UNDERSTANDING CITIZENSHIP: A DELPHI STUDY

Andrew S. Hughes
University of New-Brunswick - Fredericton

This article reports the results of a Delphi exploration of the notion of citizenship as it appears to a group of knowledgeable Canadians. The members of the Delphi panel were academics, senior public officials with major responsibilities related to citizenship, members of the Canadian Senate and some members of the general public who, either individually or through their participation in voluntary organizations, had shown a particular concern for citizenship issues. The results of the investigation reveal areas about which a considerable measure of consensus was achieved as well as some where discord persists. Perhaps most importantly the results point out a direction rather than a destination for the development of citizenship in Canada. It is a direction that points toward a citizenship of understanding.

L'article rapporte les résultats d'une exploration Delphi sur la notion de citoyenneté comme le pense un groupe de Canadiens bien informés. Les invités de Delphi sont des académiciens, des hauts-fonctionnaires tenant des postes importants relatifs à la citoyenneté, des membres du Sénat du Canada et quelques membres du grand public, qui, par leurs services volontaires à titre individuels ou comme membres d'organisation bénévoles, ont fait preuve de leurs soucis aux problèmes de la citoyenneté. Les résultats de l'enquête révèlent des domaines dans lesquels une mesure considérable de consensus a pu être atteinte et aussi des points où reste encore un désaccord. L'importance des résultats c'est que l'enquête a défini une direction et non un point d'arrivée pour développer la citoyenneté au Canada. C'est la direction vers une citoyenneté d'entendement.

The title of this paper, Understanding Citizenship, is deliberately ambiguous. It reflects both the intention of the research reported here and its result. The aim of the work was to seek out an understanding of the concept of citizenship appropriate to Canada. The result of the work became a portrait, albeit unfinished, of an understanding citizenship or a citizenship of understanding.

The work began as an attempt to probe the complex relationship that exists between the citizen and the state; the relationship that may have its origins in the conferring of the legal status of citizen but which is played out in a tension of give and take between the individual and the collectivity. The task was one of

trying to discern a face of citizenship that, janus- like, would look to both the past and the future; that would serve as an ideal to direct citizenship education efforts.

The Delphi Procedure

The procedure employed to examine the notion of citizenship was the Delphi Study technique developed in the 1950s at the RAND Corporation. It has as its intention the development of an informed consensus on a topic among a panel of experts while at the same time insulating them from the forces of direct face-to-face interaction. The forces to be concerned about are those that sometimes operate in round-table discussions: specious persuasion by the group member of greatest authority or reputation, the bandwagon effect of majority opinion, the unwillingness of members to abandon publicly expressed opinions, and even the simple wearing down of other opinion by participants with the loudest and longest voices (Dalkey, 1969; Linstone and Turoff, 1975). In the Delphi procedure, there is no direct contact between members of the panel, and indeed, members may not know who their colleagues are. The views of members of the panel are provided to each other anonymously, usually in some sort of synthesized form, in a series of rounds. Members are asked to reconsider their views in light of the feedback that they have received and the dialogue proceeds through the thoughtfulness and persuasiveness of the arguments of the members. As areas of accord and discord emerge in the discussion they become part of the mix with members of the panel have an opportunity to consider them. While the procedure deliberately seeks consensus, it does not discard dissenting views.

In operational terms, the Delphi takes the form of a correspondence that flows through a coordinator whose prime responsibility is to faithfully distil the essence of the Delphi discussion as it proceeds through each round and then provide it in a synthesized form as feedback to the members of the panel. The panel member are then responsible for reconsidering the issues before them in the light of the information and arguments provided by their colleagues.

The Delphi Panel

In this study the Delphi panel consisted of thirty individuals who could bring to the discussion an informed perspective on citizenship and citizenship education. The group included academics from a range of disciplines (the largest group was from Education), senior public servants with major responsibilities relating to citizenship, some members of the Canadian Senate who have a special interest in matters related to citizenship, and some members of the general public who either individually or through their participation in voluntary organizations had shown a particular concern for matters related to citizenship.

