

Civic Education in Community Development in South Africa: Reflections of a Community Development Practitioner

Ngcobo Ntsoaki Thandi and Edmore Ntini*

School of Built Environment and Development Studies, Department of Community Development, Howard College, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban 4001 South Africa
Telephone: <27 790406282>, <0712475545>, <27 31 260 2289>, <27 826458746>,
E-mail: <ngcobothandi@gmail.com>, * <eddiemza@gmail.com>

KEYWORDS Citizen. Democracy. Diversity. Inclusion. Patriotism. Typologies

ABSTRACT This paper argues for the inclusion of civic education in community development packages for South African communities. Using desktop research as a methodology, the paper analyzes the concept citizen, typologies of citizens and various conceptions of civic education. The paper discusses main paradigms of civic education in an attempt to position the nature of civic education that South Africa needs to include in community development practice. The paper draws examples of the effectiveness of civic education in various contexts mainly from within Africa. The paper argues that for South Africa, the need for improved patriotism, more social integration and sustained democracy should be the anchors of a community development practice that includes civic education. The centrality of civic knowledge, civic skills, civic dispensations and civic responsibilities as well as the duality of rights and responsibilities is emphasized.

INTRODUCTION

Too often community development (CD) as a discipline and field of practice is confined to economic and social spheres of society. This theoretical paper posits an argument justifying the place of civic education in community development for South African communities. It is deliberate that the argument does not draw too much from political science lest it predominates. Caution is to keep the argument as much as possible within the scope of community development. A historicity of civic education in South Africa is necessary in order to put civic education in community development into perspective. In 1652, Dutch settlement at the Cape offered little education for South Africans as the Dutch East/India Company was founded on trade (Seroto 2012). Dutch missionaries provided education just enough to meet the basic needs of colonialist. Civic education was based on Protestantism. In 1804, JA De Smit introduced secular liberal control of education at the Cape Colony aimed at ensuring civic education for a good citizen (Sabine 1960). In 1910, the union of South Africa (Natal, Cape Colony Free State and Transvaal) became a British colony with missionaries still in control and designing the scope and extent of African education (Christie 2006). It may

be argued that civic education focused on adapting citizens for good manners, making them obedient and to act responsibly as individualistic persons (Seroto 2012). By then citizens were legal members of the state with rights and obligations to the state although they were not allowed to participate in political affairs (Banks 2008b). Seroto (2012) points a grimy picture of how the state embarked on authoritarian legalism enacting segregated, racist and separation policies along social, economic, political and special spheres. Seroto (2012) remarks that the 1913 and 1936 Acts curtailed the rights of Africans. Land Act resettled Africans in reserved areas, barring them from buying land outside the reserved areas and all Africans had to remain within the 13.7 percent of South African soil. This led to the drawing of areas, such as parts of Natal, Transkei and Ciskei rural areas strictly for Africans (Seroto 2012). The state may be viewed as having played a major role in racially dividing society and discriminating Africans using the legal framework.

The implications such legal authoritarianism had on society were among other issues a creation of differentiated civic education. It laid the foundation for African citizenship that was racially tied to discrimination on basis or color or race. The 1936 Land Act made provision for a

trust fund to provide for roughly 6.2 million hectares of land to ease the congestion of Africans through the creation of Bantustans or homelands (Seroto 2012). In 1948, the state celebrated separate development that deepened the separatist conception of citizenship in RSA. Citizenship became black and white both in separate areas enjoying separate rights with whites more privileged than blacks. The 1951 Bantu Authorities Act and the promotion of Bantu Self Government Act 1959 saw Africans granted citizenship and civil rights in their own territories (homelands and batistes). This led to a separation Africans society with a separate (African) economy. This, therefore, may be viewed as the foundation of RSAs divided communities, hostile towards each. The argument here is to demonstrate the deeply entrenched social divide, which civic education has to deal with if South Africa is to defend its unity as embedded in the coined national reconciliatory concept of the Rainbow nation. As a background, the paper firstly provides a summary of civic education matters in pre-democratic South Africa. Second, analyses how several authors have viewed a citizen by advancing typologies (typologies of citizenry). Third, this paper uses the Johnson and Morris (2010) framework for critical citizenship education to argue for a specific nature and form of civic education to be packaged for community development in South Africa communities. The argument is guided by four core questions namely:

1. What is a citizen?
2. What is civic education?
3. What is the nature and form of civic education for community development?
4. Why should South Africa include civic education in community development activities?

A brief methodological exposition is presented.

METHODOLOGY

This is a secondary research also called desktop study and utilizes existing literature and resources (Collins 2010; Mcquarrie 2011). No first-hand gathering of empirical data will be done as no fieldwork was conducted. Very little if any ethical implications are of concern under the circumstances. The method has been chosen for its low cost in comparison with field research. The Internet (online desk research) was used extensively demanding sharper organizational, selection and sorting skills due to excessive data

available (Stewart and Kamins 1993; The Wallace Foundation 2009). Desktop research required the researcher to use several search engines in pursuit of compiling the most appropriate and latest data. Apart from obtaining literature, secondary research has been used in this study to illuminate the research questions as well to maintain the focus of the article (Collins 2010; Mcquarrie 2011). The next section looks at the theoretical perspectives.

Theoretical Framework and Literature Review

Community Development

Flora and Flora (1993) define community as the group of people with a common goal. Development is understood as the process that brings about improvement in a place (Kenyon 1994). Community development may be understood as a process to putting improvement socially, environmentally and also economically. For the purpose of this study, community development may be conceived as a set of values and practices that plays a special role in overcoming poverty and disadvantage, knitting society together at the grassroots and deepening democracy. It may be argued that in order for community development actions to be efficacious, community development address a variety of societal issues. It may also be argued that community development is a process, a method, a program, a movement focused on the improvement of the livelihood of communities (Ntini 2007). Several observations have been added to the current understanding of this concept. Writers have viewed it as an educational process, an active involvement, empowering adults in a community to solve their challenges (Mattessich and Monsey 2004). For writers such as De Beer and Swanepoel (2013), it has been argued as a science premised on principles such as human orientation, sustainability, empowerment, ownership, participation, compassion, transformation and release. Ntini (2007) argues for the pre-eminence of principles such as human solidarity, social equity, respect for others, continuing activism as being at the core of the science of community development. This paper does not navigate the literature on community development per se but argues that whatever view of community development one adopts, the inclusion of civic education may be one of the effective strat-

egies in pursuit of the improvement of the quality of life of South African communities. It is in this line of thought that this paper argues that civic education should be included in community development as a *sine qua non*.

