PCERII Working Paper Series

CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION FOR ADULT IMMIGRANTS IN CANADA
1947-1996

Reva Joshee
OISE, University of Toronto

Tracey M. Derwing
University of Alberta

Working Paper No. WP10-04

PRAIRIE CENTRE OF EXCELLENCE
METROPOLIS
FOR RESEARCH ON IMMIGRATION AND INTEGRATION

The *PCERII Working Paper Series* is published by the
Prairie Centre of Excellence for Research on
Immigration and Integration.

For additional information contact:

PCERII Working Paper Series
Attention: Ms. Lenise Levesque, Editorial Assistant
1-17 Humanities Centre, University of Alberta
Edmonton, AB T6G 2E5 Canada
Tel: (780) 492-0635 Fax: (780) 492-259
Email: lenise@ualberta.ca
Web Site: http://pcerii.metropolis.net

Funders

We are pleased to acknowledge the following organizations that provide funding in support of the Prairie Centre: the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada; Citizenship and Immigration Canada; Canadian Heritage; Statistics Canada; Human Resources Development Canada; Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation; Public Works and Government Services Canada; Status of Women Canada; the Royal Canadian Mounted Police; Public Service Commission; and the Solicitor General of Canada. The University of Alberta provides PCERII with a generous grant and the other participating universities offer supplementary support.

Citizenship Education for Adult Immigrants in Canada 1947 - 1996

Reva Joshee
OISE, University of Toronto

Tracey M. Derwing
University of Alberta

In recent years there has been a resurgence of interest in citizenship education, particularly in the schools. One area, however, that has remained conspicuously absent from the discussion is citizenship education for adult immigrants. This paper reports on the results of a study examining citizenship education for adult immigrants in Canada from 1947-1996. We limit this analysis to the period of the First Canadian Citizenship Act up to the period when citizenship hearings were replaced by a pencil and paper test. We conducted interviews with policy makers and citizenship applicants, reviewed relevant documents, and surveyed program providers across Canada. The findings suggest that while a great deal of effort went into policy and program initiatives at the federal level, very little actually reached the classrooms. In view of the increasing globalization of citizenship issues, we make recommendations concerning the naturalization process and the need for sustained attention to citizenship education for adult immigrants.

Keywords:Adult immigrant education; Citizenship; Citizenship education; Immigrant integration.

In recent years there has been a resurgence of interest in citizenship education, as witnessed by the work of the International Education Association (Torney-Purta 1996) and UNESCO (Delors et al. 1996). Most of this work, however, focuses on the inculcation of 'democratic values' in school children. Additionally, there have been studies of citizenship values as they have been enacted in western societies, (e.g., Kymlicka 1995; Nevitte 1996) and studies of citizenship within the context of globalization (Bloemraad, 2000; Castles, 2004). Despite all this work, one area that has remained conspicuously absent from the discussion is citizenship education for adult immigrants. Although policy makers, in Canada at least, have had a longstanding interest in citizenship for newcomers, researchers and educators have largely ignored this segment of the population (Joshee 1996). In this study, we will trace the history of citizenship education for immigrants in English Canada and discuss the current situation. In addition, we will make recommendations for policy makers and educators. In addressing these issues we will consider the following: What are immigrants' own expectations of citizenship? What attitudes, skills and knowledge are officially required of future citizens? How does citizenship education address these goals? How adequately does the current process prepare citizens for their place in the nation and the world? Given the convergence of European and North American citizenship policies (Banks, 2004; Bloemraad, 2000), the example of the Canadian experience should be instructive to others beyond our borders as well.

In 1997 and 1998 we conducted a three-part study, involving policy makers, program providers, and citizenship applicants[1]. The first component entailed a series of interviews with federal government officials who had had responsibility for citizenship education from 1986 – 1997. Each of these officials provided us with documentation relevant to their work. These documents were subsequently analysed. The second component of the study was a survey of citizenship education programs for adult immigrants in English speaking Canada (Derwing, Jamieson, and Munro 1998). Finally, we interviewed applicants as they left a citizenship testing area about their perceptions of the citizenship process.

Our research suggests that while a great deal of effort went into policy and program initiatives at the federal level, very little actually reached the classrooms. Additionally, changes to the Citizenship Act that occurred during the course of this study appear to have contributed to an even more reductionist approach to citizenship education for adult immigrants than was in place in 1987 (Derwing and Munro 1987).

Background

With the introduction of the Citizenship Act in 1947, Paul Martin Sr. stressed the importance of federal involvement in citizenship education for adult immigrants.

> Apart from the purely legal consequences of acquiring a new citizenship, we must remember that in a democracy there are obligations and responsibilities upon a citizen, and these should be thoughtfully explained, it is thought, to those who join us… They [adult immigrants] should also be given some understanding in a helpful and cooperative way of how government in Canada works, and of the great traditions of constitutional liberty and even justice that are the root and source of our individual liberty (Government of Canada 1991a, p. 10).