Project history

- Round One (December 1991 - January 1992) asked those who had accepted an invitation to participate in the work to simply "Compose a statement identifying the features of 'good citizenship' as you would wish to see it practiced in Canada." "If it helps" it was suggested, "you may wish to ask yourself what is a 'good citizen'." From the responses, the coordinator abstracted 62 separate statements, each revealing something of the thinking of one or more of the members of the panel. As far as possible the exact language and expression of the original was maintained. The concern, at this point, was to allow the panel to examine the full range of views expressed.
- Round Two (February-March, 1992) provided the 62 statements abstracted from the round one data to the panel as feedback. The panel members were asked to consider each of the statements carefully and then rate them according to how important the statement would be to the member's conception of good citizenship. They were asked to classify the statements as Absolutely Essential (AE), Important but Not Essential (INE), Desirable but Not Important (DNI), or Not Particularly Important (NPI). They were also asked to comment on any or all of the individual statements as they might see fit.
- Round Three (April-May, 1992) provided the panel with the results of round two. The feedback showed the panel that 28 of the original statements had been identified by at least 50 percent of the group as being absolutely essential or by at least 70 percent of the group as absolutely essential or important but not essential. They were also provided with a representative sampling of the comments made by their colleagues on each of the statements. Each member of the panel was asked to rethink their individual positions and then to identify statements that they were having difficulty including in their conception of the "good citizen" and statements that they would have difficulty leaving out. They were asked to elaborate their thinking on each area of concern as far as possible.
- Round Four (July-September, 1992) asked members of the panel to react to a paper drafted by the coordinator based on the discussion to that point. The paper attempted to capture the essence of the discussion to that point by addressing:
 - general concerns of the panel
 - key issues
 - emerging areas of consensus.

The members of the panel were asked to consider whether they thought the paper reflected the conversation as it had taken place through the Delphi and then to add whatever comments they thought appropriate related to the substantive matters raised in the paper.

The research reported here attempts to communicate the essence of the Delphi conversation: to identify what appear to be some emerging areas of consensus and to portray the nature of what remain unresolved issues.

Issues that emerged early in the Delphi process

The first two rounds of the Delphi sought to generate ideas related to the notion of "good citizenship" and to determine how important they might be in developing a conception of citizenship appropriate to the Canadian situation. As soon as the initial ideas of the group were shared, it was clear that there were areas that many members of the panel found worrisome.

The legal status of citizenship

The most striking feature of the panel's initial statements was a clear identification of what "good citizenship" was not about. For most members, "good citizenship" was not about the legal status of citizen, whether by birth or by choice. Not only was legal status not viewed as a sufficient condition for "good citizenship", it was viewed by some as not even a necessary condition. Indeed, several members of the panel seemed to adhere to the position that there are legal citizens of Canada who are not "good citizens" and there are "good citizens" in Canada who are not legal citizens of Canada. For some members of the panel, though, it was clear that the pursuit of the ideal of citizenship has its point of origin in the meeting of the legal requirements of citizenship.

Even some of the principles of the Oath of Citizenship seemed to cause difficulty among members of the panel: loyalty, respect, obedience. It was not that any member of the group was not supportive of these notions (as long as they were taken to connote what the member wanted them to connote), it was simply that the notion of citizen seemed to require so much more. One member of the panel said "There's a bit too much loyalty, obedience and respect here." As coordinator, I was never sure whether the "here" referred to Canada or to the Oath.

In many respects the problem emerging here is similar to one anticipated in a 1992 booklet from the Federal Department of Multiculturalism and Citizenship called *Canadian Citizenship: What Does It Mean To You?* The first sentence asks: "What does it mean to be a Canadian?" "You might say," comes the response, "that a Canadian is someone who is a citizen of Canada. And you would be right. But Canadian citizenship is far more than that." (p. 1) Understanding what is meant by the phrase "far more than that," i.e.

understanding the dimensions of citizenship that lie beyond the simple requirements of being a citizen by birth or by choice, was to become a major focus of the work of the panel.