Citizen

It may be argued that since 1994, South Africans stretched and pulled the concept of citizen in multi-directions (Mathebula 2009). Efforts are arguably in place to curve out a nation rising beyond the Apartheid racist milieus to a better and superior context within the concept of the rainbow nation. It may be imperative that RSA emerges as an example of a developing nation that upholds virtues inclusive of respect for each other's worth, justice and fairness (Seroto 2012). There have been several conceptualizations of what a citizen is in literature. Crick (2008) argues that a citizen is one valued by his or her society and defined by their nature of relationship with the state. A citizen may be viewed as one living in a nation exercising rights and privileges whilst obliged to pay allegiance to the state (Lagassé 2000). It appears that citizens may be described in different ways. One may argue that where conceptualizations are rife, there is the possibility of a plethora of typologies emerging. The use of such typologies becomes an effective way in which the concept becomes clearer and interpretable as well as applicable in selected situations. Typologies are useful in critiquing related phenomena as this paper reveals.

Typologies of Citizens

McLaughlin (1992) and Glaston (1989) have categorized citizens as minimal and maximal citizens and autarchic and autonomous citizens, respectively. It may be illustrated that the autarchic and minimal citizens are those that are obedient to the government, law abiding and of limited rational, public spirited nature (Seroto 2012; McLaughlin 1992). Maximal citizens are arguably actively involved in challenging and often critical of the state (Seroto 2012). One may argue that those are ideal for a South Africa democratic society. Further all these categories advance sets of rights, identities and duties harmonizing both state and society.

Another pair of typologies of citizen is by Veugelers (2007) and Westheimer and Kahne

(2004) based on maximal and minimal types of citizenship. They argue that there are three categories of citizens namely individual citizens who participate in society at a personal level. The second category is the adapting citizens. These are those citizens of good manners, obedient and who act responsibly. The third category consists of critical democratic citizens with an interest in issues of social justice, cooperation and changing society. These conceptualization and typologies of citizens are relevant in as far as they reflect the ideal citizens that South African community development activities need to mold. They are also a good indicator of categories one may study to determine where South African citizens belong and how they may be assisted to transition to better categories. Interestingly, these typologies may be attacked for being constructed on the bases of status to radiate international ideals. Staeheli and Hammett (2010) argue that there is need to take into account the political, social, economic variables in context including time factors. The rationale for defining and presenting these typologies is to create a focus on the type of citizen worthy of inclusion in civic education for community development in South Africa.

Civic Education

The concept civic education has been viewed differently in the world and has tended to be defined contextually. Seroto (2010) argues that the term civic education frequently has to do with describing socio-political education. Other writers such as Davies and Issit (2005) perceive civic education as merely providing information about formal public institution. They argue that citizenship is a status or position in society that should be receiving civic aspects such rights, equality before the law, freedom of speech and own property. Others such as Seroto (2010), Starkey (2000) and DeJaeghere and Tudball (2007) have argued for a holistic approach in illustrating the concepts citizenship and civic education by use of a critical approach. The pro-liberal democracy nations such as Britain (specifically England and Wales in 2001) and the United States of America have opted to call it "citizenship education" and "civics", respectively (McLaughlin 2003; Gross and Dynneson 1991) In southern Africa, South Africa retained "citizenship education" in 1994 (Kissack and

Enslin 2003). Nicaragua also used “citizenship education” in 1992 (Garcia 1996). Zimbabwe has used “political economy” in 1980, “national and strategic studies” in 2002, and “peace studies” in 2007 (Nziramasanga 1999; Nyakudya 2007). Other writers have opted to call it “political education” (Gross and Dennyson 1991) whilst others have used “education for democracy”. The concept of civic education may be traced from ancient Greece’s Aristotelian times where both democracy and civic education were being brainstormed and declared as the state’s responsibility to disseminate these to the younger citizens to avoid devaluing the quality of the constitution (Watkin 2000). Others argue that civic education or political education is inclusive of political propaganda (Gross and Dennyson 1991). They assert that political education includes any actions keen to involve communities to fully engage with social, economic and political policies. It may be argued that since then there has been an unwavering contention that the state and its institution of education have retained the responsibility for political socialization of its citizens (Fagerlind and Saha 1989). There are observations that throughout the centuries fewer nation-states allowed for the emergency of citizens with zero to very little civic competences (Pratte 1988). The period of enlightenment saw others and Rousseau arguing that the institutions of the state and education play significant roles in ensuring that all received civic education (Wiborg 2002). One may observe that what emerges all the way from ancient Greece is the quest to ensure that there is production of citizens that are civic education erudite and effectively politically socialized for the good of the nation. Significant development in civic education is noted post the American Revolution 1875-1879 when it (civic education) became formalized and schools directly provided for the political education and socialization of the younger American citizens. Thus, civic education became the base of universal education and a cornerstone for the American national development (Butt 1980). Writers such as Gross and Dennyson (1991) have contributed to the illumination of civic education by taking as a starting point the argument that civic education is anything from the political propaganda and is inclusive of any actions keen to involve communities to fully engage with social, economic and political policies. Branson (1998) has been more eloquent

