québec is still presented in class as *une province comme les autres* within a regionally divided federal nation-state. In this context, it is no surprise that B.C. student informants have developed attitudes, knowledge, and social representations fairly consistent with the views held by British Columbians in general.

But, one major difficulty with this view of Canadian citizenship, as Taylor (1993) has noted, is that it acknowledges only what he calls the “first level of diversity” (p. 182), that is, a respect of cultural diversity within the limits of the nation-state. Indeed, proponents of multicultural citizenship do not necessarily question the nation-state model to justify their socio-political arrangements. They often assume that accommodating diversity does not imply re-evaluating the concepts of nation and state, but only making both more attentive to and respectful of pluralism. If multiculturalism helps students to appreciate Québec as a distinct ethnic group, it cannot explain why Québécois are entitled to certain collective rights (self-government, language, education) that are not offered to others. The kind of citizenship education these students receive in class and their actual level of knowledge of Canadian history and politics do not really help the situation. Many B.C. student informants confessed they do not feel prepared to make informed decisions on many political issues such as Québec nationalism. From this view, we can conclude that beyond multicultural education, citizenship education seems to have done little to enhance empathy or to change the views of English-Canadians on Québec and Québécois.
In Québec, some Québécois students, particularly Québec-born francophones, have clearly expressed their primary allegiance to their national province, Québec, not to the country as a whole. Canada is not, for them, a traditional nation-state, regionally divided, because the two are conceptually distinct. Unlike B.C. students, these informants had a much more defined conception of a nation or an 'imagined community.' Language, culture, history, and also more subtle practices all contribute, in their opinion, to shape this secured francophone place in North America. Certain have even expressed their sovereignist attitudes and feelings for an exclusively ‘Québec state.’ For these students, Québec is not only their nation but also their state. In their interviews, they made no reference to Canada, had no feeling of attachment to the Canadian state they share with their fellow-Canadians. In 1970, Trudel and Jain (1970) concluded in their study that when considering the kind of history education francophone students received in Québec in the 1960s, “we can hardly wonder at the great vogue for the separatist movement…” (p. 131).

From this research, however, we cannot conclude so freely that Québécois history courses contribute to the formation of sovereignists. If programs, textbooks, and teaching practices of certain teachers are influenced by Québécois political and ideological trends (just as in English Canada), it is not clear whether these sovereignist students have developed these attitudes in class or outside the school system. As Hodgetts (1968), I believe it would be wrong to put all the blame on the school, or more specifically on citizenship education. Several agents of socialization in Québec have perhaps greater influence on the formation of sovereignists than about 100 hours of national history on Québec and Canada. This research could not verify the extent to which the grade 10 history program has a large influence on students’ prior understandings, attitudes, and social representations.
10.3 Implications of this study and further research

Although this comparative case-study research dealt exclusively with two cases, and more specifically with informants in grade 10 (in Québec) and grade 11 (in B.C.), there are, in my opinion, several implications for citizenship education in Canada.

The first one relates to the school in general. As ‘outsiders’ to the school system, we obtain through the media or public discourse a picture of our public schools which too often is associated with control, violence, drugs, and anti-academic achievement. Beyond the exceptional coverage on student performance (in maths and sciences), schools are generally blamed for not ‘doing their job’ properly.

Yet, in this thesis, I was surprised to find in both research sites organizations that do not operate democratically, but still provide their students various ways of developing their democratic citizenship. In both PSS and MSS, I found in my observations, document analysis, and interviews school communities in which students are not simply considered by the administration as ‘beneficiaries,’ but members who can participate in and influence school organizations, clubs, sport teams, extra-curricular activities, and the school council and the credit union (at MSS). All students have, at least rhetorically, the opportunity to participate and be active creators of the life of the school.

