

that teachers are encouraged to assess the diverse needs of the learners and to make decisions as situations emerge over time. The authors advocate a “collective expertise that assures that all teachers and students are actively engaged in challenging, relevant, and interesting learning situations—situations that connect to their past experiences and engage them in constructing new experiences” (p. 4)

Beyond Monet: The Artful Science of Instructional Integration is one of the most valuable and recommended volumes of its time. It is presented insightfully and rigorously by two authors who have much experience in the field of education as practitioners and researchers. It is especially recommended for school district personnel, school administrators, teachers, and parents. The book could also be used as a credible resource among the university and college professoriate, especially those involved in preservice teacher education. Anyone who believes that the often dismal performance of many disadvantaged students is inevitable should look at the instructional strategies discussed in this book. As the authors clearly surmise, all students do not learn in the same way, and all teachers do not teach using the same methods. What works for one teacher and a group of students may not necessarily work for another.

Citizenship in Transformation in Canada. Yvonne M. Hébert (Ed.). Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press, 2002, 289 pages, ISBN 0-8020-0850-X.

Reviewed by: *Jennifer Tupper*
University of Alberta

Citizenship in Transformation is an interdisciplinary compilation of essays that reflects the complexities and ambiguities surrounding citizenship debates in the Canadian context. From personal experiences with the exclusive nature of citizenship to a quantitative analysis of the value of literacy for active citizenship, the essays in this book provide an eclectic insight into the diverse ways of thinking and talking about citizenship. However, it is also important to point out that although some of the essays are of marginal interest, others are worth revisiting repeatedly. In particular the essays of Veronica Strong-Boag, Marie Battiste, and Helen Semaganis, Celia Haig-Brown, and Cecille dePass and Shazia Qureshi are thoughtful, articulate pieces worthy of attention. In total there are 13 essays in this book as well as an appendix created by Yvonne Hébert and Lori Wilkinson that attempts to organize models of democratic citizenship.

Yvonne Hébert and Lori Wilkinson, in the opening essay, identify what they perceive as the primary challenge to models of Canadian citizenship. At the heart of citizenship is the need to respect differences while commonalities are identified and nurtured. Hébert and Wilkinson situate the citizenship debate in four dimensions: the conceptual foundations of citizenship and iden-

Jennifer Tupper is a doctoral candidate in social studies education in the Department of Secondary Education. Her research interests include citizenship education and issues of race, culture, and gender in social studies curriculum.

tity; policies and institutional goals; citizenship set within the realities of Canadian society; and citizenship education. They explore some historical and contemporary models of citizenship that reflect the consent-dissent dichotomy, including Kymlicka's multicultural citizenship and Taylor's communitarian citizenship, and maintain that debates about citizenship include pluralism "within reasonable limits" (p. 12). Although I agree that pluralism must be a part of discussions about citizenship, I am left wondering what would constitute "reasonable limits" of inclusion.

Nevertheless, the authors do acknowledge the limits faced by certain individuals and groups in liberal democracies in terms of sociopolitical participation while recognizing the need to allow for multiple belongings. In terms of policies and institutional goals, Hébert and Wilkinson suggest that the desire for social cohesion is what drives state attention to citizenship. The authors view social cohesion as both a desirable goal and a nebulous concept. Where Hébert and Wilkinson run into trouble, I contend, is in their discussion of citizenship education policy and their assertion that

great challenges are to be faced in deciding precisely which manifestations of a complexity of traits or qualities ought to be included in programs of study and what would count as evidence of citizenship values, knowledge, behaviour, skills, attitudes, and practices that could reasonably be expected of most students in Canada. (p. 18)

First, why must we "decide precisely" when it has already been noted that citizenship is complex and fluid, evolving, and negotiatory? It seems to me that any attempts to measure citizenship create a hierarchy of traits and qualities and a good-bad dichotomy. I agree that there are some values that we should strive to instill in our students, but who decides what will be included in programs of studies and thus given legitimacy?

One of the gems in this volume, written by Veronica Strong-Boag, is "Who Counts? Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth-Century Struggles About Gender, Race, and Class in Canada." Strong-Boag is critical of Canada's inability to address the shortcomings of a falsely universal citizenship and reminds us that historically, citizenship education was designed to promote a homogeneous vision of Canada despite the diversity of its citizens. In this way certain groups benefited from citizenship education, whereas women, Native people, and the working class suffered from this vision. Strong-Boag explores the historic struggles for belonging and recognition that feminists, Native people, and workers engaged in as she attempts to give voice to an often silenced story of Canadian citizenship. A comprehensive discussion of the history of the franchise is provided, and the darker side of Canadian history is chronicled in the treatment of First Nations people by federal and provincial governments. The rise of labor unions and their subsequent attempts to win rights for workers are briefly outlined.