along democratic lines by arguing that civic education may be perceived as a continuous process, which supports the notion of a democratic society as well as highlights the importance of political knowledge and civic participation of citizens in all facets of a democratic society. Along the same vein she argues that civic education is prototype of education with a focus on public concern, as it provides a clear determination to influence certain capacities or tendencies on an individual in promoting public interest rather than self-interest. Others such as, Frinkel (2002) have argued from a utility point of view that civic education is an effective process that can be used to improve political participation in communities, which allows every individual to engage in issues that affect them and communities. The centrality of politics in the conceptualizations of civic education seems quite prominent. It may also be perceived as a type of education that cultivates a state of relationship existing between a natural being and his or her institution of the state one owes allegiance to and in principle guaranteed protection (Gould and Kolb 1964). What emerges from these conceptualizations is that civic education is education directed at good citizenship. This therefore colors civic education as a type of education that ensures that citizens as community members attain a sense of dignity in their lives, enjoy all the rights of citizens and develop a high degree of interest in public affairs. To augment such observations, one may refer to writers such as Cogan and Derricot (2004) who have maintained that civic education cultivates an acceptance of basic social values in community members and molds them in mastering the art of fulfilling their corresponding obligations to the state as citizens. In line with nurturing citizens, one may perceive civic education as directed at any category of community to create a sense of caring and interest in the welfare of others, being morally and ethical in interacting with others. Civic education is, thus, education that teaches critical thinking at any level of the community by equipping members how to critically question ideas, suggestions and proposals presented before them. In the views of Gross and Dennyson (1991) civic education should be viewed as an education that sharpens the community’s good judgment and ability to make good choices in any circumstances. In another dimension, Ceaser (2013) has raised the dependency of civ-

ic education on the type of regime in office. It may be argued that civic education is relative to the regime, as it is not purely a normative concept (Ceaser 2013). In this case, if a regime is unpopular with the citizens, civic education being affected results in the creation of inferior citizens and is being used to sustain an unpopular regime. Civic education is essential for the preservation of any regime and may not be left to chance. Ceaser (2013) argues that civic education needs to flow a clear, rational and comprehensive plan, run by an effective state bureaucracy, non-governmental organizations and interested community organizations. It may suffice to declare now that the argument will maintain that civic education is viewed as education of a political, civic and socioeconomic nature directed at the community for the good of the nation as a whole. It is along this thrust that an argument is presented to the effect that there is need for civic education in community development activities in South Africa.

Paradigms of Civic Education

In this section, deliberate efforts are made to search for what may be a philosophical approach to inform the nature of civic education for South Africa communities this paper argues for. Literature by McLaughlin (1992), Kerr (1999), Wertheimer and Kahne (2004), Marri (2009) and Cohen (2010) theorize civic education in an effort to arrive at a philosophical base. It would appear that most efforts have not arrived at an inclusive conceptual framework (Semela 2013). This paper will resort to broader conceptualizations or interpretations of the civic education by writers such as McLaughlin (1992), Kerr (1999), Banks (2008a), Westheimer and Kahne (2004) and Cohen (2010). The rationale for reflecting on these conceptualizations is to provide a reference point for advancing the rationale for the inclusion of civic education in South Africa's community development efforts. Further, this is an attempt to provide some sound grounding for the arguments advanced in this paper.

The Minimal and Maximal Paradigm

Kerr (2000) separates civic education into two concepts, namely, civic education meant for minimal citizens and civic education apt for maximal citizens. McLaughlin (1992) and Kerr (1999) in-

terpret civic education along a continuum from minimal to maximal extremes. Both argue that the minimal end consists of a content led and knowledge based formal education. McLaughlin (1992) further indicates that in the minimal end is the didactics of knowledge, history, geography, politics, governance issues and the constitution in particular. Kerr (1999) describes the maximal as the extreme end to do with both informal and formal strategies of reinforcing civic education in community by using projects, debates, independent learning, and discussions.

The Mainstream and Transformative Paradigm

For Banks (2008), the mainstream academic knowledge correlates with McLaughlin (1992) and Kerr (1999) minimal end or extreme in that it is mere memorization of facts on history, constitution, legal instruments, roles and responsibilities, branches of government and patriotism. Bank's (2008b) transformative academic knowledge includes all provision for explanation, arguments, paradigms that challenge "key epistemological assumption of mainstream academic knowledge" (Semela 2013: 158). It may be argued that mainstream academic education reinforces popular culture and practice, but fails to bring about change and rather preserves the status quo (Banks 2008). What is worthy of noting here is that both Bank's (2008b) extremes of civic education are inclusive of didactic implications, the quest for transformative civic education, critical thinking, decisions making skills and action (Semela 2013).

Wertheimer and Kahne's (2004) Typology of Civic Education

This is an expansion of Banks (2008) and McLaughlin's (1992) attempt to strike an intermediate philosophical view of civic education (Semela 2013). It may be viewed that their typology of civic education is based on a quest to nurture the personally responsible citizen, participatory citizen and the justice-oriented citizens. The personally responsible citizens' category of civic education refers to all civic education efforts meant to nurture citizens capable of behaving responsibly in their community. This is evident when citizens understand and make an effort to preserve and keep their environment

clean, donate blood, do voluntary charity work, respect and obey the rule of law and regulations as well as stay out of debts (Banks 2008). Participatory citizens' category refers to all civic education to and about nurture citizens who are active participants in all regional and national levels in affairs that concern and affect them (Banks 2008). The justice-oriented citizens include the nurturing of citizens who are erudite and capable of discussing and analyzing socioeconomic and political structures, capable of innovatively and collectively challenging injustice and propose effective remedies and solutions where possible on the basis of specific causes (Banks 2008). It may be noted that this typology's first and third categories match very well with McLaughlin's (1992) minimal maximal polar.

Cohen's (2010) Multiple Typologies of Civic Education

Cohen (2010) argues that civic education may be internalized in the form of dual bi-polar continuum comprising four mutually separate theoretical fields. He distinguishes a vertical continuum with procedural political knowledge at the bottom. Cohen (2010) illustrates that the procedural political knowledge consists of knowledge on institutions, rules and governance as a practice voting systems and methods. Above the procedural political knowledge, Cohen (2010) places substantive political knowledge that focuses on the fundamental principles on which institutions exist notably the socioeconomic structure and their cultural foundations. On the basis of this bi-polar continuum, Cohen (2010) carves out four typologies of civic education, namely, liberal civic education, diversity civic education, critical civic education and republication civic education. Liberal civic education focuses on procedural political knowledge and personal values such as one's good behavior, independence and responsibility. Diversity civic education deals with social groups constituting society and offering space for thoughtful, effective and participatory (active) citizenry. Critical civic education concerns itself with developing awareness, making conscious citizens on communal forces consulting their society. It sharpens individualistic skills namely critical thinking. Republican civic education simply underscores developing partisan and solidarity to the nation. No single paradigm fully explains civ-

ic education content, as would suite specific political and socioeconomic contents. Application of these to the specific South Africa and African general contexts is problematic as social, political and economic contexts differ from those in a Western context. These conceptual frameworks are, however, relevant and effective in that they demonstrate the importance of how philosophical interrogation on civic education may inform the nature of civic education for South African communities and how one may formulate operational objectives for such a program.