Almost immediately after the introduction of the Act, citizenship education was subsumed under second language instruction for newcomers; however, little guidance was provided other than some rudimentary materials that were not easily integrated into language classrooms. In the early 1950's, the federal government began transfer payments to the provinces for the purposes of citizenship and language instruction (see Joshee 1996, for a comprehensive review). These agreements, known collectively as Citizenship Instruction and Language Textbooks (CILT), created a situation where even less attention was devoted to the area of citizenship education, in part because each provincial government interpreted the terms of the agreements differently. The agreements were terminated in 1989, following

a review that indicated that CILT monies were generally not being used for their intended purpose.

In the early 1980's, in response to the patriation[2] of the Constitution and the adoption of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, there was renewed interest in issues of immigrant citizenship education. In 1985 a task force within the Secretary of State redefined citizenship education to include the development of knowledge, skills and attitudes about 'rights and freedoms, equality of access, full participation, ethnic and racial diversity, cultural and regional diversity, two official languages, constitutional monarchy, a federal system [of government] and national symbols' (Government of Canada 1985, p.19). The authors of the report proposed the following: existing print material should be reviewed and revised; the staff of citizenship courts should receive training; the court ceremony should be reexamined; orientation courses and speaker's kits should be provided for judges; and Citizenship Week and other special activities should be organized. While several of the specific recommendations were eventually addressed, the expanded definition of citizenship never took hold.

In 1987, the Citizenship Instruction Review Project (CIRP) was undertaken by the Secretary of State. A Working Group was established, consisting of providers of citizenship education from non-governmental organizations, provincial government representatives, community educators, and researchers, in addition to Secretary of State personnel. Under the auspices of this project, several individual initiatives were taken that resulted in a spurt of attention to citizenship instruction. In addition to symposia on citizenship teacher education, two products of CIRP were particularly notable: 1) *More of a Welcome Than a Test* (Government of Canada n.d.), which was intended to provide teachers with the necessary background and materials to use a critical approach to citizenship instruction, and 2) a census of all English language citizenship programs in Canada, which provided baseline data on instructional practices.

More of a Welcome Than a Test was distributed to every English language citizenship program identified in the census. This binder of materials contained a directory of citizenship programs and courts, a

description of the process, and a discussion of ways in which instruction could move beyond the bare minimum by incorporating the principles of participatory education. Specific pedagogical suggestions for presenting citizenship concepts were also included to encourage program providers to promote genuine understanding amongst their students rather than a reliance on rote memorization. Although *More of a Welcome Than a Test* was a comprehensive, readable document, its format did not lend itself to use by teachers. It was a cumbersome binder that was not easily reproduced, and, in many instances, the material required modification for a specific class of learners. Given that many programs utilized volunteer instructors, it was unlikely that these materials would be adapted. At the level of the federal government there were also barriers to the implementation of *More of a Welcome Than a Test.* Although there was money to produce the document, there were no funds for subsequent testing and revision. Neither was there any way to assess whether the materials were being used. The Working Group, which had temporarily provided leadership in citizenship education across the country, disbanded when *More of a Welcome Than a Test* was published. Without any kind of infrastructure to support the implementation, the project essentially came to an end. An attempt was made in 1994 to revive *More of a Welcome* in a more user-friendly instructor's package called *Preparing for Citizenship*. Changes to the citizenship process (e.g., introduction of a multiple choice test) made this package obsolete before it was to have been distributed.

The other product of that period was the citizenship program census (Derwing and Munro 1987). The census gave the Secretary of State a clear picture of the state of citizenship education practice in English-speaking Canada. It also provided recommendations in the areas of networking, materials, funding, instructor training and bilingual classes. Each of these recommendations would have required financial commitments and sustained effort on the part of the federal government. The census was never widely distributed; although attempts were made to update and distribute the list of program providers, the report that accompanied the list sat on a shelf in a government storeroom.

In 1992 the federal government (Canada Employment & Immigration Commission, now Citizenship & Immigration Canada - CIC) introduced a new English language training program for adult immigrants called Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada (LINC). This program represented a significant change from the previous federally funded language classes: instead of a focus on employment, LINC classes were to incorporate 'information on Canadian values' (Government of Canada 1991b, p. 3). Furthermore, LINC was aimed at recent newcomers who had limited or no proficiency in English. With the introduction of LINC, many new commercially-produced ESL materials were developed that focussed on Canada.

The next endeavour that had a significant impact on citizenship instruction was the release in 1995 of the revised *A Look at Canada,* a self-study guide for applicants for citizenship. The booklet had been under revision for approximately 15 years; several attempts to rewrite it were abandoned for a variety of reasons. Senior officials in the Department delayed publication, in part by insisting that there be no 'controversial' content, such as the Battle of the Plains of Abraham, a mention of which was thought to be offensive to French Canadians. As one official formerly responsible for citizenship education noted, 'There's no way to write the official history of Canada that's going to be approved by the Canadian government.'

At the time of the issue of the new *A Look at Canada*, the Department of Canadian Heritage commissioned a series of facilitator manuals on different aspects of Canadian citizenship under the umbrella heading of the 'Citizenship Participation Initiative'. Binders were distributed to settlement agencies, to selected individuals, and to others upon request. However, these materials did not appear to reach citizenship classrooms: only 5% of citizenship program coordinators reported using these resources (Derwing, Jamieson, and Munro 1998).