My criticism of this essay is Strong-Boag's failure to acknowledge adequately the diversity inherent in each of the categories *women*, *Natives*, and *workers*. Instead she tends to ignore the diversity within these groups save for a brief mention midway through her essay. At the beginning of her discussion, Strong-Boag is critical of citizenship education for ignoring diversity among

groups, yet she herself negates the diversity that exists in the categories of women, workers, and First Nations people. Despite this shortcoming, Strong-Boag's discussion provides insight into how the practices of citizenship and citizenship education have been exclusive and unequal and is well worth reading.

Following Strong-Boag, Romulo F. Magsino explores some of the various theoretical orientations to citizenship as he grapples with the question of how we are to "ascertain the citizen's entitlements and obligations and the roles that government and citizens ought to play in the political realm" (p. 60). A central concern I have in reading this essay is the author's attempt to resolve what he perceives as the citizenship issues that we face. This contradicts what both Hébert and Wilkinson and Strong-Boag maintain in their respective discussions: that citizenship is a complex and nebulous concept that may never fully be resolved as societies and human beings are always in a state of flux. In addition, Magsino's use of *he/she* in his discussion of historical models of citizenship leaves the reader with a false sense of inclusivity. For example, in the context of Ancient Rome, he states, "one was not considered a citizen until he/she was seen to participate in the polis" (p. 59). The implication is that women were able to participate in the polis whereas the opposite was true. Although I understand the importance of using inclusive language, in some instances its use serves to mask historical and contemporary inequities, as is the case here. Attention is paid to the debate between liberalism and communitarianism and the limitations of each, followed by an examination of civic republicanism and critical theory as providing implications for citizenship education. The use of critical theory as "a radical alternative to citizenship" is interesting, if not dated, but Magsino is careful to note some of the shortcomings of this approach.

The fourth essay in this collection, "Recognition of Cultural and Religious Diversity in the Educational Systems of Liberal Democracies" by Guy Bourgeault, France Gagnon, Marie McAndrew, and Michel Pagé I find disturbing. It is ironic that the authors clearly note the diversity of individuals in society, yet fail to couch their discussion in inclusive terms. It seems that all citizens are males as the authors make repeated reference to citizenship in terms of "his existence," "his life," "his social integration," "his conception of good," "his interests," "his being and belonging," and so forth. Even more ironic, the use of exclusive language in this context does not operate to reveal historical or contemporary inequities; rather it appears to be unintentional. As a woman, I felt alienated and excluded by this use of language, and although I might expect to encounter it in essays written in a different era, this was written in 2002. Perhaps we should view it as a tangible example of how "universal" citizenship is manifest in liberal democracies.

Moving beyond this, the authors do engage in a thoughtful exploration of the notion of *virtue* in citizenship. However, this thoughtfulness is lost when they embark on a discussion about the establishment of norms of existence that recognize religious and cultural differences, when they state that "He [sic] must also recognize that not everything can be submitted to the rule of the majority alone and *that minority points of view must be taken into account when it results in no inconvenience to others*" (emphasis added, p. 88). What does this

mean? Are the authors implying that as long as minority rights or points of view do not disrupt the existing structure of privilege and power then they may be considered? Diversity is desirable only insofar as it does not disrupt dominance? It seems to me that this statement undermines much of the thinking the authors have engaged in about issues of cultural and religious diversity in a plural society.

A further criticism stems from the authors' assertion that "contemporary educational research is a long way from demonstrating that the equality of individuals belonging to different cultural groups necessitates a rigorously egalitarian representation of their cultures in curricula and school practices" (p. 89). To support this point, they provide a single reference from 1990, ignoring more than 10 years worth of feminist educational research and scholarship demonstrating exactly the opposite position.

The essay that follows, "First Thoughts on First Nations Citizenship: Issues in Education" by Marie Battiste and Helen Semaganis is an insightful and provocative exploration of citizenship from an Aboriginal perspective. The authors are highly critical of dominant conceptions of citizenship education, which render First Nations people invisible and attempt to offer contrasting views of citizenship. They do so in part through a discussion of kinship webs, which inform the lived experiences of citizenship for Aboriginal peoples rather than citizenship in relation to an external state authority. Rosa Bruno-Jofre, in her essay, also identifies how citizenship education has historically operated as a vehicle for cultural transmission, but reminds us of its oppositional dimension that involves resistance, contestation, negotiation, and memories of oppression.