Empirical Perspective

This section address the question, has civic education been researched elsewhere and with what results? Empirical studies will help this desk research topic to prove that civic education for community development in South Africa communities will work if implemented. Due to the limited scope of this paper, the researchers' focus on researches conducted in Third World Nations to minimize abstractions in the possibility of South Africa placing civic education as part of the packages for community development. Related research is used to prove that there is room to implement community development through civic education.

Finkel (2011) conducted USAID sponsored civic education themes between 1990 and 2005. He used case-control methods and yielded robust evidence that is reliable and efficacious in identifying areas where civic education may have an impact in society. The researches were conducted in Africa targeting post-communist conflict transitions. Small thematic areas such as elections, voter education, youth and youth engagement were focused on within the scope of civic education rather than attempting the complex and very wide subjects of civic education as a whole. Several results were obtained from this. These researchers obtained that civic education must be repeated often through interactive and participatory methods as well as use of the informal approaches (Browne 2013). In essence, the researchers concluded that civic education methods of democratization used proved to be effective practical lessons in democracy by fostering tolerant democratic attitudes in society. The researches proved that civic education improves society's understanding of and direct knowledge of political processes and

their roles in them. The studies revealed that civic education does not necessarily increase support for democracy or trust in the political system. Another finding is that lack of resources constrains civic education effectiveness to an extent that ineffective methods are used because of lack of alternatives.

Implications of these results need to be related to civic education for community development in South African communities. First, civic education for community development in South Africa communities should exploit group dynamics, participatory and interactive methods. Of late these have been used in HIV/AIDS campaign programs, coordinating labor strikes, and students' unrest to the extent of using social media. South Africa being multi-racial, multi-ethnic and a democratic nation needs the use of participatory and interactive methods in civic education for community development. However, caution is needed to the fact that not all citizens will develop faith in the political system. It may be accepted from these findings that civic education has great potential for instilling in all knowledge of land issues, understanding of political processes and citizens' roles.

Another category of findings from the same series of studies is that civic education targeting women increases the effectiveness of women's knowledge. The studies revealed that it is illusionary to believe in the trickle-down effect for women. The researchers recommended the use of more gender-sensitive materials and approaches. Within the African context, civic education in Kenya proved that attitudes to election related violence changed to being more tolerant, forgiving on the past of attendants than on those who did not attend the series of seminars and workshops. Implications here are that South Africa's civic education for community development may target women for change of specific attitudes such as accepting the implications equal rights and gender equity policies instead of remaining conservative. This also implies that men, boys and girls should have separate sessions in civic education without forgetting the importance of combined non-formal sessions in their communities to instill a sense of democratic co-existence. Community development workers, facilitators of youth empowerment programs and church outreach personnel, may conduct these activities during their convenient times.

The same studies teach that civic education will in the long run be relevant in making citizens falling into the vices of vote buying, as it has proven effective in that regard. Researches have proven that civic education raises awareness over the moral issue in line with clientelism and vote buying. Interestingly, the findings revealed that exposure to civic education leaves the communities accepting the incentives a corrupt electoral candidate offer and yet still vote for their originally intended candidates. For the participants short-term financial and economic interest compel them to take offers. They do not find anything undemocratic about that at all. Civic education shapes and leaves them able to make the right and morally backed choices. Implications for civic education for community development in South African communities become clear here. Local government elections in South Africa are prone to vote buying, as candidates vie for power, numbers and control. Factionalism is reported in the media frequently and this needs a strong electoral population to play its role. If civic education is then disseminated to citizens as an element of community development, society will be geared towards fair play in elections. It may be argued that civic education for community development in South Africa communities will yield better political knowledge, long-term change of values, encouragement and more opportunities to engage with local and national officials.

A study in Thailand by Prinzing (2011) and sponsored by the USA Center for Civic Education yielded empirical findings of interest to this study. It was a post Red and Yellow shirts conflict that sought to find to what extent civic education may be used to resolve conflict and heal communities of the past. The team of researchers provided civic education with a focus on the following:

1. Authority (distinguishing authority, power, choosing leaders, cost/benefits analysis of authority, scope and limits of authority)
2. Privacy (importance, cost/benefits and limits)
3. Responsibility (choosing, assigning and accepting and justice and distributive corrective procedural)

The study confirmed that civic education is effective in post-conflict communities, as it brings an austerity to the ideal, the wrong and right way to respect authority, privacy, respon-

sibility and justice. Implications for civic education for community development in South Africa communities may be taken for the need to ensure that communities continue to uphold the Ubuntu, respect for authority, responsibility and justice. One may argue that the parliament today raises ethical concerns over respect of authority. South Africa communities are still feeling the effects of pre-1994 conflict and as such civic education on selected topics may be used effectively to bring about long lasting results.

A study in Indonesia also repeated in Bosnia and Herzegovina by Terra (2010) involved non-governmental organizations and religious leaders in civic education studies. The findings were that civic education fostered a democratic political culture in youths in Indonesia whilst it (civic education) boosted tolerance and inter-ethnic amity among the youths. There is more to emulate from these findings to be used in civic education for community development in South Africa communities that need to burry Apartheid engineered tribal, racial, and regional animosity among people in one country. One may also need to take caution in using non-governmental organizations for civic education, as these have been known to harbor regime change objectives.