The "good citizen" in the Canadian sense and in the global sense

Some members of the panel very early began to think about whether there might be no difference between being a fundamentally decent human being and being a good citizen of Canada. For some it seemed that these were the same concepts but with different labels; for others they were seen as complementary but distinct ideas. Good citizens in Canada, some thought, would inevitably show a concern for global issues such as the environment and adherence to fundamental human rights. The task of distinguishing the necessary and sufficient conditions was a task that the panel would address but not resolve.

An informed citizenry

From the very beginning there was a large measure of consensus that a "good citizen" would be an informed one. At an abstract level there seemed little dissent. But informed about what? No-one seemed keen to offer up some 5000 bits of information that all Canadians should know, *à la* Hirsch. (1988) in the United States. Still, there was general adherence to the view that we should know who we are, where we have come from, how we have come to be the way we are, how our civic culture works, what we aspire to in the future.

Participation

It was also clear that the panel felt strongly about participation as a dimension of "good citizenship". It seemed to be widely held that the good citizen participates, does not sit on the sidelines but rather takes an interest, gets involved. At the same time there seemed to be an unwillingness to stipulate that such participation should be viewed as a necessary condition of "good citizenship". Participation was often qualified by such terms as "voluntary" or "to an appropriate level."

A second theme related to participation went beyond notions of the right to participate to focus on the capacity to participate. "Good citizens," it was argued, "should be in a position to exercise their full citizenship rights." They should never be disempowered because of economic, social or other disadvantages.

Dispositions

In the initial statements, words such as disposition, attitude and values played an important role in the conceptions advanced by several members of the panel. An almost equal number objected. Some objected on the basis that they simply did not understand the concept; others worried more about any conception

of citizenship that would intrude into the realm of what any individual might think or value. It was to become an area requiring elaboration and clarification.

The disposition of "respect" was mentioned more than any other in the initial submissions of the panel: respect for others, for differences, for freedom, for rights, for the contributions of other, for the rule of law. For some, respect implied an unconditional acceptance of others; for many there were caveats to be attached. For most, respect did not connote an uncritical, mindless acceptance of ideas and behaviour. There was a dimension of thoughtfulness that must be attached. Perhaps this would be a sympathetic thoughtfulness: one that does not seek commitment to a particular orthodoxy; one that is pluralist in its disposition, generally tolerant in its outlook, but that is quite prepared to reject ideas and behaviour that do not stand up to scrutiny.

But even the word "tolerant" was to lead to considerable difficulty. In the early stages, many members of the panel wrote of the importance of tolerance. Then, a member asked: "Who wants to be told that they will be tolerated? We will tolerate your presence here? We will tolerate your point of view?" The posing of the question was telling. In these statements, tolerance is seen as something offered grudgingly. The notion of respect being sought was not this. It was something to be given freely; that was welcoming and including.

Similarly, many of the initial statements of the panel seemed to be undergirded by an attempt to work toward a notion of citizenship that would seek to include rather than exclude. Still, the attempts were vague, imprecise in their language, and indicated a quest rather than a firm position securely arrived at. One of the members wrote of "good citizenship" as "reaching out to one another in every scale of human living." Another talked of "a sense of caring for our country -- not blind chauvinistic pride, but caring about preserving and improving on our democratic values and institutions." This latter statement inspired universal support among members of the panel even though its precise meaning was by no means clear. The sentiment captured by the word "caring" seemed to evoke a strong positive resonance as an attribute that should characterize "good citizenship" as we think about it in Canada.

The "good citizen" or the "ideal citizen"

Very early in the dialogue, members of the panel began to wonder about the value of the "good citizen" concept. "If a good citizen is one who is informed and who participates," members began to ask, "is one who is less well informed and who does not participate as much then a 'bad citizen'? Is citizenship to be graded on a curve?" The question was to be the beginning of a journey away from consideration of the "good citizen" and "good citizenship" to consideration of the "ideal citizen" and the "ideal of citizenship."

Working Toward Consensus

In rounds three and four of the Delphi, members of the panel had the opportunity to elaborate their ideas and to explore those of their colleagues. As the dialogue proceeded, it seemed that there was movement toward a common ground on many of the issues that had been raised. The following section tries to capture something of the emerging commonality views.