In addition, work in citizenship education was hampered by changes occurring in the larger public arena. Jenson (2001) has pointed out that the particular vision of citizenship advocated by concerned researchers and

educators "underwent profound questioning" (Jenson p.11). Specifically in education, Osborne (2001) has noted that the activist citizenship emphasis was "supplanted by an economic agenda in which the claims of citizenship largely disappeared" (p.36).

The Current Process and the View of Citizenship Officials

While revisions to *A Look at Canada* were underway, the citizenship process was changed in the interests of increased efficiency and economy. At that time, Citizenship was merged with Immigration, a huge department. Immigration had already started to centralize many functions, and Citizenship was obliged to follow suit. Under the old system, applicants for citizenship met first with a citizenship officer and were later scheduled for a hearing (personal interview) with a citizenship judge. Upon successfully passing the hearing, applicants participated in a formal swearing-in ceremony, presided over by the judge. Although there were a few judges who had abused the powers of their office, they were, for the most part, dedicated individuals who took their responsibilities very seriously. One advantage of a hearing is that it can be tailored to the language proficiency level and the educational background of the applicant. Judges were required to ask questions with regard to a small body of knowledge specified in the Citizenship Act, but they were free to ask other questions as well, depending on their perceptions of the language ability and educational level of the individual. This flexibility gave the judges the opportunity to make the interviews meaningful to all the applicants, regardless of their backgrounds. Unfortunately some of the judges misinterpreted the knowledge requirements. As one official informed us, 'We had judges who routinely set overly difficult knowledge requirements for American or British immigrants in an effort, perhaps, to demonstrate that these people weren't as well integrated as they thought.' The Canadian government was taken to Court by some unsuccessful applicants who felt the knowledge questions had been unreasonable. The Court found in favour of the plaintiffs. This was one of the reasons that the government started work on a standardized assessment process.

However, the concern for consistency was only one of the catalysts for a number of changes instituted by CIC in the mid 1990's. First, the predominant attitude across the major political parties was one of fiscal conservatism. Each department in the federal government was charged with the responsibility of ensuring cost recovery for client-based programs. There was also a prevailing view that the cost of the judges' salaries was too high (approximately $65,000 per annum). Second, a sizeable backlog of hearings had accumulated in the larger centres, particularly Toronto and Vancouver, which led to lengthy delays. The consequence of all of these factors was the elimination of the hearings and the judges' positions.

Federal officials had been working on a bank of standardized questions for judges based on *A Look at Canada*; these questions eventually became the basis for a written test. Although literacy is not a requirement of the Citizenship Act, it was decided that a pencil and paper test would be more economical and efficient, in addition to being entirely consistent. In place of a personal interview, applicants now take a 20 question multiple choice test. If applicants answer 12 or more questions correctly, they are notified that they should come to a ceremony to take the oath of citizenship.

Every new applicant between the ages of 17 and 59 takes the test; if someone should fail, he or she is given an appointment for an oral interview at a later date. People who are not literate in English must still write the test, and can only be interviewed after failing. Individuals who are 60 years of age or older, or 16 years of age and under, are exempt from the test.

When the changes to the citizenship process were first implemented, CIC contacted recipients of the Order of Canada to ask if they were willing to voluntarily attend citizenship ceremonies. Although initially there was a positive response, there were insufficient numbers of recipients available to maintain the system. As the few remaining paid judges finished their terms, the Department discovered that there was a need to employ individuals whose only responsibility is to preside over citizenship ceremonies. As a result, a series of new, short-term appointments with the title of citizenship judge were made.

Officials in the department varied somewhat in their evaluation of the new process. None of the officials we talked to was completely satisfied with it, but those who were further removed from contact with the applicants were more positive than those who worked directly with newcomers. The civil servants in Ottawa cited efficiency as the major advantage of the multiple choice test. They are now able to process 200,000 applications rather than 120,000, with no additional expenditure. When we spoke with court officers who had been with the department for several years and who had experienced both approaches to citizenship procedures, their reactions to the new process were less positive. 'We treat these people like cattle, we herd them in for the test and we herd them through the ceremony. The meaning is lost. We have cheapened citizenship by depersonalizing it. It used to be there was a lot more emotion -- now it's paper, paper, paper. They took away all the integrity and meaning, by taking away the interview.' Another citizenship officer said the following: 'Citizenship is watered down. We've been swallowed up by Immigration and their procedures. Now with the test, there is no weighting of the types of questions, but the judges could do that -- they could concentrate on what was most important -- rights and responsibilities and voting.' As discussed below, many of the officials believed that the new process had direct and detrimental consequences for citizenship education.

Applicants' Perceptions of the Citizenship Process

In order to understand what immigrants themselves thought about the new procedures, we conducted an exit poll, in which we interviewed all the test-takers from one citizenship test session. While this poll was not representative of the country as a whole (it was conducted in only one city on a single occasion) the applicants were from a wide variety of backgrounds, education levels, and ages. We believe that the comments of these individuals provide insights into the immigrants' experience of the citizenship process and should be included, especially given the paucity of immigrant voices in the citizenship literature.

Many of the applicants were disappointed by the test; their complaints tended to fall into two categories. Some were concerned with the simplistic nature of the questions, while others were troubled that people who are not literate are obliged to write and fail the test before being allowed to have an oral interview. As one applicant put it, 'It is better to have the option of test or interview, not to be forced to write the test, if you already know you have trouble reading, especially older people.' Several people reflected on whether they would have preferred an interview to the multiple choice test format, a representative sample of their comments appears here.

