

**DO VALUES IN EDUCATION CREATE SPACES
FOR DEMOCRATIC CITIZENSHIP?**

FATIMA ESSA

BA, HDE and BA (Hons) (UWC)



Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment for the Degree of

Master of Education (MEd)

at the

University of Stellenbosch

Supervisor: Professor Yusef Waghid

December 2002

DECLARATION

I, the undersigned, hereby declare that the work contained in this thesis is my own original work and that I have not previously in its entirety or in part submitted it at any university for a degree.

FATIMA ESSA

ABSTRACT

The “Values in Education” initiative of the Department of Education seems to have become an important facet of the transformation of education agenda in South Africa. My argument in favour of a “Values in Education” initiative to be implemented in schools along the lines of democratic citizenship can be considered as an attempt to contribute to the democratisation of schooling post-1994. This thesis develops a link between “Values in Education”, intersubjectivity and democratic citizenship and argues that “Values in Education” can cultivate democratic citizenship in South African schools.

KEYWORDS: Values in education, intersubjectivity, democracy and citizenship.

ABSTRAK

Die Departement van Onderwys se “Waardes in Onderwys” inisiatief blyk om ‘n belangrike faset van die Suid-Afrikaanse agenda oor die transformasie van die onderwys te wees. My argument ten gunste van die implementering van ‘n “Waardes in Onderwys” inisiatief in skole volgens die gedagtes van demokratiese burgerskap kan beskou word as ‘n poging tot die bydrae van die demokratisering van skole na die 1994 onderwysbedeling. In hierdie tesis word die verwantskap tussen “Waardes in Onderwys”, intersubjektiviteit en demokratiese burgerskap ontwikkel en terselfdertyd word daar geargumenteer dat “Waardes in Onderwys” wel demokratiese burgerskap in skole kan bevorder.

KERNBEGRIPE: Waardes in onderwys, intersubjektiviteit, demokrasie en burgerskap.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

- The Almighty Creator for showing Wisdom, Compassion and Mercy.

- Professor Y Waghid for his co-operation, valuable comments, careful reading and feedback on earlier drafts of this thesis.

- My children their encouragement, inspiration and support.

- The “Democracy Higher Education and Citizenship 2002-2003” research project leader for his support and the Division: Research and Development of the University of Stellenbosch for financial assistance to achieve this study.

CONTENTS

DECLARATION	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
ABSTRAK	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
CHAPTER 1	1
VALUES, EDUCATION AND TRANSFORMATION IN SOUTH AFRICA	
1.1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.2 RATIONALE OF STUDY	2
1.3 "VALUES IN EDUCATION" AND PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION	4
1.4 PROGRAMME OF STUDY	8
1.5 SUMMARY	10
CHAPTER 2	11
CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS AND CRITICAL EDUCATIONAL THEORY: METHOD AND METHODOLOGY	
2.1 INTRODUCTION	11
2.2 CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS	14
2.3 POSITIVIST EDUCATIONAL THEORY	19
2.4 INTERPRETIVE EDUCATIONAL THEORY	21
2.5 CRITICAL EDUCATIONAL THEORY	24
2.6 SUMMARY	26

CHAPTER 3

27

**THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE “VALUES IN EDUCATION”
INITIATIVE IN SOUTH AFRICA**

3.1 INTRODUCTION	27
3.2 CONSTITUTIONAL DEMOCRACY IN SOUTH AFRICA SINCE 1994	29
3.2.1 Democracy	33
3.2.2 Democracy and education	37
3.3 THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION'S <i>TIRISANO</i> PROJECT	40
3.4 THE VALUES IN EDUCATION INITIATIVE	43
3.4.1 The Commission and the Values on Education Report	45
3.4.1.1 <u>Equity</u>	48
3.4.1.2 <u>Tolerance</u>	49
3.4.1.3 <u>Multilingualism</u>	50
3.4.1.4 <u>Openness</u>	51
3.4.1.5 <u>Accountability</u>	52
3.4.1.6 <u>Honour</u>	53
3.4.2 Saamtrek: Values, Education and Democracy in the 21 st Century	54
3.4.3 The Manifesto on Values, Education and Democracy	56
3.5 SUMMARY	57