Away from "good citizenship" and toward an "ideal of citizenship."

One of the areas of consensus that emerged during the course of the Delphi was a redefinition of the question. We had begun by thinking about "the good citizen" and "good citizenship" but these turned out to be notions that restricted and limited the dialogue. Some members of the panel argued very early against the use of the "good citizen" concept and their argument was generally accepted. As an alternative, an argument was made in favour of the notion of "an ideal of citizenship." Using this notion, to be less than ideal would not imply "bad"; it might be very good indeed though somewhat less than ideal.

There was also a general consensus in the panel that the concept of ideal citizenship should be "inspirational." It should portray an image of civic life to which Canada, as a society, might aspire, said members of the panel. It would not be a set of conditions to which each individual would have to adhere, but rather, it would be a set of ideals that we would collectively pursue. The quest for inspirational ideals identified here conjures up images of the Canada First Movement of the last century that so much regretted that the union of British North America "had been accomplished in the prosaic manner more associated with the formation of joint-stock companies than in the founding of new nations;" (Berger, 1970, p. 49) a manner that persisted down to the recent Charlottetown Accord.

Toward a Consensus on Civic Knowledge

The consensus of the panel was clearly that Canada should aspire to an informed citizenry. The statements that evoked a positive resonance from the group focused on some themes:

- An understanding of the ideas of rights and responsibilities in a general sense
- An understanding of the ideas of rights and responsibilities in the particular sense of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms
- An understanding of how these ideas have evolved historically in Canada and elsewhere.

Specifically, it seems to be implied that an informed citizenry would have an understanding of the concepts that have shaped the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. The most basic of these would be justice which is sought through the

assurance of certain freedoms. Section 2 of the Charter specifies the particular fundamental freedoms about which we would seek understanding:

- (a) freedom of conscience and religion;
- (b) freedom of thought, belief, opinion, and expression, including freedom of the press and other media of communication;
- (c) freedom of peaceful assembly;
- (d) freedom of association.

In the panel statements and in all the comments made in order to qualify and clarify them, there seems to be an implication that understanding of these ideas must come at two levels. One is the abstract level of the understanding of the general principle; the other, the concrete level of how these principles are manifested in Canada -- how they have developed, how they have been and are being pursued. It is our understanding, then, of fundamental concepts such as justice and freedom, that will inform our actions and attitudes as a society.

There are a number of other concepts that have crept into the discussions, often parenthetically, that might also require scrutiny. These are concepts such as loyalty, participation, property, due process, dissent, rule of law, diversity, equality. The correspondence implies that it is how we understand these ideas that will give shape to our Canadian commitments.

Toward a Consensus on Civic Participation

The views of the panel on participation suggest that, ideally, in Canada there would be a high level of responsible citizen participation in the affairs that shape the character of society. Responsible participation would be well informed. It would also be effective. Citizens at large would be knowledgeable about how decisions affecting public policy are arrived at and they would be skilled in giving a "voice" to their views. Furthermore, the degree and level of participation would be freely chosen. But to choose freely, Canadian citizens must know what their choices are. One of our Delphi colleagues has expressed it this way: he says that "not knowing what your rights are is the same as not having them." And not having the skills to give form to the rights is the same as being denied them.

To participate, then, is not simply a matter of having the right and the inclination to do so. It is also the matter of having the knowledge and skills that will allow you to do it. What matters freedom of expression, it was asked, to the citizen who can find neither the ideas nor the words to express his/her aspirations?

For the panel, it was useful to think of knowledge that informs but is essentially passive and then the skill that allows action in the form of participation. Among these skills are clearly those of speaking and writing, as well as their counterparts listening and reading. Clearly the capacity to speak and write clearly on matters of public interest are factors that limit and facilitate the capacity of any

citizenry to participate. The absence of these skills effectively limits the citizen's right to participate. Some of our group were clearly very concerned about this sort of limiting of rights that emanates not from legal restrictions but from social and political impotence.