- An interview with a judge would be better. A judge could determine the real intentions of a person. The questions should be aimed at people's real feelings for the country. This country would be built better with people who want to improve it -- a test can't get at those issues.
- People need to find some way to speak about what they think about Canada. An interview with a judge would be much better.
- The test was too easy. All that I studied for, e.g., capitals of provinces, political parties and their leaders, etc., didn't come on the test. You need questions that make you think.
- The test was too easy; you should know everything, for example, about the economy. People must know about multiculturalism. It should be more subjective—not the same questions everywhere. An interview would be better.

A minority of applicants liked the process because they felt that the test was very easy.

It is worthwhile noting that many of these applicants were not familiar with the old hearing process, and were simply responding to their experience with the written test. Had they been exposed to both models, we expect the responses towards the test might have been even more negative. Extrapolating from the applicants' responses we understand that they have a desire to think more deeply about citizenship and to discuss these thoughts with others during their citizenship acquisition process. Neither the existing citizenship education programs nor the new acquisition process allow for this to happen.

The Citizenship Process and Education

The educational implications of the changes to the citizenship process were significant and evident to federal administrators and providers alike. One federal official commented, 'The only ones who are involved with actual citizenship education are the academics. What's happening at the local level I don't see as being part of citizenship education. It's how to prepare for a test; it's how to get through a government process. I really don't call that citizenship education, that's citizenship acquisition – how to fill out the forms, how to get the application through as soon as possible.'

One unforeseen consequence of the changes to the process was a decline in the number of citizenship education programs for immigrants; more than half of the programs identified in 1987 no longer existed in 1997. The nature of the test encourages rote memorization that can be facilitated outside the classroom (in one community, for example, questions and answers are printed in the Chinese language phonebook). Derwing, Jamieson, and Munro (1998) indicate that the new process has had other impacts on citizenship education programs, including a reduction in funding, less contact between providers and the government, and an extremely limited body of content. Strong regional emphases were no longer feasible because a national test cannot satisfactorily incorporate regional diversity. There had been an increase in formal evaluation, in that many programs introduced a mock exam at the end of the course; unfortunately, this only served to reinforce the notion that citizenship is no more than a multiple choice test. Providers reported that students were very anxious about the test; it was difficult for them to see the value in an open-ended discussion about the meaning of citizenship when they knew that they would be evaluated on discrete facts.

Citizenship education providers' opinions on the changes to the process were divided. Although the majority of programs did not support the changes, many of the providers of bilingual programs viewed the test as being 'more objective, cost-efficient and quicker' (Derwing, Jamieson, and Munro, 1998, p. 392). The providers who expressed disappointment in the

new process reported that it was rigid, superficial, and lacking in meaning. One educator noted the following: 'I think the government's attitude is typically pragmatic – they don't care about the quality of citizenship instruction for adults, nor do they care about the kind of citizens they are creating.'

Discussion

Because public schools in Canada have historically been charged with the responsibility of preparing children for their role in the community and the nation, educators, researchers and policy makers have devoted considerable attention to this area (see, for example, Sears & Hughes 1996; Joshee, 2004). Banks (1997) has noted:

> Citizenship education has been constructed historically by powerful and mainstream groups and has usually served their interests. It has often fostered citizen passivity rather than action, taught students large doses of historical myths in its attempts to develop patriotism, conceptualized citizenship responsibility primarily as voting, and reinforced the dominant social, racial, and class inequality in American society." (p. 4).

The situation in Canadian education has been very similar (Sears 1996). The attention to citizenship education for school children has allowed this position to be exposed and challenged.

Citizenship education for adult immigrants has also been constructed by powerful and mainstream groups. Joshee (1996) cited a number of objectives of citizenship education over the last century, including 'civilizing newcomers, creating British subjects, promoting patriotism, encouraging awareness of and support for government policy, preparing immigrants for naturalization, and training in language skills' (p. 27). Through the changes introduced in 1996, citizenship education for adults was reduced to merely preparation to pass a test. Although we were glad to see the end of many of the specific goals of the past, we as educators, researchers, and citizens should also be concerned about the trivialization of Canadian

citizenship and the apparent lack of interest in the development of an engaged citizenry.

On the surface it may appear that there is a simple causal relationship between the nature of the citizenship process and citizenship education for adult immigrants. As we probe further, however, we find that the heart of the issue lies in the relationship of the State to a sometimes nebulous and sometimes non-existent body we will call the citizenship education community.

Since the 1960s, the federal government has had almost exclusive control over the direction of citizenship education for adult immigrants. As we have discussed above, the Canadian government initially became involved with citizenship education when the Citizenship Act (1947) came into force. At first, government officials worked closely with non-governmental organizations that had been involved in the field. As time wore on the government's role became more central and the non-governmental organizations became more peripheral (for a fuller discussion see Joshee 1995). While we do not believe that government officials intended to eliminate community participation, the cumulative effect of their actions was just this.