CHAPTER 4 61

**COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF “VALUES IN EDUCATION” INITIATIVES IN
SELECTED DEVELOPING AND DEVELOPED COUNTRIES**

4.1 INTRODUCTION	61
4.2 “VALUES IN EDUCATION” IN THE UNITED STATES	62
4.3 EUROPE’S “VALUES IN EDUCATION” PERSPECTIVE	66
4.4 JAPAN’S “VALUES IN EDUCATION” PERSPECTIVE	71
4.5 TAIWAN’S “VALUES IN EDUCATION” PERSPECTIVE	74
4.6 THE MALAYSIAN “VALUES IN EDUCATION” PERSPECTIVE	76
4.7 THE AFRICAN “VALUES IN EDUCATION” PERSPECTIVE	79
4.8 COMPARISON BETWEEN SOUTH AFRICA AND OTHER COUNTRIES	85
4.9 SUMMARY	87

CHAPTER 5 88

**THE GUIDING PRINCIPLE OF “VALUES IN EDUCATION” AND ITS
IMPLICATIONS FOR DEMOCRATIC CITIZENSHIP**

5.1 INTRODUCTION	88
5.2 INTER-SUBJECTIVITY	89
5.3 “VALUES IN EDUCATION” ARE CONCEPTUALLY LINKED TO INTERSUBJECTIVITY	91
5.4 DEMOCRATIC CITIZENSHIP AND ITS CONNECTION TO INTERSUBJECTIVITY	97
5.5 “VALUES IN EDUCATION” CAN CULTIVATE DEMOCRATIC CITIZENSHIP	102
5.6 SUMMARY	107

CHAPTER 6	108
DEMOCRATIC CITIZENSHIP, VALUES IN EDUCATION: A WAY FORWARD	
6.1 INTRODUCTION	108
6.2 DEMOCRATIC CITIZENSHIP AS AN OBJECTIVE IN EDUCATION: SOME SIGNPOSTS	108
6.3 POSSIBILITIES FOR FUTURE EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH	117
6.4 CONCLUSION	124
REFERENCES	125

CHAPTER 1

VALUES, EDUCATION AND TRANSFORMATION IN SOUTH AFRICA

1.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter I shall expound on the notion of values, education and transformation for the reason that my research involves answering the question as to whether the “Values in Education” initiative spearheaded by the South African Ministry of Education can promote democracy and citizenship in schools.

An exploration of “Values in Education” is as old as philosophy itself. Both the legendary Plato and Aristotle spoke about producing a “good” citizen who can serve Greek society. More recently, philosophers like Taylor (1985), MacIntyre (1981) and Rorty (1980) produced seminal ideas on notions of the common good which can be linked to the idea of “Values in Education”. My interest in the subject on “Values in Education” has been initiated by my reading of articles published by my supervisor which relate to moral notions and educational discourse. It is in this context that I shall now frame my rationale for this study.

1.2 RATIONALE OF STUDY

For decades prior to 1994, apartheid education dominated the education in South Africa. A complete overhaul of the previous racially divided education system was necessary for the reason that many legitimate voices amongst educators, learners and parents were unjustifiably discriminated against and marginalised. The emergence of a new Outcomes-based education system (OBE) coupled with a new Norms and Standards for Educators framework present a watershed in the transformation – permanent change – from apartheid education to a democratic education dispensation.