Similarly, the multi-ethnicity of the student-body makes these two schools laboratories for multiculturalism/interculturalism. As some student interviewees have noticed, even if they do not necessarily learn multiculturalism/interculturalism adequately in their citizenship education classes, they learn considerably by living side by side with students of different ethno-cultural and linguistic backgrounds. Put differently, if students go to school because they have to, there is a sense of community membership and collegiality which is truly there, but perhaps only perceivable when one immerses himself in it.
But, saying these two schools contribute to the development of democratic citizenship is not to say that the present situation is adequate for future citizens in a democracy. Schools are educational institutions with particular obligations in regard to their political arrangements. They cannot be transformed into 'miniature democracies' as implied by Dewey (1916). Yet, I believe, like Levin (1998), that these institutions need to direct their attention away from labour markets and economic prosperity and pay more attention to the preparation of thoughtful students, capable of participating actively in the discussions and decisions of the communities in which they live. Learning about democracy is one thing. But learning to live democratically is another. Here, I am not making the case for students to have all the same citizenship rights as adults. Rather, I believe that students need to play a more active role in determining with adults the nature of schooling. Callan (1988), for instance, points out that students will not devote time and effort to learn and become skilled at something they cannot practice or experience.

The challenge for public schools is not to move from authoritative institutions to democratic ones, but to contribute actively to the development of the various civic competencies needed by students to become democratic citizens. As Perrenoud (1998) has noted, "le véritable débat devrait porter sur les finalités prioritaires de l’école" (p. 3). Students go to school not only to acquire knowledge but to develop various competencies (savoir-mobiliser) which rely on the construction, transmission and appropriation of knowledge, attitude, and capacities. But to do so, students must become active in their own learning. They have to listen, read, watch, communicate, question, criticize, and experiment. Such an approach to schooling, Osborne (1991) claims, not only stimulates students to be active in their own development, but encourages students to carry with them after school a set of attitudes and dispositions that ultimately will help them grow into active citizens. Competencies, Perrenoud (1998) adds, "se manifeste[nt] dans l’action" (p. 4). They are to be found in the action or 'on the ground.' Otherwise, what students learn in school will always remain ‘lettres mortes,’ that is, something
they see as irrelevant for their lives. Too often in the past, students have understood history as a set of prescribed dates, events, and personages that needed to be memorized. No connection was made with their lives, with the necessity of learning history for understanding the present and preparing for the future. Part of the solution, I think, lies in the connections that need to be established between the school and the world outside its walls. Following the Estates General on Education in 1995-1996, the government of Québec has decided to adopt this constructivist approach to schooling. The Ministry of Education has recently argued that the new learning and teaching methods in school will be based on 'competencies.' In its information document *The Education Reform: What's All About?*, the Ministry states:

The new teaching/learning methods are based on competencies, i.e. knowledge, skills and attitudes, to be developed by students. This is a key concept of the reform. It is now known that students learn better when they are actively involved in their own learning. They must also make meaningful connections between the different subject areas and see how they can use what they learn in class in their everyday lives. Instead of passively listening to teachers, students will take part in active, hands-on learning. They will spend more time working on projects, doing research and solving problems based on their areas of interest and their concerns. They will more often take part in workshops or team learning to develop a broad range of competencies. (MEQ, 2000, p. 6)

The Ministry of Education only implemented its reform (at the elementary level) very recently (2000-2001). As a result, it is too early at the moment to study the implications of the reform on the school system and more specifically on the development of competencies by students.
Second, I believe we urgently need more discussions and research in Canada on the nature of citizenship education. It appears from this research that both ‘citizenship’ and ‘education’ are contested concepts, both theoretically and practically. I do not claim, like others, that schools have failed to impart in our young citizens the civic and historical knowledge and skills necessary to make informed decisions and sustain a sense of belonging, and, as such, that we urgently need a pan-Canadian consensus on what to teach and how. But, my readings and discussions with teachers, staff, and students in Québec and B.C. suggest that Canadians have little experience of their country as a whole. They surely know about rights, cultural pluralism, democracy, nationalism, and citizenship, but their civic and history knowledge does not necessarily lead to a better understanding of our two historical nations. Like Létourneau (2000a), I believe that the recent fragmentation of great Canadian narratives, the increasing influence of social and cultural history, and strong regional (and national) tendencies have all contributed to this situation. As he puts it:

On peut bien prétendre que la seule vérité acceptable, concernant l’interprétation du passé du Canada, est celle qui insiste sur la pluralité des points de vue, et donc des “vérités particulières”, relativement à ce passé. Il apparaît tout de même inopportun, comme interprétant, de laisser le passé dans un tel état d’indétermination conceptuelle, indétermination qui n’exprime, ne légitime ou ne mène d’ailleurs toujours qu’à une sorte d’impuissance politique chez les acteurs. La fonction de l’intellectuel en général, et celle de l’historien en particulier, est en effet de réintroduire, dans la matière du passé ancien et récent, un sens qui se révélera fécond pour contruire l’avenir. (Létourneau, 2000a, p. 239)
From this point of view, it seems to me that the ‘two solitudes’ of MacLennan are still a reality in Canadian education, at least in the ways citizenship education programs are elaborated and shared collectively. If a shared past often serves to unite different people into an imagined community, in a multinational state like Canada it is, in the words of Meisel, Rocher, and Silver (1999), a source of acrimony and misunderstanding. It is ironic to see that while recent studies (see Sears et al., 2000) have shown that Ministries of Education across Canada have taken “a remarkably similar approach to citizenship education” (p. 152), political and ideological factors can lead to divergent teaching and learning practices. In my opinion, in a multinational state, history cannot be understood as in a traditional nation-state. It must be viewed as “a shared context and framework within which we debate our differing values and priorities” (Kymlicka, 1998, p. 174). History must become an implicit shared background for understanding who we are, where we come from, and where we head as a democracy. From this point of view, studying history in Canada implies the studying of the historical tensions and divergences between various regional/provincial, national, and federal forces which led to our unique democratic, multinational, and multi-ethnic experience.

There is obviously no simple solution to our predicament. As I have noted, the theoretical discussion in political theory around multicultural and multinational citizenship is rich and articulate, but it does not reflect all the complexities of my findings. I believe, therefore, that if we are to teach democratic citizenship in our schools, we need a better coherent vision of the country in which we want our young citizens to live in. Part of the solution may lie in recognizing more explicitly our historical (interrelated) regional subtleties, as well as our complex cultural and national differences in history and social studies education. These are not always evident in the dichotomy ‘Québec vs. English Canada’ in political theory. This approach to citizenship education would mean a move from the study of ‘national unity’ (how can we
Some argue that citizenship education should simply reflect the ongoing debate in the country about the nature of Canadian citizenship. As Sears (1997) puts it: “the purpose of citizenship education is to prepare students to participate in that debate in an intelligent way” (p. 19). Others, like myself, believe that since Ministries of Education are by no means neutral on the nature of citizenship, they need to be more committed to explicitly recognize the multifaceted character of Canada. Similarly, textbooks and teacher training programs should reflect not only the multicultural but also the multinational view of citizenship help by most Québécois. What Canadians need is to help develop in future citizens the necessary democratic competencies for living in a complex state.

Third, we must reconsider the ways we teach citizenship and learn it in class. Rather than ‘teaching a subject,’ which often is understood as teaching fixed knowledge of a particular discipline (historical dates, events) without understanding why what is taught and learned is significant and worthwhile, we should focus more on the development of competencies (or savoir-mobiliser) needed by students to become free active citizens. In other words, I think it is necessary to teach students that they are not only ‘free to read their history but to make it as well,’ to use Fernand Dumont’s famous phrase. The Québec Ministry of Education has recently decided to adopt this road in its reform of education.

Obviously, teachers in citizenship education need a better background and training not only in their school subjects (history, social, studies, geography, civics) but in the formation of democratic competencies. Universities, and more specifically faculties of education, have a role to play in this educational process. But, in the present context, Sears et al. (2000) have noted that universities do not provide any clear indication that their goals include the promotion of democratic citizenship. “The universities,” they write, “seem to be saying that they provide
experiences that fully enrich the lives of their students and consequently prepare them to be dynamic members of the community [...] that is, they will be good citizens" (p. 160). Similarly, faculties of education often assume that their student-teachers “possess the qualities of responsible citizens and can, therefore, prepare themselves to pass these qualities on to the next generation” (idem.).