A study by Semela (2013) in Ethiopia proved the effectiveness of civic education through television. Focus was on domestic laws, regional and federal constitutions. The audience scored higher on a scale to determine the effectiveness of community development by television. Lesson for South Africa here is that civic education may reach communities by media instead of relying on community development workers or field officers employed in government departments only. A study by Levine and Bishai (2010) in Sudan proved civic education as effective through drama, workshops in educating communities on voters' information, civic rights, skills social responsibility; and winter-ethnic and multilingual interaction. Civic education for community development in South Africa communities may attain better results by using similar methods taking into account the serenity in the country. Of late the national broadcaster SABC/TV adopted a ninety percent local content, which may create enough space for them to incorporate civic education like the Sudan example. More may be achieved in community development by disseminating civic education through print and electronic media in South Africa.

The Rationale for the Inclusion of Civic Education in Community Development Activities

Civic education contains the knowledge and skills necessary for the post-apartheid communities in South Africa and deserves a space in community development. These are demonstrated under the need for improved patriotism, sustaining democracy, multicultural coexistence and binding and improved political awareness.

The Need for Improved Patriotism

“There can be no patriotism without liberty, no liberty without virtue, no virtue without citizens... To form citizens is not the work of the day, and in order to have men it is necessary to educate them when they are children” (Rousseau in Wiborg 2002: 238).

Of late there have been reports of unpatriotic behavior in some provinces in South Africa where expressions of grievances against service providers and post-election discontent has seen national assets such as schools and libraries being burnt. The ability to differentiate and respect national assets seems to be suffering in South African communities. Civic education may be a very convenient strategy of penetrating communities to educate or orient all members of society on the need and importance of respecting national assets. Good citizenship respects all infrastructure set up for the development of communities and any unbecoming behavior out of any motive that seeks to negate the development needs to be removed from society. Civic education cultivates patriotism by forging a common national identity through community development. Whilst there are high possibilities of affecting it through formal education, there are those citizens who have dropped out of school, those whose curricula did not include civic education, and others that did not get the chance to get formal education. Civic education disseminated through community development is likely to benefit these citizens. It may be argued that community development workers need to be equipped with a strong foundation of civic education to be able to disseminate it through community development to create the desired citizen. Rousseau's version of patriotic education referred in the excerpt above may be effected in communities by making it part of the content for

community development. The media (electronic and print) and those state organs entrusted with the responsibility of engaging in community development may promote civic education. This becomes a form of adult, community and extended learning that cultivates patriotism in all society. It may be argued that civic education may be included in community development packages for South African communities as a socio-political tool for achieving patriotism. It is still debatable that South Africa has not done much to narrow gender, racial, ethnic and regional conflict among its citizens (Seroto 2012). In this case inclusion of civic education in community development becomes an effective tool for forging a sense of nationhood, national identity and unity among its citizens left divided by apartheid (Msila 2007). It may be argued that RSA communities still need a form of community development strategy inclusive of civic education because of the tribal, inter-racial and inter regional effects of civil strife created by apartheid. The need for including civic education in community development in RSA will serve as an effective way of uniting all types of belligerents into a solid rainbow nation sharing the same value system, bound by clear national goals in the spirit of patriotism (Msila 2007). As a way of going beyond efforts to break effects of apartheid, the inclusion of civic education in community development may be viewed as transforming community development into a field of practice driving for a better understanding of development of human communities, their ecosystem and their world. There is no doubt then that South Africa communities will eventually be equipped with skills for grappling with political, economic and social challenges. One may argue that the inclusion of civic education in community development activities may enable community to attain some relative level of applying materialist and dialectical tools of analysis. It may be contended that the inclusion of civic education in South Africa's community development activities will serve as an effective strategy in fostering a sense of patriotism among communities, which is good for national development. It may be argued here that apart from fostering patriotism and national pride, the inclusion of civic education in community development activities will promote in non-formal settings of communities the inculcation of a deep-seated commitment to national development,

social harmony, national pride and an impressive respect for national heritage. In this globalized era there is no doubt that the inclusion of civic education in community development activities will help in the creation of desired citizens who at any level of society are able to wrestle with ideas, defend their national consciousness, uphold their self-identity, and self-esteem in the face of any imperial forces (Chisaka 1999).

Sustaining Democracy

Good citizens may be viewed as prerequisites of a good democracy as the fourth pillar whose quality the other three pillars namely the executive, legislature and judiciary are anchored on and depend upon (Gross and Dynneson 1991). It may be argued that there exists a strong correlation between civic education and democracy resulting into it being called education for democracy (Usher et al. 1997). In this case civic education serves to empower the citizen for full participation in the affairs of the state (Kymlicka 2002). RSA being a democratic state has the need to ensure that citizens at all levels develop an understanding of this ideology. This will enable South Africans to appreciate the development values, ideals and policies of the state. It may be expressed that there is a need by all communities in South Africa to go beyond just voting but have a mastery of the merits and limitations the country's democracy. One may persuade for civic education that has the propensity to skill citizens in leadership analysis, understanding and comparing manifestos of political parties, monitoring parliamentarians and holding them accountable for their decisions and effectively influencing policymaking processes at any level (Kissack and Enslin 2003). There is potential that if RSA community development activities were to embrace civic education, this would go a long way in the creation of politically literate society distanced from the shameful effects of political propaganda (McAllister 1998). Whilst one may argue for a community development practice embracing civic education's ability to instill in communities an understanding of political processes and citizens' self-expression through political participation, the issue of rights and responsibilities naturally becomes important (Oster and Starky 2002). From the writer's observations in current RSA communities, there is over articulation of "my rights" and less of

“my responsibilities”. Rights issues are either misunderstood or abused. All are eager to drag any to a court of law on the slightest “violation of my rights and personal dignity”. In other communities, members’ personal pride supersedes the rights of the other person. Some do not sue for damages/recourse and child maintenance in the event of being deflowered (Mapumulo 2015). It may be argued that currently RSA communities need a brand of CD practice disseminating civic education to appreciate and understand their responsibilities as citizens such as paying tax, voting, volunteering, patriotism and dedication. In this case, it may be remarked that RSA communities may eventually be more informed, educated, active and able torchbearers of their communities (Kymlicka 2002). It may be argued that community development with a civic education drive empowers communities in their day-to-day life as “...informed, responsible, committed and effective members of a modern democratic political system” (Butts 1980: 132).