Yet, any new and transformative changes to the education system require people with the “strength of will” (Gutman, 1998) to enact such changes. This “strength of will” refers to a different state of mind and willingness to bring about meaningful and lasting, that is, transformative change. But then, a different state of mind implies that the education system requires individuals and groups of people to develop a disposition and positive orientation towards bringing about meaningful change. The point is, enacting transformation in education is in fact a value-laden process; transformation requires a particular individual and group of people to make education worthwhile to and for others to pursue. It is with such an understanding of making education worthwhile to and for others in mind that the Department of Education (DoE) through the Ministry of Education proposed a “Values in Education” initiative to effect lasting and permanent change in the education system in South Africa.

Of course it can be argued that the DoE's "Values in Education" initiative has been catapulted into the education system in South Africa primarily because of globalising and market economic forces. The argument runs as follows: South Africa requires skilled persons who can compete and contribute towards the development of the economy. One way of ensuring this is to establish a democracy since the latter can bring about peaceful and negotiated change necessary for a stable political and economic climate. Hence, globalising forces mostly concerned about capital would support and invest in programmes that can ensure peace and stability in a country that shows much promise to emerge into the economic hub of the African continent. Although such an argument sounds plausible, one should not ignore the fact that South Africa is characterised by high levels of crime, corruption and moral decadence. Thus, it would understandably be logical to introduce a "Values in Education" initiative which can contribute towards producing "good" citizens. It is for this reason that I find the DoE's project highly and morally virtuous.

I agree with the Ministry of Education that "Values in Education" are necessary to enact transformation in schools. Therefore, in this thesis I shall explore whether "Values in Education" can create spaces for a deep sense of democracy and citizenship in schools. It is my contention that "Values in Education" can cultivate democratic citizenship in schools – a position I shall argue for and explore in this thesis.

1.3 “VALUES IN EDUCATION” AND PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION

Before I address the question as to why I have chosen to do a thesis in Philosophy of Education, I first need to say something about my understanding of education. As a retired secondary school teacher, my interest in educational matters can be located in my commitment to serve others. I always saw myself as a person ready to engage in some kind of conversation or dialogue with others – a commitment which is not indifferent to what I have read philosophers say about the concept. In the Deweyan mould I consider education as a social practice whereby people (educators and learners) engage in a collaborative process of meaning making (Dewey, 1925: 25). My own teaching experiences in English at secondary school level bear testimony to my engagement with others through sharing and exchanging of ideas and other knowledge constructs. In other words, knowledge in an educative activity cannot merely be transferred to learners from educators. Learners engage with questions of meaning of how ideas are shaped. Moreover, education like any other social practice is value-laden, that is, it is constituted by notions which give “worth” to the concept. As a secondary school teacher I was always concerned with teaching for the good of making a difference in people’s lives, that is, of my learners. Hence, my own interest in “Values in Education”, since I contend that “Values in Education” can improve the level of understanding and living of learners.

My thesis is related to the discipline of Philosophy of Education. Drawing on the ideas of Soltis (1998), I argue that Philosophy of Education comprises three dimensions: a personal, public and professional view. Firstly, to have a personal Philosophy of Education is to possess a certain set of beliefs, understandings, inherited conventions, rules and explanations about what constitutes education and what it ought to be. I am a person with a committed religious disposition. Therefore, I view education as a social practice aimed at producing a good person. This is my personal view of what a Philosophy of Education should be. Already the link between what constitutes education and a matter of “goodness” should be quite apparent, hence, my interest in “Values in Education”. “Values in Education” according to my personal view involves understanding and practising education with some worthwhile end in mind. For years, I have been a Mathematics and English educator at a secondary school and have thought about improving the quality of my learners’ understanding of Mathematics and English. Initially, I was interested in pursuing a Masters in Mathematics Education, but my concern with the moral dimension of what constitutes good teaching and learning gained more prominence. In this sense, I developed a deep concern with “goodness”, that is, “Values in Education” in relation to educational changes in schools.