As some of the government officials told us, the only organized part of the citizenship education community with particular interest in adult immigrants is English as a Second Language teachers. Some believe that the ESL community is 'doing citizenship education' because LINC is mandated to instruct learners on the Canadian way of life. In fact, our survey of programs showed that LINC providers are not formally teaching citizenship, although some topics are addressed if they happen to come up in class discussion (A more recent study of LINC providers indicates that this is still the case [Derwing & Thomson, forthcoming]). There are two primary reasons for this. First, the students in LINC classes have a very rudimentary proficiency in English and are thus unable to deal with complicated, often abstract concepts at this stage in their acquisition of English. Second, the context for newcomers in language classes is such that the emphasis is on survival English and language skills to

prepare them for the workplace. Most participants in LINC programs are recent arrivals to Canada who are not yet at the stage where they are able to apply for Canadian citizenship. Their main preoccupation is with obtaining employment to become self-sufficient (Abu-Laban et al. 1999). ESL classes do provide an excellent microcosm of Canadian cultural diversity, and many teachers incorporate informal lessons on multiculturalism and cross-cultural understanding; however, many other values are not explored in a comprehensive fashion because of the primacy of survival language survival language needs. Thus, most ESL teachers do not concern themselves specifically with the field of citizenship education. Who, then, is part of the citizenship education community?

As Derwing, Jamieson, and Munro (1998) found, citizenship program providers are primarily volunteers who are interested in helping people prepare for the test but have little time or inclination to lobby for citizenship education. Adult educators, who were once the backbone of the citizenship education movement in Canada (Selman 1991), have all but abandoned the field. As Selman and Dampier (1991) state:

> There is concern on the part of many adult educators that a combination of conservative government policies and trends towards professionalism in the field of practice are producing an adult education enterprise which is increasingly concerned with vocational and academic aspects and correspondingly less interested in the social and citizenship dimensions of adult learning in this country (p.291).

One official informed us that the only people who seemed to be truly interested in citizenship education were university-based researchers, of which there were very few. Canada is in the ironic position of having no real community of citizens interested in citizenship education for adult immigrants.

We believe that re-building the citizenship education community should be a priority. But it would require the type of sustained effort and attention to process that seem to be incompatible with the organizational imperatives and meagre resources of the small arm of government charged

with the responsibility for citizenship education. This study revealed that, in the field of citizenship education, at least, there is a bureaucratic preference for product over process. We have already discussed the numerous initiatives that were undertaken involving the development of materials. These efforts did not result in an improvement in citizenship education practice, in large part because there was no commitment to implementation and follow-up. The bureaucracy militates against longer term efforts because of the difficulty associated with evaluation of process-oriented work, the financial implications for taking on this type of work, and the likelihood of a sudden change of priorities or personnel. As a result, sporadic attempts to revive the community through networks or conferences have occurred but inevitably fail because the fledgling groups are left to their own devices before they can become a cohesive unit. As Schugurensky (2003) notes, civic participation requires "civil investing" (12); that is, "strategies that can revitalize civic involvement" (12).

In the absence of a community, the government took on a leadership role but its ability to provide effective leadership in citizenship education was compromised by a variety of structural problems and ethical considerations. During the period under study the Citizenship Registration Program belonged to three different departments. From the mid-1960s to 1989 the program was part of the Department of the Secretary of State. Here Citizenship Registration was one of several programs designed ostensibly to promote a sense of belonging to Canada. From 1989 to 1994, it was part of the Department of Multiculturalism and Citizenship. Although the work of the department was meant to be guided by both the Multiculturalism Act (1988) and the Citizenship Act (1977), multiculturalism was undeniably the dominant member of the partnership. Since 1994 Citizenship Registration has been part of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration. Here again it suffered as the junior partner in the department. Through each of these moves the officials responsible for citizenship education had to rationalize their work in terms of larger departmental mandates. We were told that within the Secretary of State and Multiculturalism and Citizenship 'there was always

an effort to push the promotion and education stuff because it sort of fit in the overarching umbrella that covered the granting programs. But the service component [granting citizenship] was then being neglected. When we got into Immigration, however, the fee for service component made a lot of sense … Lip service is paid to the need to do it [citizenship education] but then the money isn't being provided to support it.'

Another structural issue that plagued the area was staff turnover. From 1986 to 1997, five different people within the federal departments had responsibility for citizenship education. We interviewed four of them. Each of their jobs was defined slightly differently and this affected their work and outlook. One of the individuals was given responsibility for citizenship education only, two for education and promotion - one as a manager and the other as a program officer – and the fourth had responsibility for citizenship promotion. Each brought different strengths to the position as a result of their backgrounds and a different understanding of citizenship to their work.

Citizenship has rarely occupied a central place in the priorities of government. This has meant that there are few resources allocated to the area and that it receives little political attention. Officials who have been given responsibility for the area have had the latitude to define citizenship education however they deem appropriate within the general guidelines provided by the Citizenship Act and the departmental mandate. Among the officials we spoke with there was a lack of agreement on the goals of citizenship education. Donald (1996) has noted that when we talk of citizenship we often conflate three very different questions:

> One is the question of who, in particular historical circumstances, does and does not bear the rights entailed by full membership of the state. That is, who are citizens …? A second question concerns individuals' self-understanding as belonging to a collectivity… who is the citizen? And a third question concerns the practice of citizenship understood as the formation of opinion and the self-definition of a community within civil society. In

> other worlds [sic], what are citizens? What do people do when they are being citizens? (Donald 1996, p.172)

Some of the officials with whom we talked seemed to be guided in their work by the first question and thus saw the federal involvement in citizenship education as limited to providing access to the information required to obtain citizenship. Others were directed by the third question. One saw citizenship primarily in terms of voting and thus felt that citizenship education should concentrate on 'things you need to know if you are going to vote next year.' Another was concerned with promoting 'active citizenship in the sense of critical involvement in a range of issues.' None of them addressed more global citizenship issues faced by transnationals and the governments of many nations. The lack of a common understanding of citizenship or citizenship education led to decided inconsistencies in the area.