Civic education may be viewed in a broader sense as referring to attempts at creating a strong link, awareness and appreciation of a political system and its traditions in one’s country. Further broadly speaking civic education refers to engaging in efforts to instill, socializing citizens into habits, knowledge, skills and mores that in turn serve to entrench a ruling system (Ceaser 2013). It may also be viewed narrowly to mean a forum of pedagogue influencing citizens to identify with their political system, socioeconomic dynamics of the nation relative to the regime in control. At the center of all is that citizens master the principles, operational mechanisms and skills of citizens (Ceaser 2013).

Civic education for community development in South Africa communities may be argued as a way of promoting the ideals of democracy and a seasoned commitment to the values and principles of democracy. It may also be argued that this will promote the development of communities’ (rural and urban) that are well informed, politically erudite and participate rather than remaining passive recipients of dictums of others (Branson 1998). One may note that civic education may be effective if it is realistic and addressing the central truths about South Africa’s socio-political life such as the subtle forms of racism, discrimination, stereotyping, phobia and segregation rooted in pre 1994 era’s political authoritarianism. Civic education for communi-

ty development becomes a clear socio-political strategy South Africa may draw from and educate all citizens that the era of politics as a zero sum game or winner-take-all is gone more so is that actually this has no place in a democracy.

It may be argued that civic education for community development in South African communities is a tool and opportunity to teach the sharing of resources, political power, and responsibility as core features of rainbow nations. By so doing, South Africa may create a generation of citizens across all races in RSA willing to redistribute wealth with beneficiaries of colonialism and apartheid sharing land with others. The gruesome foundation and lasting effects of the 1913, 1936, 1951 land and tenure acts and related policies may not be belabored here.

One may freely argue that RSA’s politics are ever changing just like anywhere in the world. For example, single party governance is giving way to coalition governance. Political parties are becoming more and more aware that political opponents are not enemies and are indeed necessary partners. The case of South Africa’s Democratic Alliance (DA) and Liberation war movement African National Congress (ANC) who have been compelled into negotiation with the Inkatha Freedom Party (IFP) and the novice, erratic and worker based Economic Freedom Front (EFF) in the local government spheres after the August 2016 local government elections. In light of this civic education for community development in South African communities becomes a tool for teaching adults that social, political and even economic change is ever present and that it is brought about by knowledgeable, willing and skilled citizens who are products of effective civic education.

The Nature of Civic Education for Community Development in South African Communities

It has been argued earlier on that civic education is regime specific. One many, therefore, argue that RSA being a democracy, the nature of civic education should be strictly supportive of their political ideology and practice. The researchers argue that the nature of civic education for community development in South Africa communities may best be categorized as civic knowledge, civic skills and civic dispensations. According to Branson (1998), taxonomy civic knowledge basically refers to what citizens

ought to know. It may be argued here that South African communities need a civic education that enables them to engage in an unending debate on democracy and democratic ideals. One may state the following as core components of what South Africa's civic education would be, general knowledge of politics and political processes, governments, histories, power structures, civic life, the importance and purpose of government (Branson 1998; Johnson and Morris 2011).

Of late the continentally deplored xenophobic violence that claimed lives in South Africa may be blamed on weak civic education in South Africa communities. It would appear more needs to be done to educate all about the foundations of South Africa political system such as individual rights, public goods, rule of law, equality, justice, diversity, to mention but a few. Another body of knowledge that civic education for community development may convey is that which instills an understanding of the need and relevance for South Africa's rapport with other nations. This would include some basic content on international relations, world affairs and effects on them, international organization and their main roles and how they influence their political, social and economic lives.

The content may also consist of information and illustrations of how they may play their roles as citizens. It may be argued that there is need to advance a civic education for community development in South African communities that instills an understanding of their participation in civic society and political life. One may argue for the promotion of role knowledge on how to improve quality of life, nation, neighborhood, and communities (Branson 1998). It may be argued that citizens need to acquire specific civic participatory skills relevant for engaging in ongoing debates in a democratic society. Branson (1998) and Johnson and Morris (2011) categorize civic skills as firstly intellectual skills that enable citizens to think critically (critical thinking skills (CTS)). For South African communities, this will enable citizens to think critically over the distorted history of South Africa. Its relevance to the present and how the future is likely to remain anchored on this history. Communities need to be supported in acquiring a working knowledge of and command of intellectual tools useful in mastering national history. It may be argued that these intellectual skills serve to bring about community members that are effective,

informed and responsible (Branson 1998; Johnson and Morris 2011). A multi-party system as in South Africa needs communities to receive civic education through community development that enables them to describe, analyze, explain, and evaluate issues at their respective levels.

It may be fair to have civic education for community development that enables South African communities to be able to identify and give meaning of national symbols such as the flag, national anthem, and monument, civic and political events. This may be augmented by knowledge of ideas and concepts such as constitutionalism, civic society, rights, patriotism, and emotive language in political rhetoric.

The nature of civic education one may argue for inclusion in packages for South Africa community development is one that instills the skills required for informed, effective and responsible participation in political processes and in civil society. In this sphere one would refer to Branson's (1998) short taxonomy of skills for civic education namely interacting, monitoring and influencing. For interacting, citizens need to be effective communicators capable of working with others, responsive to others and question, answer and maintain civility in deliberating and conflict fairly and peacefully (Branson 1998; Johnson and Morris 2011). Monitoring as a skill in civic education for community development makes citizens to be able to track the way politicians at any level handle their issues and concerns at any level of society and government as well as overseeing (watch-dog role) in state issues (Branson 1998). Influencing as a participatory skill refers to citizens' ability and potential to affect politics, governance and governance processes in both formal and informal ways (Branson 1998). These can be influenced by participating in public debates, voting, taking part in census, referenda, plebiscites, petitioning, testifying before public bodies, joining ad-hoc advocacy groups, forming community based organizations with foci on different interests (Branson 1998). The implications of Branson's (1998) taxonomy for civic education in RSA community development are that it reflects a wide spectrum of the citizens' participation that RSA is yet to attain. It may still be argued that civic education is an effective route for creating a vibrant citizenry.