Toward a Consensus on Civic Dispositions

Initially, the concept of "disposition" seemed to hold little meaning for many members of our group. And yet, this is the category that yielded the largest number of statements that we largely agreed on. One member of our group says that she "still does not have a clue what it means"; another says that he uses the term synonymously with "attitude" and "tendency to." By the end of round four, most members of the panel had accepted the value of the concept. One wrote "if I have any criticism about this category, it is that the word "disposition" is not really strong enough, but I can live with it." Another said "finally I know what participants in the Delphi mean by this! and I no longer have a problem with the word."

If we look at some of the key terms in the statements reflecting dispositions, we see words such as loyal, respect, recognition of rights, commitment, values, sense of caring. It is quite clear that the panel would hope that Canadian citizens would develop a commitment to certain sorts of ideals, as expressed in the statements, and that these commitments would be sustained by the knowledge and skills outlined in the previous sections. Many of these ideals would seem to be characterized by a willingness to set aside private interests and concern for the sake of the common good. Our assumption seems to be that in order to freely decide to give precedence to the common good, certain sorts of traits of character, habits of mind, or dispositions are required. Among the dispositions mentioned by our group are open-mindedness, civic mindedness, respect, willingness to compromise, tolerance, compassion, generosity of spirit, and loyalty.

The struggle in the Delphi conversation has been not so much with the acceptance of the labels but with ensuring a significant commonality of understanding of the ideas behind the labels. For example, our concept of loyalty incorporates a place for dissent; the manner of dissent is influenced by our notions of compromise, tolerance, compassion and generosity. Our notion of open-mindedness requires that we be receptive to ideas and arguments that may differ from our own; but our open-mindedness is not empty-headedness. Our receptivity to ideas and arguments includes a critical scepticism and the possibility of the rejection of the ideas and the argument. Our concept of respect would seem to imply treating others with regard, regardless of gender, race, religion or national origin; of ensuring their equal place in the Canadian family.

For a minority of the panel, there was a considerable reluctance to include what were referred to as general traits of character as aspects of our image

of an ideal Canadian citizenry. For most of the panel, it was hard to conceive an ideal citizenry not characterized by the sorts of dispositions listed.

These major areas of consensus -- knowledge, participation, and dispositions emerge from categories suggested by members of the panel. Those familiar with the domain of civic education will recognize that they are the same as some of the major categories proposed by the Civitas (Bahmueller, 1991) project in the United States and that they contain elements similar to various Civic education programmes in use in Canada such as the Participate Model developed by the Ontario Ministry of Citizenship. One of the members of the Delphi panel had urged very early in the process that our members should become acquainted with Civitas right away. As coordinator, I took the liberty of not informing the other members of the suggestion. This was not because I did not recognize the considerable potential of Civitas for our work but because, in my judgment, its eloquent and perceptive positions might be too readily adopted by our panel. I later wrote to the panel saying that I had been worried about a "made in America" solution to a Canadian issue.

Issue within the Broad Consensus

The consensus reached by the Delphi Panel that would view an ideal Canadian citizenry as being

- informed
- willing and able to participate
- characterized by certain dispositions

was a consensus of broad strokes, of general principles. For some, such a consensus provided the latitude and flexibility necessary to allow pursuit of the ideal on a variety of levels, whether governmental or individual. For others, it remained too abstract; allowing not only for interpretation but for misinterpretation.

The specificity with which the ideal of citizenship in Canada is to be portrayed remains an issue for some members of the panel. The latter rounds of the Delphi contain suggestions that "it would be far more helpful to identify what knowledge the ideal citizen is to possess." Some members of the panel provided a list of examples or "a partial list of competencies that citizens need." For most members of the panel, though, there was a reluctance to see any particular piece of information, any particular competency, any particular disposition, as a necessary condition in the ideal of citizenship. There was, rather, an inclination to the view that there are various configurations possible that would be sufficient to meet the ideal but that no single element of knowledge, participation or disposition would be necessary.

Areas of On-going Discord

While the four rounds of the Delphi appeared to facilitate a coalescence of views on the issues described above, there were other areas that remained sources of discord. The discussion may have facilitated a measure of understanding of contrary positions but had not yielded any significant measure of consensus.