Finally, this research suggests that we need to invest more resources and energy in the development of research in citizenship education in Canada. While small scale, case study research like this one and conferences in citizenship education, such as the annual conferences of the McGill Institute for the Study of Canada and Metropolis, have grown significantly in the last years, there has been no systematic large scale effort to study citizenship education practices in Canada in the last thirty years or so and to answer key questions such as: What impact(s) do variables such as gender, class, and ethnicity do have on students’ and teachers’ conceptions of citizenship in Canada? How are these different conceptions represented in citizenship education materials, policies, and practices in Canadian schools? What are the behaviours, values, attitudes, and competencies of students and teachers in Canadian schools? How are they lived and learned? What influence(s) do students have on school organizations? How are they perceived by teachers, administrators, Ministries of Education?

Researchers, left alone, often have to adapt the studies conducted in other countries to our complex situation in Canada, while I do believe, like Ignatieff (2000a), that it should be the other way around. We have much more to teach the world about how to deal with nationalism, regionalism, pluralism, and citizenship. As he puts it:

When viewed from the inside, Canadian politics has often seemed like a psychodrama of narrowly avoided catastrophe [...] Viewed from the outside [...] Canada has been inventive in finding ways to enable a large multi-ethnic, multi-national state to survive and even prosper. (Ignatieff, 2000a, pp. 9-10).
Problems, in my opinion, do not only lie in the scarcity of funding in citizenship education, but also in the lack of co-ordination between scholars and faculties in various academic disciplines (philosophy, history, political science, education, gender/ethnic studies, etc.). I would not go as far as Granatstein (1998) who argues that “[m]ost prefer to remain alone in their specialists’ cubbyholes” (p. 71), but I sincerely believe that we need to put more co-ordinated efforts to study both theoretical and practical aspects of citizenship education. And, how theory informs practice and vice versa. Democracy, citizenship, and the future of young Canadian citizens require nothing less.

---

1 On the influence of political and ideological factors on citizenship education in Québec schools, see Morton (2000).

2 As part of the pan-Canadian Citizenship Education Research Network (CERN) agenda, a group of Canadian and international researchers, led by Yvonne Hébert, submitted to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council in February 2000 a request for a five-year research funding. The purpose of this large scale research is to examine how democratic citizenship and citizenship education are conceptualized, learned, and actualized in social and educational policy and practice in Canada.
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APPENDIX A
Detailed chronological chart of the research process for the B.C. case study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOCUMENT ANALYSIS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBSERVATION (GENERAL)</td>
<td>school</td>
<td></td>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gr. E, F, G, H, E(IB), F(IB)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERVIEW (STUDENT)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERVIEW (TEACHER, ADM.)</td>
<td>1 adm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 teachers</td>
<td>1 adm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEETING (SCHOOL, PARTICIPANTS)</td>
<td>District meeting, staff meeting, discussions with participants</td>
<td>District meeting</td>
<td>Staff meeting (administrator, head of social studies dept)</td>
<td>Discussions with social studies teachers (grade 11)</td>
<td>Discussions with social studies teachers/students (grade 11)</td>
<td>Discussions with social studies teachers/students (grade 11)</td>
<td>Meetings with school participants, presentation of report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLACE(S)</td>
<td>University, school</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>University, school</td>
<td>School halls, library, cafeteria, social studies classes</td>
<td>School halls, library, cafeteria, social studies classes</td>
<td>Social studies classes</td>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)This time period corresponds to the term (January-June) when I worked as a research assistant for another project, which gave me the opportunity to do observations and conduct interviews with students for this research.