Moreover, Soltis (1998) also talks about a public dimension of Philosophy of Education. Soltis (1998: 197) explains Philosophy of Education according to the public dimension as follows:

Public philosophy of education is everybody’s business and ought to

be. The point of being philosophical about education in the public dimension is to articulate public aspirations and educational values, give sense and purpose to the cooperative public enterprise of education, and provide the opportunity for thoughtful participation in the direction of education by all who care seriously about it.

To have a public view of Philosophy of Education is to subject one's understanding of education to public scrutiny. My first experience in working in an academic (university) environment as a research assistant to my supervisor exposed me to Philosophy of Education along the lines of the public domain. I had to write pages and pages of information, which I came to know as developing and articulating arguments which I then submitted to my supervisor for consideration and critical examination. He gave me endless and slavish feedback on how to restructure, re-conceptualise and re-articulate my arguments, in his words, "in a coherent, logically consistent and rational manner". In this way, my understandings of education have been subjected to the public domain. In this way, my understanding of Philosophy of Education augmented to the extent that I agreed to write a thesis dealing with "Values in Education" in schools.

In addition, Soltis (1998) also refers to another dimension of Philosophy of Education: the professional view. Soltis (1998: 199) explains that being professionally philosophical is to

... make the educational enterprise as rationally self-reflective as

possible by providing philosophically rigorous examinations, critiques, justifications, analyses and syntheses of aspects of the educators' conceptual and normative domain ... (Professional philosophers of education) are philosophical scholar-teachers who do technical philosophical work demanding rigour, precision, and adherence to their own professional canons of scholarship just as sociologists, historians, psychologists, and other academics do in their writing and teaching.

My own journey through writing this thesis – and it has been an arduous and thought provoking one – best illustrates my marriage with a professional dimension of Philosophy of Education. This involved having been taught to argue rationally, that is, providing reasons as to why I assume a particular position regarding “Values in Education”. Coupled with this, I had to make sure that I understood the context in which the Ministry of Education’s “Values in Education” initiative unfolded. In this regard I studied most of the literature associated with the *Tirisano* (Saamtrek) project on “Values in Education”, including my supervisor’s thoughts on the matter. Then I had to make a comparative analysis between “Values in Education” initiatives in South Africa and other selected countries where the concept also gained prominence. This brought, I think, coherence to my research for the reason that a discussion on “Values in Education” is not just confined to South African schools. Finally, I was always told by my supervisor to be “logical” about my arguments. Thus, logical soundness of arguments, reasonableness, coherence and consistency constitute key features of what it means to practise Philosophy of Education in a professional manner. It is within this framework of a personal, public and

professional view on Philosophy of Education that I traversed my journey through the rich maze of “Values in Education”.

1.4 PROGRAMME OF STUDY

In **Chapter 2** I expound upon conceptual analysis as a method to pursue educational research in Philosophy of Education. I am attracted to conceptual analysis for the reason that any understanding and implementation of a concept should be subjected to rigorous analysis before suggesting ways as to how the concept can be lived out. And, for the reason that “Values in Education” (as I shall argue for) comprise moral notions which need to be lived out in school practices, my reason for choosing a critical educational methodology seems justified. This is so for the reason that before a concept can be meaningfully enacted in practice, as well as transforming distorted practices, one first needs to be convinced that such a concept can actually lead to bringing about a change in people’s lives. Critical educational theory offers such an emancipatory framework of thinking and acting.

In **Chapter 3** I give an account of the historical development of the “Values in Education” initiative of the Department of Education. I show that three main events contributed towards the Ministry’s “Values in Education” drive aimed at deepening South Africa’s quest towards democracy and nation building: The Report of the Working Group, the Saamtrek Conference on Values, Education and Democracy, and the Manifesto on Values in Education. Basically six to

ten “Values in Education” have been identified for enactment in schools and other areas of public life. My task in this thesis would be to explore the possibilities these “Values in Education” engender for the cultivation of the notion of democratic citizenship for the reason that the latter can help consolidate South Africa’s newly found democracy.