In addition, we found that the citizenship officials faced a variety of ethical considerations as they were attempting to work in this field. Like all individuals working within the State, the officials with whom we spoke found a need to negotiate and reconcile their personal and institutional identities. All of the Ottawa-based officials talked about feeling some degree of conflict as they tried to reconcile their role as a representative of the State with the role of community animator. One reached the conclusion that, 'citizenship education is important but the government shouldn't be doing it.' Another approached this dilemma by choosing to define the position as a 'citizenship educator who just happened to work for government.' It is apparent that the two distinct decisions would lead the individuals to define their work very differently.

Another major consideration was the tension between doing what one knew to be 'right' and what would 'be approved'. All of the officials, for example, felt that there was more they could have offered to the development and sustenance of a citizenship education community but they were limited by their location in the State apparatus. Many times they felt they had to bow to the demands of those above them in the chain of command even when they felt to do so was clearly wrong. Sometimes this

was seen as simply a matter of doing one's job. Sometimes this was done in order to gain the trust of a supervisor so that, at a later time, one might be given greater latitude. On occasion the officials with whom we spoke made choices that put the good of the community ahead of the demands of the bureaucracy. They asked us not to mention specific instances for fear of being reprimanded.

Recommendations

Like our colleagues concerned with citizenship education for children (e.g. Sears & Hughes, 1996; Osborne, 2001), we advocate an approach to citizenship education that would emphasize dispositions and skills over the memorization of discrete facts. We believe this would make the awarding of citizenship more meaningful to both the applicant and the country. We do not wish to suggest that the process be made more difficult or cumbersome so as to limit the ability of members of certain groups to obtain citizenship. Rather, we wish to suggest that those becoming citizens be given access to the knowledge and skills they will need to be active participants in Canadian society.

We advocate a new process that would evaluate not just the limited knowledge requirements outlined in the Citizenship Act (1977) and in the Act that is currently before Parliament, but one that would allow the applicants to discuss and display their commitment to Canada, thus focussing on participation. The CIRP working group developed a series of questions in 1987 (Derwing 1992) that capture the intent of this recommendation (see Appendix). We do not expect applicants to be able to respond to each of the 13 questions but rather to have considered the underlying issues in citizenship education classes before applying for Canadian citizenship. Changing citizenship is a significant event in the lives of those who have chosen to live here; the magnitude of this decision should not go unrecognized by the country. We should also recognize that many newcomers will continue to maintain ties elsewhere; citizenship education should encourage them to view citizenship in an integrative rather than an assimilative light.

If the government is truly to provide leadership then citizenship education must be seen as more than an afterthought. Rather than focussing attention on the development of products, the government should be more concerned with providing continuity in the field. One measure of this would be program funding for citizenship specific courses at a range of language proficiency levels for immigrants who have been in Canada for three years or more. This we believe would lead to the development of a stable citizenship education community. Notwithstanding our earlier discussion, the obvious choice for situating the proposed programs is within the ESL community. The infrastructure already exists, and the personnel are familiar with newcomers' needs. In the past, however, they have not had sufficient support or incentive to take on this role. This would allow the potential of existing resources such as the Citizenship Participation Initiative to be realized.

Finally, all of us who are concerned with citizenship education should not lose sight of the history of the field. There have been several good initiatives that have resulted in both useful resources and important insights, but they have been forgotten. The tendency among educators and bureaucrats has been to work in isolation, with no reference to what has gone before, or what is happening elsewhere.

Concluding Remarks

Canada prides itself on taking an integrative, as opposed to assimilative, approach to immigration. Citizenship education should be a key component of this approach. Until now it has been sorely lacking for the reasons discussed above. The type of citizenship education that is advocated here would recognize the complexity of the process, and would fulfil the needs of *both* the immigrant and the receiving society. It would result in true integration according to the definition given by Freire (1973):

> *Integration* with one's context, as distinguished from *adaptation*, is a distinctively human activity. Integration results from the capacity to adapt oneself to reality *plus* the critical capacity

> to make choices and transform that reality. To the extent that man (sic) loses his ability to make choices and is subjected to the choices of others, to the extent that his decisions are no longer his own because they result from external prescriptions, he is no longer integrated. Rather he has "adapted" (p.4, original emphasis).