Discord about the legal status of citizen

In the early stages of the Delphi, most members took for granted the legal status of "citizen" and focused their comments on an ideal that lay beyond meeting the minimum requirements to be a Canadian citizen whether by birth or by choice. For at least one member of the panel this perspective caused considerable consternation. She wrote:

I continue to be jolted by everyone's seeming lack of concern about the legal status of requirements for citizenship. I recognize our (Citizenship) Act is only the beginning, but who legally is entitled to citizenship, and how they achieve that legal status, makes Canada unique in the world. Unique in many ways -- Canada's legal endorsement of multiple citizenship in 1977 opened the doors to many people who could not become Canadian ... Our approach that citizenship is a right not a privilege is also unique. We have no "good character" requirements -- only a formal process ... By moving toward multiple citizenship, we have lost the notion of a single loyalty ... (which has) given us opportunities to define citizenship in a broader way -- perhaps we are a more permissive, equalitarian and humanitarian society.

Among the members of the expert panel there was certainly an intuitive appreciation of the notion of multiple loyalties but apparently little sense of the way in which commitment to the concept had been enshrined in our institutions as described in the above comment.

By the later stages of the Delphi, concern among a majority of members of the panel for the matter of the legal status of citizenship had been relegated to a tacit if sometimes grudging recognition of it as a necessary precondition to ideal citizenship. After all, it seemed to most quite clear that the issue before us was not a question of what should be the legal requirements for citizenship but rather how would we envision the attributes of ideal citizenship. For others, though, the idea that some found it possible to talk of an ideal of citizenship in Canada without concern for the legal requirements of citizenship was to beg the issue.

The relationship of the individual to the Monarch

A matter somewhat related to the legal status issue was raised with the panel in the course of the feedback for round four. As coordinator, I had noticed that in correspondence over a period of several months there had not been a single

mention made of the Monarchy. Members were then reminded of the Oath of Allegiance:

I swear (or affirm) that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors, according to law and that I will faithfully observe the laws of Canada and fulfil my duties as a Canadian citizen.

I then asked if I could take it that, since no mention had been made of the monarchy in our discussions, if it was the panel's view that the monarch was irrelevant to the matter of ideal citizenship in Canada. I had expected that some members of the panel might seize the opportunity to seek out a central place for the relationship with the monarchy in our conception of citizenship. It did not happen. Two members indicated that they had simply presumed our discussion to be proceeding in the context of a constitutional monarchy. Two others took the opportunity to paint the monarchy as an institution that divides Canadians rather than uniting them. Several members explicitly stated that consideration of the monarchy was not something that had influenced their thinking. Most did not comment on the matter of the monarchy at all.

The ideals of citizenship for Canada and for the global community

There persisted from very early in the Delphi a concern over whether there was any important distinction to be drawn between a conception of citizenship that would serve as an ideal for Canadians and the features of an ideal for world or global citizenship. For example, one of the early statements suggested that "a good citizen is one who values the search for wholeness, which includes reaching out to one another in every scale of human living from families to the world community." Members of the panel were not unsympathetic to the idea but wondered whether it contributed anything to a discussion of citizenship that was to be circumscribed by the concept of "Canadian."

The issue persisted throughout the discussion. Initially, a majority of the panel seemed inclined to equate good Canadian citizenship with good global citizenship. One member suggested that "the values of good human beings are the same as those that define a good Canadian." As the discussion developed, though, there began to develop a sense of the need to put a Canadian stamp on the idea of Canadian citizenship. "I think there is a difference between being 'a basically decent human being and being a good Canadian citizen' ... one can be a decent human being without being a good Canadian citizen but could not be a good Canadian citizen without being a decent human being." Another member argued that we should not "create an unnecessary dualism here, as though they are two separate and disconnected conceptual ideas." As the discussion evolved, the effort focused on reconciling the Canadian and global dimensions of citizenship. There