DISCUSSION

One may have observed that each time South African citizens have a strike or demonstration against any authority, most often the “our rights” chorus thunders into airwaves. None of “our responsibilities” is heard at all. This imbalance needs to be corrected. Civic education for community development of South African communities would be expected to deliver adequate knowledge of both rights and responsibilities of citizens in a democratic state.

It may be argued that for civic education, community development in South African communities should instill knowledge on personal rights such as freedom of conscience, expression, thoughts, association, residence, movement and travel. One may stress that this should concurrently be delivered with personal responsibilities such as supporting one’s family, care for and educating one’s children at all cost. Other personal responsibilities may include taking and accepting responsibility for one’s action and consequences, observing moral principles, respect for the rights and interests of others as well as upholding a civic character (Branson 1998). Civic education may instill knowledge of political rights such as freedom of speech, press, petition, voting as well as running for public office. Such knowledge of political rights may be paired with the civic or political responsibilities such as obeying the law, paying taxes, respecting and adhering to political leadership and working in harmony with government bureaucracies. It may also enable citizens in engaging in public services such as volunteering, attending to public issues, and even just serving in any division of the armed forces as part of voluntary national service (Branson 1998). Southern Africa’s pre-majority governments used to conscript all post tertiary for military service to suppress liberation efforts by the majority blacks. Shockingly at uhuru (independence) majority governments are silent on national services.

Another category of rights one would include in a civic education package for community development for South African communities is a strong awareness of economic rights. This may include the rights to join a labor union and or professional organization. Other rights such as to choose one’s work and or change of employment may be included. Citizens may be also provided with an awareness of the rights to ac-

quire property both immovable and movable. The inclusion of the rights to use, transfer property, setting up business, having copyrights or patent and contracts may not be over stressed (Branson 1998). It may be concluded that civic education for community development in South African communities should emphasize the duality of rights and responsibilities in a democracy. Branson (1998) argues that responsibilities are the other half of the democratic equation. For South African communities, the rights and responsibilities referred here may lead to political tolerance, a value quite consistent with a democratic nation. The concept political tolerance includes beliefs, values and attitudes that are in line with democracy. One may argue that with civic education as part and parcel of the community development packages, South Africa may be a shining example of a community where human rights, human dignity and worth as well as rule of the law are observed for common good. Branson (1998) argues that political tolerance is reflected in the citizens’ respect for political rights and civil liberties of the society as well as those of ideas and identities one may not share. This provides a nation with “ordering, temperate, moderate, and self-controlled citizens” (Tocqueville 1969 cited in Branson 1998).

CONCLUSION

This paper has demonstrated the complexity of the concepts citizen and civic education. It has been explained that pre-1994 minority regimes sought to use civic education for their own ends to the disadvantage of the majority. The study has also demonstrated that no single paradigm is adequate in theorizing civic education. A sample of empirical studies used in this study shows that civic education as part of community development package has yielded positive results elsewhere. This has been used as an indication that South Africa has much to emulate to improve its communities. An argument has been central in this paper that apart from the need to improve its levels of patriotism and sustaining democracy, South Africa may create among the citizenry the desired civic disposition for the good and peace of society.

REFERENCES

- Banks JA 2008a. *Diversity and Citizenship Education: Global Perspective*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