Dominant images of citizenship based on the presumption of universality have shaped Canadian approaches to citizenship education. To be consistent with our multicultural ideal, our collective understanding of citizenship has to change to be inclusive of the lives and realities of diverse groups in our society. This does not preclude some elements of commonality but does require us to abandon a 'one size fits all' vision of citizenship. What would this new citizenship look like? Perhaps it is this question that government officials have been unable or have not wanted to address. Instead they present us with 20 multiple choice questions for which we must all have the same answers. The truth is that our histories, our memories, and our ways of being Canadian are different. The multiple choice test and all that it represents obscures this fact. As Castles (2004) has suggested, we now live in a world of porous borders (although the impact of 9/11 has made the bureaucracy of travel somewhat more difficult). We have not yet addressed what this means for citizenship and citizenship education. Nor have we thought deeply about the implications of "a more transnational conception of identity and citizenship [that] may displace the pursuit of a more just and inclusive nation- state" (Kymlicka, 2004, xv). Each person lives simultaneously in a local and a global context and has responsibilities to both. As we have shown here, current approaches to citizenship education for adult immigrants in Canada are clearly inadequate, even at the local level. Our challenge is to think more deeply about Canadian citizenship within a global context so that citizenship education may become a path to a truly integrative approach to citizenship for all Canadians.

Footnotes

1. To preserve anonymity, names of programs and interviewees have not been used.
2. Until this time the British Parliament was the final authority in matters pertaining to the Canadian Constitution. The patriation process brought to Canada a 'new and improved' constitution that included a Charter of Rights and Freedoms and made Canadian Parliament and the Supreme Court of Canada the final authorities on constitutional matters.

Appendix

1. Where am I in relation to the world and in relation to the rest of Canada?
2. Where am I in relation to where I came from and in relation to where others came from?
3. How do I know that I'm in Canada? What makes Canada unique?
4. What symbols are associated with Canadian identity and how do they relate to me?
5. Who lives around me? What do they do and how did they get here?
6. What sort of political and economic environment am I in? What jobs are available to me? What is the nature of the economy? What future opportunities are open to my children and me? How did this situation come about? What are the political and economic situations elsewhere in the country?
7. What facilities/services are available to me? What concerns do I have regarding them? What can I do to resolve my concerns?
8. How did Canada become a country? Who are the key players?
9. What is the government and what is my relationship to it? What authority does it have over me and how did that come about?
10. What are my rights? How did these rights come about? Do we all have the same rights? How can I exercise my rights?

11. What laws/rules do I have to follow?
12. Do I want to be a citizen? What will becoming a citizen enable me to do? What responsibilities do I have as a citizen?
13. What obstacles do I face as a citizen? Who else is concerned about them? What can I and others do about them?

Author Note

The authors would like to thank the participants in the study for being so forthcoming in the interviews. We are grateful to Jeff Bullard and Murray Munro for their comments on this paper. Our thanks also to Kama Jamieson and Marian Rossiter for their assistance. This research was supported by a grant from the Prairie Centre of Excellence for Research on Immigration and Integration (Metropolis Project), awarded to the second author.

References

Abu-Laban, B., Derwing, T. M., Krahn, H., Mulder, M. and Wilkinson, L. (1999). *The settlement experiences of refugees in Alberta (Vol. 1).* Edmonton, AB: Prairie Centre of Excellence for Research on Immigration and Integration.

Banks, J. A. (1997). *Educating citizens in a multicultural society.* New York, Teachers College Press.

Banks, J. A. (Ed.) (2004). *Diversity and citizenship education: global perspectives.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bloemraad, I. (2000). Citizenship and immigration: A current review. *Journal of International Migration and Integration, 1,* 9-37.

Castles, S. (2004). Migration, citizenship and education. In J. A. Banks (Ed.) *Diversity and citizenship education: global perspectives.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 17-48.

Delors, J., Al Mufti, I., Amagi, I, Carniero, R., Chung, F., Geremek, B., Gorham, W., Kornhauser, A, Manley, M., Quero, M.P., Savane, M.A., Singh, K., Stavenhagen, R., Suhr, M.W., & Zhou, N. (1996). *Learning: The treasure within. Report to UNESCO of the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century.* Paris: UNESCO Publishing.

Derwing, T. M. (1992). Instilling a passive voice: Citizenship instruction in Canada. In B. Burnaby & A. Cumming (Eds.) *Socio-political aspects of ESL***.** Toronto, ON: OISE Press.

Derwing, T. M., Jamieson, K., & Munro, M. J. (1998). Citizenship for adult immigrants: Changes over the last ten years. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 44,* 383-396.

Derwing, T. M., & Munro, M.J. (1987). *Citizenship instruction for adult (ESL) learners.* Ottawa, ON: Corporate Policy Branch, Department of the Secretary of State.

Derwing, T. M., & Thomson, R. I. (forthcoming). Citizenship concepts in LINC classrooms.

Donald, J. (1996). The citizen and the man about town. In S. Hall & P. du Gay (Eds.), *Question of Cultural Identity.* London: Sage Publications.

Freire, P. (1973). *Education for critical consciousness.* New York: Continuum.

Government of Canada (n.d.). *More of a welcome than a test.* Ottawa, ON: Multiculturalism and Citizenship.

Government of Canada (1985). *Task force on the development of a strategic plan on citizenship.* Ottawa, ON: Secretary of State.

Government of Canada (1991a). *Citizens of Canada. A Brand New Act for Everyone.* Ottawa, ON: Secretary of State.