were various attempts to recognize the complementarity and compatibility of the Canadian and global dimensions. The difficulty seemed to lie in disentangling what might be uniquely Canadian from the larger morass. In the final round, one of the members put it this way: "The concept of world citizenship is not an ideal except for a rather special minority. Most Canadians would see our role in the world through our Canadian citizenship." The movement in the discussion seemed to be toward a view that Canadians who strive to achieve an ideal of citizenship in Canada would inevitably find themselves in harmony with ideals of global citizenship. It would be the specific context in which the ideals are pursued, and their particular concrete manifestations, that would be Canadian. In this way it might be possible to recognize a particularly Canadian dimension to issues of citizenship without imposing what had previously been referred to as "an unnecessary dualism." This was the direction in which the tenor of the discussion was moving. For several members of the panel, though, it was overambitious; it was seeking to accomplish too much. They emphasized that the concept of citizen was one linked to nations and nation states and the rightful focus should remain there.

The purpose of the work reported here was to examine how a group of knowledgeable Canadians are thinking about the notion citizenship. There have emerged aspects of an ideal of citizenship about which there is apparently a large measure of consensus: that an ideal of citizenship would involve an informed citizenry; one able and willing to participate; one guided by dispositions rooted in notions of justice and freedom. But it is a consensus of broad strokes, one that is fragile and might well break down if pushed to too great a degree of specificity. There have also emerged aspects of the notion of citizenship about which there was considerably less commonality of view: the importance of legal aspects of citizenship; the personal relationship of the citizen to the monarch; the compatibility of notions of Canadian citizenship and global citizenship.

The Delphi began as an attempt to clarify the notion of citizenship that we might aspire to in Canada so as to provide some clearer direction to those involved in various aspects of citizenship education. The results point out a direction without specifying a destination. "Let's make sure that our thinking... remains dynamic," said one member of the panel. After all, even our conceptions of who can qualify for citizenship have altered drastically over a short period or time. "Citizenship," it was pointed out, "is no longer restricted by class, race, gender or religion, as it once was." And, perhaps, it is well to keep in mind that Canada's struggle with the notion of citizenship is relatively recent. It was, after all, only after the Second World War that the Canadian Citizenship Act of 1947 supplanted the notion of British Subject with that of Canadian citizen. It was the same Act that made Canada the first nation in the world to prohibit any distinction between its citizens by birth and its citizens by choice. Since then, in its policies and practices, Canada has sought its vision of freedom through pluralism; and

pluralism invites dissensus rather than consensus. In the Delphi conversation it has been evident that the struggle has been not simply to accommodate the pluralist perspective but to find a central position for it. Hence, the understanding of the ideal of citizenship that the panel is working toward is that of a citizenship of understanding.

Epilogue

Recently the noted Canadian journalist, Bruce Hutchison, died. In 1942 he wrote:

No one knows my country, neither the stranger nor its own sons. My country is hidden in the dark and teeming brain of youth upon the eve of its manhood. My country has not found itself nor felt its power nor learned its true place. It is all visions and doubts and hopes and dreams. It is strength and weakness, despair and joy, and the wild confusions and restless strivings of a boy who has passed his boyhood but is not yet a man. (p. 3)

At various stages, the Delphi exhibited many of the attributes that Hutchison identified: the visions, doubts, hopes and dreams; the wild confusions and restless strivings. At the same time, it became itself an exemplar of the ideal of citizenship being pursued: it represented willing and able participation; informed and thoughtful perspectives; a sympathetic consideration of contrary positions.

References

- Bahmueller, C.F. (1991). *Civitas: A framework for civic education*. Calabas, CA: Center for Civic Education.
- Berger, C. (1970). *The sense of power: studies in the idea of Canadian Nationalism 1867-1914*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Dalkey, N.C. (1969). *The Delphi Method: An experimental study of group opinion*. Santa Monica, CA.: Rand Corporation.
- Hirsch, E.D. (1988). *Cultural literacy: What every American need to know*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Hutchison, B. (1942). *The unknown country: Canada and her people*. Toronto: Longmans, Green and Company.
- Linstone, H.A. and Turoff, M. (1975). *The Delphi Method: techniques and applications*. Reading, Mass.: Addison- Wesley.
- Multiculturalism and Citizenship Canada (1992). *Canadian Citizenship: What Does It Mean To You?* Ottawa: author.