In "Bridging the Boundaries for a More Inclusive Citizenship Education," Roberta J. Russell explores some of the challenges of creating a more inclusive and participatory approach to citizenship education, and Harold Troper provides a historical discussion of immigration policy in Canada. In her essay "Democratic Research to Inform Citizenship," Celia Haig-Brown pushes the boundaries of thinking about citizenship in an exploration of its shifting meanings in the Canadian context. She is critical of contemporary understandings of democracy that drive education and research, particularly as they are manifest through standardized tests. Fundamental to any research, maintains Haig-Brown, is the question of how it will be used and who will benefit from it. More importantly, though, are the people being researched and the role they play in this process. They must always be more than nameless, faceless numbers and statistics. She calls for research that will inform citizenship to acknowledge the rich and complex differences between people in order to create and re-create strong communities. Of all the essays in this collection, Haig-Brown's is perhaps the most provocative and unsettling for those who imagine that research should always be about utility and application, numbers and categories.

Following on the heels of Celia Haig-Brown's discussion, Cecille dePass and Shazia Qureshi focus on the ironies, paradoxes, and contradictions in which the concept of citizenship is mired. dePass' own experiences as a Jamaican Canadian living in Calgary provide meaning to what might otherwise be an overly theoretical discussion of citizenship. In real terms, dePass' experiences provide the reader with an understanding of how people of color

exist in the spaces between citizen and non-citizen in Canadian society. The authors reject the term *visible minority* in this essay in favor of *people of color*, viewing the former as an externally imposed definition and the latter as a self-selected term for self-definition. Three categories of citizens recognized by the minority perspective are identified and described, but the authors fail to acknowledge adequately that categories often leak into each other. However, this shortcoming is minor in the light of efforts to examine how citizenship has played out for various groups in terms of inclusion and exclusion. I have no doubt that this is an essay I will visit and revisit as I continue my own research and thinking on citizenship.

As seems to be the pattern in this book, exceptional work is followed by less than exceptional work, so it is no surprise that Fernando Mata's essay "Visible Minorities as Citizens and Workers in Canada" is somewhat disappointing. Mata suggests that the purpose of the chapter is to provide some cross-linkages among "labour force integration, citizenship, and visible minority status in Canada using recent demographic data" (p. 192). I find it interesting that he chooses to use the term *visible minority* following the critique of this terminology in the preceding essay, and I could not help but be bothered by this. There is an extensive statistical discussion of labor force integration of 14 visible and nonvisible minority groups who hold varying degrees of citizenship in Canada. Although this discussion might be interesting to some, I found that the human element was absent. Immigrants are reduced to the color of their skin, and their lived experiences are reduced to numbers and percentages. This stands in direct contrast to Celia Haig-Brown's assertion that research must be about "the possibility of investigations, deep and thorough, of ideas, dreams, and everyday worlds, investigations that may have no apparent utility and no direct application to anything" (p. 161).

The book closes with Yvonne Hébert and Michel Pagé's call for a pan-Canadian research agenda in the areas of citizenship and citizenship education. They suggest that research on citizenship in Canada lacks coordination and has been undertaken largely as a result of "personal preferences, interests, affinities, and whims" and has been "subject to continuous ideological winds" (p. 228). An assertion such as this negates and trivializes important work that has been undertaken by Canadian researchers in the area of citizenship education that does not necessarily conform to the agenda being advanced by Hébert and Pagé. Further, the authors call for the development of a conceptual framework for the analysis of citizenship that will "be modified and enriched as necessary to enclose all unforeseen aspects of citizenship," that will allow us to "grasp the overall meaning of citizenship," and whose "full development is achieved when saturation is reached" (p. 233). It seems that the framework the authors are referring to is already in existence, having been developed by "two colleagues in Montreal" (p. 233). I find these statements troubling on a number of levels. First, they contradict earlier recognition that citizenship is a dynamic and fluid concept. Will we ever be able to grasp the overall meaning of citizenship? As long as society continues to change and evolve, so too will our varied understandings of citizenship and all of its possibilities. Second, it is one thing to advocate a language through which we might better understand citizenship in all its complexities. It is quite another to imply that a time will come when

the possibility of generating new insights about citizenship and citizenship education will vanish. Finally, maintaining that all the research and work on citizenship in Canada conform to a conceptual framework for the analysis of citizenship created by two individuals in Montreal is at once limited and limiting.

Whether one agrees or disagrees with the assertions and recommendations made in the various essays, they do provide a snapshot of the current state of thinking about citizenship and citizenship education in Canada.