In **Chapter 4** I explore global and national “Values in Education” initiatives in the United States (US), Europe (United Kingdom (UK), the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG), the Netherlands, Denmark and Sweden), South East Asian countries (Japan, Taiwan and Malaysia) and Africa in general. It is my contention that these countries’ “Values in Education” projects – with their emphasis on re-evaluating civic (moral or religious) virtues in education – might offer useful lessons for South Africa’s moral education initiatives.

In **Chapter 5** I explore the guiding principle which underpins “Values in Education”, namely, inter-subjectivity. I show that inter-subjectivity involves the idea of common, shared meanings agreed upon in deliberative action (rational argumentation and justifiable moral points of view) and guide the notion of “Values in Education”. Thereafter, I show that inter-subjectivity also underpins a defensible understanding of democratic citizenship.

In **Chapter 6** I explore some of the ways in which “Values in Education” can cultivate democratic citizenship in schools. I also suggest ways and areas in which the concept of democratic citizenship can be further analysed and explored.

1.5 SUMMARY

The “Values in Education” initiative of the Department of Education seems to have become an important facet of the transformation of education agenda in South Africa. My argument in favour of a “Values in Education” initiative to be implemented in schools along the lines of democracy and citizenship ideas can be considered as another voice in the democratisation of schooling agenda which has gained prominence post-1994. The link I establish between “Values in Education”, inter-subjectivity and democratic citizenship is where the potential contribution of this thesis lies.

CHAPTER 2

CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS AND CRITICAL EDUCATIONAL THEORY: METHOD AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter I shall explore the research design in terms of which I examine the “Values in Education” initiative propounded by the Department of Education. I use design as referring to two distinct practices: using method and methodology respectively. Briefly, method refers to the technique or procedure in terms of which one examines a particular task at hand. It is simply a way of doing something or what Aristotle would refer to as a “habit of action”. Methodology denotes the theoretical framework(s) of thinking, referred to by Kuhn (1978) as “paradigms” which underscore or guide, in this instance, educative practices. Put differently, methodology frames or guides one’s practices. For example, on the one hand, methods which can be used to expedite educational research include: case studies, action research, historical reviews, literature summaries, surveys, interviews or other quantitative and qualitative ways of doing research. Marcinkowski (1993: 52) associates educational research with different types of method:

- Descriptive studies – surveys, longitudinal and cross-sectional developmental studies, correlational studies;
- Predictive studies – correlational and multi-correlational statistical analyses; and
- Explanatory and controlling studies – experimental type designs.

Bennett de Marrais (1998: 10), also relates educational research to different types of “qualitative” methods:

- Observational knowing which tends to privilege ethnography and action research through participant observation, and the writing of detailed field notes to capture the words and behaviour of people;
- Archival knowing which provides the framework for historical research, reliant primarily on archival data (journals, diaries, letters, newspapers, photographs, films, etc.) and might also include interviews and oral histories; and
- Narrative knowing which usually takes the form of in-depth interviews, oral histories, autobiography, narratology and phenomenology, but extends top privilege to participant observations.

Methodology, on the other hand, indicates the metatheoretical narratives, such as positivism, interpretivism, constructivism, criticism and deconstruction which guide or frame educational research. A concise description of these methodologies can be as follows:

- Positivism sees facts as independent from the values judgements of people, that is, what one observes is considered as factual independent from the biases of people. For example, that the principal is an autocratic manager is a fact without considering his subjective views on the matter;
- Interpretivism considers knowledge as value-laden, that is, events and occurrences should be subjected to human explanation. Human beings offer reasons as to why situations are what they are. For instance, the learners' performances in schools are poor for the reason that educators do not teach effectively enough;
- Constructivism contends that knowledge is individually and socially constructed. This means that knowledge constructs are not merely the ownership of individuals but constitute part of the social matrix in which they are formed. For instance, in a Mathematics classroom knowledge about solutions to particular problems can be constructed drawing on the subjective views of educators and learners;
- Criticism happens when reasons are found for situations or events and people actually do something about changing themselves and their environments. For instance, the reason why learners perform badly in Mathematics can be attributed to poor teaching. In turn, educators improve their teaching strategies, that is, doing something about their poor teaching; and
- Deconstruction refers to ways of "looking beyond the text", that is, searching for meanings outside the "margins". For instance, it is not