Government of Canada (1991b). *Immigration policy and program development.* Ottawa, ON: Canada Employment and Immigration Commission.

Government of Canada (1995). *A look at Canada.* Ottawa, ON: Citizenship and Immigration Canada.

Joshee, R. (1995). *Federal government policies on cultural diversity and education: 1940-1971.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Vancouver, University of British Columbia.

Joshee, R. (1996). The federal government and citizenship education for newcomers. *Canadian and international education, 25,* 108-127.

Joshee, R. (2004). Citizenship and multicultural education in Canada: From assimilation to social cohesion. In J. A. Banks (Ed.) *Diversity and citizenship education: global perspectives.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, pp. 127-156.

Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural citizenship. A liberal theory of minority rights.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Kymlicka, W. (2004). Forward. In J. A. Banks (Ed.) *Diversity and citizenship education: global perspectives.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, pp. xiii - xviii.

Osborne, K. (1999). *Education: A guide to the Canadian school debate – or who wants what and why?* Toronto, ON: Penguin Books.

Osborne, K. (2001). Democracy, democratic citizenship and education. In J. P. Portelli and R. P. Solomon (Eds.) *The erosion of democracy in education: From critique to possibilities.* Calgary, AB: Detselig, pp. 29-61.

Nevitte, N. (1996). *The decline of deference.* Peterborough, ON: Broadview Press.

Schugurensky, D. (2003). Civic participation: On active citizenship, social capital and public policy. *Canadian Diversity, 2,* 10-12.

Sears, A. M. (1996). "Something different to everyone": Conceptions of citizenship and citizenship education, *Canadian and International Education, 25,* 1-16.

Sears, A. M., & Hughes, A. S. (1996). Macro and micro level aspects of a program of citizenship education research. *Canadian and International Education, 25,* 17-30.

Selman, G. (1991). *Citizenship and the adult education movement in Canada.* Vancouver, BC: Centre for Continuing Education, UBC.

Selman, G., & Dampier, P. (1991). *The foundations of adult education in Canada.* Toronto, ON: Thompson Education Publishing.

Torney-Purta, J. (1996) The second IEA civic education project: Development of content guidelines and items for a crossnational test and survey. *Canadian and International Education, 25,* 199-214.

_____. 2001. Social citizenship in 21st century Canada: Challenges and options. text of 2001 Timlin Lecture at the University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon.

General Information

• What are PCERII Working Papers?
PCERII's working paper series is related to the broad mandate of the Metropolis Project. This initiative is designed to: (1) speed up the dissemination of research results relevant to the interests and concerns of Metropolis researchers, policy-makers, NGOs; (2) fulfill a commitment made in the application to SSHRC/CIC for a renewal grant for the Prairie Centre; and (3) populate the Virtual Library on the PCERII web site.

• Will these be considered "official" publications?
The inclusion of a manuscript in the working paper series does not preclude, nor is it a substitute for its subsequent publication in a peer reviewed journal. In fact, we would encourage authors to submit such manuscripts for publication in professional journals (or edited books) as well.

• What subject content is acceptable?
The Working Paper Series welcomes research reports and theoretical discussions relevant to the mandate of the Metropolis Project, providing insight into the policy concerns not only of immigration and integration, but also ethnocultural diversity. Examples of these areas include: socioeconomic, political, cultural, and educational integration of migrants and refugees; impacts on the host society; language; transnationalism; spatial distribution; gender roles and family; ethnic, cultural, and religious diversity; multiculturalism; media and communication; social cohesion-inclusion; racism and discrimination-exclusion; employment equity-anti-discrimination; youth; identity; citizenship; temporary migration; immigration and demographic planning; justice and security; settlement programs and policy; and population health.

• Who may submit papers?
Paper submissions are open to Metropolis researchers, policy-makers and service providers. Submissions from non-affiliates will be examined on a case-by-case basis.

• How do I submit a paper?
All submissions must include an electronic copy of the paper.
By post please send a hard copy of your paper and an electronic copy on disk or via email to:

Editor, Working Paper Series
Prairie Centre of Excellence for Research on Immigration and Integration
1-17 Humanities Centre, University of Alberta
Edmonton, AB T6G 2E5 Canada
By email please send to: lenise@ualberta.ca with a subject heading of:
Working Paper Series Submission

• What happens when I submit a paper?
The Prairie Centre will acknowledge receipt of the paper via email within 10 working days. The series editors will review your submission to ensure that it falls within the mandate of the Metropolis Project and that it is properly referenced and documented. If these standards are met, the paper will then be referred to the appropriate Domain Leader for review and advice. Once the review is completed the author will be contacted with the results. Note: Authors of papers accepted for inclusion in the PCERII Working Papers Series may be asked to make revisions, in which case they will be asked to provide the Centre with 2 hard copies of the final version of the paper and an electronic copy.

For format and style guidelines please visit PCERII web site at:
http://pcerii.metropolis.net/WorkingPapers/index.htm

Back issues of the PCERII Working Paper Series
are available from the Prairie Centre
for $5.00 a copy.

Please contact the Prairie Centre at
1-17 Humanities Centre, University of Alberta,
Edmonton, AB T6G 2E5 Canada.
Tel: (780) 492-0635; Fax: (780) 492-2594;
Email: lenise@ualberta.ca