\(^b\)Draft copies of the report were sent to the school in February 2000. Meetings with the administration, student, and teacher participants were held in March and April 2000.
APPENDIX B

Schematic description of B.C. participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTICIPANTS</th>
<th>YEARS AT PSS*</th>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>ORIGIN(S)b</th>
<th>GENDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student 1</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>IB program</td>
<td>Canadian-born</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 2</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Regular program</td>
<td>Canadian-born</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 3</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>IB program</td>
<td>Canadian-born</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 4</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Regular program</td>
<td>Hong-Kong</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 5</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>IB program</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 6</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>IB program</td>
<td>Canadian-born</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 7</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Regular program</td>
<td>Canadian-born</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 8</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Regular program</td>
<td>Canadian-born</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 9</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>Regular program</td>
<td>Canadian-born</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 10</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>IB program</td>
<td>Chile/Germany</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 11</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>IB program</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 12</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>IB program</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 13</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>IB program</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 14</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>IB program</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 15</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Regular program</td>
<td>Canadian-born</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 16</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>Regular program</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 17</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>Regular program</td>
<td>Canadian-born</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>IB program</td>
<td>Canadian-born</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 2</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>Regular program</td>
<td>Canadian-born</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 3</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Regular program</td>
<td>United States/China</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Refer to the number of years spent at Pacific secondary school, including the academic year 1998-1999.

b All Canadian-born participants were white and English-speaking (i.e., had English as their first language).
## APPENDIX C

### Detailed chronological chart of the research process for the Québec case study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOCUMENT ANALYSIS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBSERVATION (GENERAL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gr. 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10</td>
<td>Gr. 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10</td>
<td>Gr. 5, 7, 9, 10</td>
<td>Gr. 5, 7, 9, 10</td>
<td>Gr. 5, 7, 9, 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBSERVATION (SPECIFIC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERVIEW (STUDENT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERVIEW (TEACHER, ADM.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 teachers 2 adm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEETING (SCHOOL, PARTICIPANTS)</td>
<td>District authorisation, School meeting, discussion with school adm.</td>
<td>Discussion with history teachers (grade 10)</td>
<td>Discussion with history teachers (grade 10)</td>
<td>School meeting, Discussion with history teachers (grade 10)</td>
<td>Discussion with history teachers (grade 10)</td>
<td>Discussion with history teachers (grade 10)</td>
<td>Meetings with school participants, presentation of report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLACE(S)</td>
<td>University, school</td>
<td>University, school</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>School halls, library, cafeteria, history classes</td>
<td>History classes</td>
<td>History classes</td>
<td>History classes</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For practical and logistical reasons, it was possible to conduct observations in the school and the classrooms (general and specific) only a week per month, except in May (2 weeks). Some discussions were, however, made via internet and/or telephone with history teachers and administrators on a regular basis.

*Draft copies of the report were sent to the school in September 2000. Meetings with the administration, student, and teacher participants were held in October and November 2000.*
APPENDIX D
Schematic description of Québec participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTICIPANTS</th>
<th>YEARS AT MSS(^a)</th>
<th>ORIGIN(S)(^b)</th>
<th>GENDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student 1</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 2</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 3</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>Canadian-born</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 4</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 5</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>Canadian-born</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 6</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 7</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 8</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>Canadian-born</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 9</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 10</td>
<td>4 year</td>
<td>Canadian-born</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 11</td>
<td>4 year</td>
<td>Canadian-born</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 12</td>
<td>4 year</td>
<td>Canadian-born</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 13</td>
<td>3 year</td>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 14</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>Zaire</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 15</td>
<td>4 year</td>
<td>Canadian-born</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 16</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>Canadian-born</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 17</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>Canadian-born</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 18</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>Haiti/Guyana</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 19</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>Canadian-born</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1</td>
<td>9 years</td>
<td>Canadian-born</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 2</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>Canadian-born</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Refer to the number of years spent at Montréal secondary school, including the academic year 1999-2000.

\(^b\)All Canadian-born participants were white and French-speaking (i.e., had French as their first language).
General observation of one history 11 (IB program) with Mr. Danny B.