- Banks JA 2008b. Diversity, groups, identity and citizenship education in a global age. *Educational Researcher*, 37(3): 129-139.
- Branson MS 1998. *The Role of Civic Education*. South Africa: Center for Civic Education.
- Browne E 2013. Civic Education: Approaches and Efficacy. Governance, Social Development, Humanitarian, Conflict. From <www.gsdc.org> (Retrieved on 6 June 2016).
- Butts RF 1980. *The Revival of Civic Learning: A Rationale for Citizenship Education in American Schools*. Bloomington, IND: Phi Delta Kappan Educational Foundation.
- Ceaser JW. 2013. *The Role of Political Scientists in Civic Education: An Essay for the Series "The Professions and Civic Culture"*. Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute.
- Chisaka BC 1999. The Zimbabwean education system: Whose interests does it serve? *The Journal of Social Change*, 48: 23-30.
- Christie P 2006. *The Right to Learn: The Struggle of Education in South Africa*. Johannesburg: Ravan Press.
- Cogan JJ, Derricot R 2004. *Citizenship for 21st Century: An International Perspective on Education*. London: Falmer Press.
- Cohen A 2010. A theoretical model of four conceptions of civic education. *Canadian Journal of Social Studies*, 44(1): 17-25.
- Collins H 2010. *The Theory and Practice of Research for the Creative Industries*. Switzerland: AVA Publishing SA.
- Crick B 2008. Basic concepts for political education. In: J Arthur, I Davies (Eds.): *Citizenship Education*. Volume 3. London: Sage, pp.123-139.
- Davies I, Issit J 2005. Reflections on citizenship education in Australia, Canada and England. *Comparative Education*, 41(4): 389-410.
- De Beer F, Swanepoel H 2013. *The Community Development Profession: Issues, Concepts and Approaches*. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.
- DeJaeghere JG, Tudball J 2007. Looking Back, Looking Forward: Critical Citizenship as a Way Ahead for Civics and Citizenship Education in Australia. *Citizenship Teaching and Learning*, 3(2). From <http://www.citized.info/strand-6> (Retrieved on 10 February 2012).
- Fagerlind I, Saha LJ 1989. *Education and National Development: A Comparative Perspective*. 2nd Edition. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Finkel, SE 2002. Civic Education and the Mobilization of Political Participation in Developing Democracies. *Journal of Politics* 64(4): 994-1020.
- Finkel SE 2011. Adult civic education and the development of democratic political culture: Evidence from emerging democracies. In: S Odugbeni, T Lee (Eds.): *Generating Genuine Demand for Accountability: Public Opinion and State Responsiveness*. Washington, DC: CommGap, World Bank, pp. 417-435.
- Flora CB, Flora JL 1993. Entrepreneurial social infrastructure: A necessary ingredient. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*, 539: 48-58.
- Garcia T 1996. Education for citizenship and reconciliation in Nicaragua. *I Prospects*, 26(4): 750-761.
- Glaston W 1989. Civic education in liberal state. In: NL Rosenblum (Ed.): *Liberalism and the Moral Life*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, Chapter 5, pp. 96-120.
- Gould RE, Kolb WL (Eds.) 1964. *A Dictionary of the Social Science*. New York. Free Press.
- Gross RE, Dennyson TL 1991. *Social Science Perspectives on Citizenship Education*. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.
- Johnson L, Morris P 2011. Critical citizenship education in England and France: A comparative analysis. *Comparative Education*, 48(3): 283-301.
- Kenyon P 1994. *Ready Set Go: Action Manual for Community Economic Development*. Melbourne: Municipal Association of Victoria.
- Kerr D 2000. Citizenship education: An international comparison. In: D Lawton, J Cairns, R Gardner (Eds.): *Education for Citizenship*. London: Continuum, pp. 200-227.
- Kerr D 1999. Citizenship and education the curriculum: An international review. *The School Field*, 10 (3/4): 1-31.
- Kissack M, Enslin P 2003. Reconstruction from the ruins: Higher education policy and the cultivation of citizenship in the new South Africa. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 17(3): 36-47.
- Kymlicka W 2002. *Contemporary Political Philosophy: An Introduction*. USA: Oxford University Press.
- Lagassé P (Ed.) 2000. *The Columbia Encyclopedia*. 6th Edition. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Levine DH, Bishai LS 2010. Civic Education and Peacebuilding: Examples from Iraq and Sudan. United States Institute of Peace Special Report 254. United States Institute of Peace. From <http://dspace.cigilibrary.org/jspui/bitstream/123456789/29751/1/Civic%20Education%20and%20Peacebuilding.pdf> (Retrieved on 18 June 2016).
- Mapumulo Z 2015. Teen Brides: Girls forced to Say "I do". *City Press*, 15 July, P. 5.
- Marri AR 2009. Creating citizens: Lessons in relationships, personal growth, and community in one secondary social studies classroom. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 11(1): 12-18.
- Mathebula PT 2009. *Citizenship Education in South Africa: A Critique of Post-Apartheid Education Policy*. PHD Dissertation. Johannesburg: University of the Witwatersrand.
- Mattessich P, Monsey M 2004. *Community Building: What Makes it Work?* St. Paul, MN: Wilder Foundation Press.
- McAllister I 1998. Civic education and political knowledge in Australia. *Australian Journal of Political Science*, 33(1): 7-23.
- McLaughlin TN 2003. Citizenship education in England: The crick report and beyond. *Journal of Philosophy Education*, 34(3): 541-570.
- McLaughlin TH 1992. Citizenship, diversity and education: A philosophical perspective. *Journal of Moral Education*, 21(3): 235-250.
- Mcquarrie EF 2011. *The Market Research Toolbox: A Concise Guide for Beginners*. 3rd Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Msila V 2007. From apartheid education to the revised national curriculum statement: Pedagogy for identity formation and nation building. *Nordic Journal of Africa Studies*, 16(2): 146-160.

- Ntini E 2007. The Participation of Rural Based Teachers in Community Development Activities in Chive District, Masvingo, Zimbabwe. MA Thesis. Unisa. From <Uir.unisa.ac.za/bitstream/10500/1023/1/dissertation.pdf> (Retrieved on 13 August 2016).
- Nyakudya M 2007. The rationale for national and strategic studies in teacher training colleges: Fostering a sense of patriotism in trainee teachers. *Zimbabwe Journal Educational Research*, 19(2): 115-126.
- Nziramasanga CT 1999. *Report of the Presidential Commission of Inquiry into Education and Training*. Harare: Government Printers.
- Oster A, Starkey H 2002. *Teacher Education and Human Rights*. London: David Fulton Publishers.
- Pratte R 1988. *The Civic Imperative: Examining the Need for Civic Education*. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.
- Prinzing D 2011. We Can Create Civic Mind. Institutionalizing Civic Education in Thailand. Center for Civic Education. From <http://new.civiced.org/images/stories/Civitas/Programs/Impact/Thailand_Institutionalization_Report_FINAL.pdf> (Retrieved on 17 June 2016).
- Sabine GH 1960. *A History of Political Theory*. London: George G Harrap & Sons.
- Semela T 2013. Civic education in Ethiopian schools: Adopted paradigms, instructional technology, and democratic citizenship in a multi-cultural context. *International Journal Context*, 33: 156-164.
- Seroto J 2012. Citizenship education for Africans in South Africa (1948-1994): A critical discourse. *Yesterday Today*, 7: 64-83.
- Staehele LA, Hammett D 2010. Educating the new national citizen: Education, political subjectivity and divided societies. *Citizenship Studies*, 14(6): 667-680.
- Starkey H 2000. Citizenship education in France and Britain: Evolving theories and practices. *Curriculum Journal*, 11(1): 39-54.
- Stewart DW, Kamins MA 1993. *Secondary Research: Information Sources and Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Terra L 2010. Today we Work For our own Benefit. Tomorrow we Work for the Benefit of Future Generations. *A Report on the Southeast Europe Regional Project Citizen Showcase and Summer Camp*. Center for Civic Education.
- The Wallace Foundation 2009. Workbook B: Conducting Secondary Research, Collecting and Using Data Resources. From <<http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/after-school/collecting-and-using-data/Documents/Workbook-B-Secondary-Research.pdf>> (Retrieved on 12 August 2016).
- Usher R, Bryant I, Johnston R 1997. *Adult Education and the Post Modern Challenge*. London: Routledge.
- Veugelers W 2007. Creating critical-democratic citizenship education: Empowering humanity and democracy in Dutch education. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative Education*, 37(1): 105-119.
- Watkin K 2000. *The Oxford Education Report*. England: Oxfam G.B.
- Westheimer J, Kahne J 2004. What kind of citizens? The politics of education for democracy. *American Educational Journal*, 41(2): 237-268.
- Wiborg S 2000. Political and cultural nationalism in education: Ideas of Rousseau and Herder concerning national education. *Comparative Education*, 36(2): 235-243.

Paper received for publication on November 2016
Paper accepted for publication on December 2016