sufficient for educators just to change their teaching methods to improve the learning situation in classrooms. Educators also find other reasons that they have not conventionally thought about, such as to attribute poor teaching to them being too “objectives-driven” in the Mathematics classroom.

In this thesis, I shall use conceptual analysis as a research method and critical theory as research methodology to explore the notion of “Values in Education”. This brings me to a discussion of the specific method I shall use in this thesis, namely, conceptual analysis.

2.2 CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS

In this thesis I shall attempt to analyse broadly, the notions of “Values in Education” and democratic citizenship, hence, my use of conceptual analysis. What does conceptual analysis mean? As can be deduced from the term “conceptual analysis”, the practice or activity involves an analysis of concepts. Briefly, analysis refers to an activity which involves seeking to understand meanings which make concepts what they are. And, if one examines the underlying meanings which constitute concepts, one searches to gain more clarity or insight as to what the particular concept under investigation entails. For instance, if one wants to know what education means, one has to search for or uncover the meanings which constitute education – meanings which give education its distinct understanding. Education might be interpreted as a

social practice which involves human actions for the purpose of attaining some benefit for society in general. In this case, meanings, which constitute education, involve: purposive human actions and moral behaviour for achieving the common good. These are called constitutive meanings of education for they make education what it is. In short these constitutive meanings give education its distinct character and feel.

However, trying to uncover the constitutive meanings of concepts such as education, demands that one searches for those meanings which one thinks might best explain what the concept is about. Hirst and Peters (1998) specifically refer to searching for the underlying meanings of a concept as a practice of looking for logically necessary conditions which give a concept its meaning, style and appearance. In essence, when one analyses a concept one would search for logically necessary conditions which make up a concept. If these logically necessary conditions were not there, then one would not understand the meaning of the concept. It is in this sense that Hirst and Peters (1998: 33) claim the following:

If, therefore, we are trying to analyse a concept it is important to realise that this cannot be done adequately by just examining the use of words in a self-contained way. We have to study carefully their relation to other words (concepts) and their use in different types of sentences (contexts). An understanding of their use in sentences does not come just by the study of grammar; it is also necessary to understand the different sorts of purposes (general principles or logically necessary

conditions) that lie behind the use of sentences. And this requires reflection on different purposes, both linguistic and non-linguistic, that human beings share in social life.

Thus, if one wants to know what constitutes “Values in Education” one has to search for the logically necessary conditions which frame such an understanding. Thus one might find that “Values in Education” are constituted by ethics, moral good, engagement, civil obedience and shared goods. When one chooses these meanings as constitutive of the concept “Values in Education”, then one has good reason to refer to them as logically necessary conditions which explain the existence of the concept. In this way, one engages in conceptual analysis.

Moreover, doing conceptual analysis is not just confined to finding logically necessary conditions which make a concept what it is. Concepts such as “Values in Education”, like any other concept are framed within a particular social or historical context. In other words, concepts have a history. Of course, one does not have to know the history of the notion “good” in order to do well. Neither does one have to know the social conventions or rules that have given rise to the formation of “goodness”. However, if one clearly wants to know what informs the use of a concept such as “goodness” in a particular way, one needs to know something about its historical context. In this way, Taylor (1985: 87) refers to searching for or knowing the historical context which shapes concepts as a matter of “diachronic causation”, that is, one would be able to know in a more articulate and substantiated way as to what a concept

means if one refers to the use of the concept in its historical context. Similarly, if one wants to know how “Values in Education” unfolded or emerged, it would be more feasible to know something related to the manner in which the concept has developed historically. Only then can one say one has a clearer, more nuanced and defensible understanding of the concept “Values in Education”. In essence, conceptual analysis does not only mean that one has to know the logically necessary conditions or constitutive features which make concepts what they are, but also, the historical and social contexts which have given rise to the formation and existence of the concept.