PSS, May 11, 1999

9h40 am

Room 201

Class: Block E(IB)

29 students: 13 females, 16 males, 10 white, 19 non-white.

Note: the abbreviations W = white, N = non-white, F = female, and M = male.

Description: (from my seat)

Beige walls covered with various posters, maps, and clippings, all in English!

Front wall: Poster on the blackboard with thoughts: "Don’t avoid thinking because you might learn something."

Maps of North America and other pull-down maps

354
Right wall: File cabinet with piles on documents on it.
Other pull-down maps and posters of most provinces, except Québec!, BC parks.

Right wall: Old large windows with plastic blinds.
View on the front parking, and the large Canadian flag on the corner of the school parking.

Left wall: Posters "Racism, Stop it!", BC Lions team, BC legislative Assembly, Description of provincial flags and coats of arms, BC GM Place, and St. Andrew’s golf course Board with the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, below the Charter, two thoughts: "I am here to teach, you are here to listen" and "What part of NO didn’t you understand?"

Old map of the world (18th century??)

Low ceilings with sprinklers and hot water pipes repainted (same color): very noisy water system.

Old building, "smelly" classroom. Windows are open to let fresh air enters. Many blinds are closed: sunny day.

Very small student desks with different plastic chairs (blue, green, red, and yellow) all organized in a traditional setting of nine rows of four desks.

Tables underneath the student desks are full of garbage (e.g., chips, papers, pops, etc.)
Teacher’s desk (wooden) is large and full on various piles of documents. The teacher seats on a small bench (about 3 feet high) so he can see everyone while remaining seated.
Activities/interactions:

Students are chatting with each other and getting to their assigned desk, while Danny is looking at his personal notes. He is seated on his bench wearing his "reading glasses".

Three male students (Asian background) are chatting at the back of the room (left side for me) in their native language. Other students don't bother with their conversation...

Two students (female) in front of me (first alley on my left) realized that there is a TV/VCR in front on the room. "I guess we have a video today" says one female to her friend.

No food/drink on student desks.

Students are used to my presence in the room. They notice me but don't make any remark or apparent gesture.

Danny looks at his watch and decides to start.

-"Alright, now the movie on the West..."

Students take out their note books, pencil, and other learning materials.

Some students in the room take this opportunity to chat. Noisy classroom...

Danny turns off the lights, gets to the VCR, turns it on, and starts the video (with the typical, strident "SHHHHHT" sound at the start of the video which brings the room back to observance.

Most students are lay back.

During the 30-40 minutes video, I see many students taking personal notes in their books.

Surprisingly, no one is sleeping on his/her desk!

The same group of three students (Asian background) at the back of the room sometimes exchange opinions (on the video??).

Danny does not really care for them. Except for one time when he raises his head and looks at them over his reading glasses with authoritative eyes.

Students realized it and naively go back to the video...

(...).
APPENDIX F

Typical specific observation excerpted from the Québec case study

Observation spécifique d’une classe d’histoire (sec IV) avec Mme Nancy M.
MSS, 24 mars, 2000
12:55 pm
Salle 205(R)
Groupe: Gr. 10
27 étudiants : 13 étudiantes, 14 étudiants, 19 cocasiens, 8 non-cosasiens.

Commentaires généraux :
Bien que nous ne soyons que le 24 mars, la température extérieure est supérieure à zéro. Après des mois de temps hivernal, les étudiants sont excités par cette journée de printemps inhabituelle. Cette situation printanière se reflète dans les attitudes des élèves, leur tenues vestimentaires (!) et l’atmosphère de la classe.¹

Commentaires spécifiques :
- “Ah! non…” s’exclament certains élèves
Nancy écrit au tableau: “31 mars, examen: modules 1-4 et 5.”
- “Bon, vous avez 25 questions sur les modules 1 à 4 et 20 sur le module 5.”
- “C’est-tu juste des choix de réponse, madame?” demande un étudiant.
- “Non, pas toutes.”
- “Ah!!! madame.”
Plusieurs étudiants parlent entre-eux du prochain examen et du fait qu’il ne sera pas uniquement à choix multiples. On sent une certaine fébrilité en classe.