It is with such an understanding of conceptual analysis that I shall explore the constitutive meanings which make up, as well as the historical context which shaped and guided a perspective of “Values in Education”. In short, I shall perform a conceptual analysis to find out what constitutes “Values in Education”.

Finally, to conclude my exposition of conceptual analysis, I shall briefly refer to another aspect which informs the practice of analysing concepts. When one searches for logically necessary conditions which could frame a concept one invariably refers to relational concepts. That is, one refers to the use of a concept such as “goodness” in relation to other words or concepts. It is in this context that I understand Wittgenstein (1953: 76) when he says that one only gets to know the meaning of a concept if one relates it to the use of other concepts. Thus, one finds that in order to understand the concept “goodness” one has to relate the use of “goodness” to other concepts such as justice,

fairness, liberty, equality and openness, as well as the ways in which these concepts are used in practice. When one explains the concept goodness in relation to justice, fairness, and so on, then one gets to know how the concept is used relationally and contextually. In this way one becomes attuned to the relational understanding of the use of a concept. In my view, uncovering constitutive meanings of the notion of “Values in Education” demands that one not only understands the relational concepts which give meaning to “Values in Education”, but also understanding the way in which the concept is attuned to other concepts in society.

In summary, conceptual analysis involves three things: (1) searching for the logically necessary conditions which constitute concepts; (2) knowing the historical development according to which concepts manifested in practices; and (3) knowing the relational meanings of concepts. It is with this framework of conceptual analysis in mind that I shall in the next chapter explore the underlying meanings of “Values in Education”. In this way, I would become better positioned to answer my research question whether “Values in Education” create spaces for democratic citizenship. This brings me to a discussion of methodology in education policy analysis – an aspect of educational research.

As has been alluded to earlier, methodology provides the theoretical framework in terms of which educational research can be organised. Broadly speaking, I shall discuss three research methodologies used in educational research and argue as to why some are not and others are useful for the kind

of conceptual analysis I shall perform in this thesis. I identify three methodologies which can guide forms of educational research: positivist educational theory, interpretive educational theory and critical educational theory. I shall discuss each methodology and provide reasons as to which methodology is most apposite for conceptual analysis about "Values in Education".

2.3 POSITIVIST EDUCATIONAL THEORY

According to positivist educational thought, everything that needs to be explained about social events is independent from the metaphysical dispositions of human beings. Events and happenings are as they are without the value biases of people. The sun is shining is an event which does not require human explanation since one can observe the sun's brightness and sunlight being cast onto the Earth's surface. In other words, it can be verified that the sun shines without human interpretation. Humans observe the sun's brightness without having to offer reasons in defence of their empirical observation. Educational discourse in the positivist tradition draws on a neutral, objective, or statistical language and, occurs independent of human beings' self-understandings (Kelchtermans & Schratz, 1994: 244). Similarly, positivists would argue that learner indiscipline could be attributed to the absence of good teaching without wanting to know what reasons contribute to the ineffectiveness of teaching which can result in inapt learning. It is not necessary that reasons be offered which can justify inapt learner performance

in the classroom. Positivists assert that one can verify learner indiscipline as being a direct consequence of ineffective teaching. In other words, there exists a causal relation between ineffective teaching and learner indiscipline. This causal relationship, positivists argue, can be verified.