Nancy utilise alors une cloche qu’elle prend sur son bureau pour ramener les étudiants à l’ordre (comme à la petite école...).

-“Vous avez ici un cadeau, un aide-mémoire pour votre examen.”

Nancy distribue à chaque étudiant(e) une copie de l’aide-mémoire pour les aider à préparer leur examen.

-“Madame, vous avez vu l’examen?” dit un étudiant

-“Oui, c’est moi qu’il l’a écrit. Et puis, n’attend pas à jeudi soir pour étudier. L’histoire c’est comme une pizza, il faut prendre un morceau à la fois, pas tout d’un coup!”

Sur ces mots, Nancy prend les copies de l’examen quiz du dernier cours et les distribue aux étudiants. Les élèves sont nerveux et ils discutent entre-eux en attendant leur copie.

Près de moi (à gauche), deux étudiants (dans la même rangée) discutent:

-“Passes-tu?” dit Y

-“Oui!” répond X en montrant sa copie.

-“Wow! 79%,” s’exclame le premier (Y).

-“Une bonne main d’applaudissement pour X, il a eu 79%” dit Nancy.

Toute la classe se met à applaudir en riant. Il semble que l’étudiant X près de moi ne soit pas très doué en histoire d’après les commentaires des élèves. Mais il a tout de même obtenu une bonne note au dernier contrôle...

Deux étudiants (une fille, un garçon) se dirigent vers le bureau de Nancy. Ils n’ont pas reçu leur copie. Ils sont inquiets.

Nicole veut les voir seules après le cours.

Trois autres élèves se dirigent également vers le bureau de Nancy. On demande des explications sur la correction de l’examen.
Pendant ce temps les deux étudiants près de moi continuent leur discussion.

- "X, comment t’as eu man?
- "Je te l’ai dit, 79%, pis toé" répond X
- "J’ai 80%, je te bas!!" répond Y en levant son bras dans les airs avec le poing fermé.

- "OK tous le monde,
- dit Nancy en faisant sonner la cloche pour faire taire les étudiants qui discutent toujours de leur examen... et d’autres choses.

- "Bon, vous avez les prochaines minutes du cours pour préparer votre examen," ajoute Nancy.

Les étudiants sortent leur aide-mémoire et débutent leur travail (remplir les cases manquantes).

Certains jasent entre-eux. D’autres lisent les questions et complètent les réponses en silence.

- "Avez-vous des questions?" demande Nancy
- "Non!" répondent certains.

Nicole laisse les étudiants travailler. Certains font leur travail en équipe. La classes est brulante et Nancy le sait.

- "Attend, c’est le droit de veto ici," dis X près de moi.
- "OK" répond Y

Les deux étudiants poursuivent la lecture du texte en silence. Puis, Y dit à X à voix basse:

"Je pense qu’ici le ‘commerce’!!".

- "Non, ça ne marche pas" répond X en tournant sa tête pour être bien compris de Y.

(...).

1 Here is my translation of the general comments written in class : “Although it is only March 24, the weather outside is well over zero. After months of snowstorms and cold weather, students are excited by this unusual warm day. This “early spring” situation is reflected in their attitudes, dresses (!), and atmosphere in the classroom.”
APPENDIX G

List of general questions to participants

General

-Hi __________ (name)

-How are you? How is school going?

-I am really glad you could talk to me today.

-Well, let me explain you what I am interested in. I would like to know about your understandings/conceptions of citizenship as a ____ in BC/Québec. I guess what I want to know is if I were you, living in __________, how would I see things related to Canadian citizenship? So I want to ask you several questions related to citizenship as you see it as a __________ in __________. If you have any question or don't understand what I mean (or don't understand my English), please feel free to stop me and ask for clarification.

-Would that be OK if I tape record our interview so I can go over it later? (see consent form)

-Well ______(name), you have quite a bit of experience with the school system, haven't you?

-How long have you attended this school?

-You know, I have been in the school for over _______ weeks, observing students/teachers interactions and behaviors, now, let me begin with a simple question about the composition of the school population. Can you tell me about the multi-ethnic groups in this school? Like if I were a "friend from another district" and you were
responsible for a "guided tour" of the school, how would you describe the student population? And how would you describe the school?

**Canadian citizenship**

-OK, (name) let me ask you questions about your country, Canada, and its members "Canadians". How would you describe, in your own words, Canada? What is Canada for you?

-How do you understand the concept of "Canadian" citizenship?

-What components do you think are central to good citizenship?

-Tell me who would be a typical "good Canadian" for you? His/her characteristics, his/her attitudes, his/her activities.

-In the same way, can you tell "benefits" of being Canadian?

-Students/teachers (like all other people) have different allegiances or identities. They are Canadian/immigrant, male/female, etc. Now (name), why don't you tell me, in your own words, how you would describe yourself (your identity)?

-That's very interesting. But let me go back to the idea of Canada. What is your feeling toward Canada and Canadians? In other words, what is your sense of belonging (or your ties) to your community? Your province (BC/Québec)? Your nation? Your country?

-OK, what comes to your mind when I tell you the words "nationalism"? Patriotism?

**Role of school, social studies/history courses**

-OK (name), again, in your own words, can you tell me where students learn to become citizens? (...How about the school? History?)
-How would you describe social studies/history courses? In terms of content, teaching, and classroom climate. Give me typical examples of situations you experienced...

-Tell me what it takes to do well in social studies/history?

-You know (name), you have just mentioned how you view things as a student in social studies. Now, if you were the social studies/history teacher (say Mr/Mrs ____), what would you do differently? The same?

**Involvement/participation**

-Now, I would like to ask you questions about participation and involvement in social/civic activities. Tell me what is your involvement in the school? The community? The province? The country?

-According to your experience in this school, how can students participate in social studies/history classes or the school life if they want to?

-You will soon be allowed to vote, could you tell me (name) if you think you can influence political/social decisions? At the local, provincial, federal levels?

-How would you describe people running government? At the local, provincial, federal levels?

-That’s very interesting. Now how would you describe your own interest for politics?

**Diversity/nationalism**

-OK, I want to go back to my earlier question on multi-ethnicity in school. You have touched it, but now I would like you to describe your relations with ethnic minorities/immigrants students?
- That's interesting. But tell me about the racial tensions in the school? Do you have any examples?

- Well, this school is very multicultural as is the population of our urban centers (Vancouver/Montréal). Tell me more ______(name) about your vision of immigrants integration? In other words, how do immigrants integrate into the larger Canadian community? In terms of language, culture, traditions.

- That's interesting. Can you think of any examples where students in your classrooms/school do not integrate?

-(If immigrant) Tell me about your experience as an immigrant student in this school? In this community/province/country?

-Now ______(name), I would like to end this interview by asking you a couple of questions regarding your own vision of Canadian/Québec nationalism. As you have probably noticed, I am French Canadian from Québec, so I am particularly interested in questions of "nationalism," "bilingualism" and the idea of the "founding peoples" as you have seen in class. So, based on your experience and what you have learned (social studies classes, school), what is your view of Canada? Of BC/Québec?

-Well, that's interesting. Now can you tell me more about your feeling toward Québécois?

- Do you really understand what Québécois are asking for? Why they want to be a "distinct" nation?

-What is your views on the idea that we should officially recognize Québécois/French Canadians as a distinct nation/province in Canada?
-That great! Finally, one last question. What will be your reaction if Québec separates from Canada?

**Conclusion**

Well, thank you very much for your participation. Your contribution to this research is extremely important. I’ve really learned a lot today, but it also makes me aware that you know a great deal more about these issues. Before we end this interview, do you have question? Would you like to add something that you think is important?

Thanks again for coming today. This has really been interesting...