In my view, positivist educational theory is not an adequate framework of thinking to explain and analyse "Values in Education". Why not? In the first place "Values in Education" involve metaphysical human presuppositions that require explanation and interpretation. Positivist thought seems to undermine human explanation for the reason that its primary interest is to manipulate and control events. One can only manipulate and control events once one accepts that actions should merely be observed and verified according to their natural occurrences. Put differently, positivists would argue that once we observe and verify that learner performance depends on classroom discipline then we can make predictions as to how humans, say teachers, should behave. In my view, one cannot simply assume that inapt learner performance can just be causally attributed to indiscipline without determining other reasons which might contribute to such a practice. Here, my emphasis is on interpretation which does not find space within a positivistic framework of thinking. Consequently a positivist educational theory is not adequate enough to explain human behaviour, particularly those involving "Values in Education". "Values in Education" involve human actions which require interpretation, analysis and explanation. Positivism seems to be averse to such interpretive practices.

Now if positivist educational theory is not sufficient to explain human actions, I shall refer to interpretive educational theory as a theoretical framework which does allow space for an explanation of human behaviour.

2.4 INTERPRETIVE EDUCATIONAL THEORY

For the reason that education policy analysis, more specifically an analysis of “Values in Education” involves the actions of human beings, I shall use an interpretive educational theory in order to uncover the self-understandings of human agency. Taylor (1985: 25) most adequately explains interpretive educational theory as the rational articulation of meaning in a clear, lucid and coherent manner. In other words, interpretive inquiry involves giving reasons as to why things are what they are. But these reasons are not just haphazard without any form of consistency in their articulation. Reasons are justified according to logical and systematic explanations. The point about such an understanding of human action is that events are not just verified according to what is observed. Instead, events and human actions are explained according to rationality, that is, informed opinion, insight and understanding. Simply put, human actions do not just occur without some sort of rational justification as to why they are what they are; without giving reasons. For example, the value of “tolerance” cannot simply be verified according to what one observes. One can observe a person to be kind, humble and showing respect. But this does not necessarily mean that such a person is tolerant. In order to find out whether the person is tolerant one has to explain the actions of this person, say, in relation to other persons. If such a person is hostile towards others of a

different culture, yet exhibits kindness towards members of a homogenous group, such a person cannot be said to be tolerant. The point I am making is that a human value such as tolerance cannot simply be explained in terms of the actions someone exhibits. One has to find more substantiated or articulated reasons in order to justify the tolerance somebody else might seem to enact. And, if one offers justifiable reasons in a clear, logically consistent and coherent manner, one is said to be an interpretive being. That is, one justifies, in this instance, the value of tolerance according to logically sound reasons without inconsistency and contradiction. It is in this sense that I agree with Taylor (1985) when he posits that one is an interpretive being if one articulates a point of view or idea or argument in a logically sound, consistent and perspicuous order (that is, coherent manner). Taylor (1985: 137) argues as follows:

We have a rational grasp of something when we can articulate it, that means, distinguish and lay out the different features of the matter in perspicuous order (that is articulations which are lucid and consistent).

Interpretive educational theory seems best suited to explain and analyse "Values in Education", for the reason that values in the first place is a human construct which involves human actions. Tolerance, like justice and fairness is a human value since it involves the actions of human beings. For the reason that "Values in Education" constitute the actions of human beings, interpretation seems to be a feasible way to explain and analyse their actions. Hence, interpretive educational theory seems to be a plausible

methodological framework which can explain, interpret, understand and analyse human actions. It is for this reason that I shall use interpretive educational theory as a research methodology in order to find out the self-understandings of human beings who can cultivate “Values in Education”.

However, my conceptual analysis of “Values in Education” as explained and justified by the Ministry of Education cannot just be limited to an interpretation of human actions without also saying how these human actions can be used to enable transformation, and more specifically in the light of this thesis, democratic citizenship in schools. Therefore, a mere interpretation of human values is not sufficient without also making a case for effecting democratic citizenship in schools. In other words, it is not sufficient to explain and interpret values, but also come up with ways or procedures as to how “Values in Education” in particular, can bring about the democratisation of the attitudes of citizens, in this instance, school learners and educators. Consequently, interpretation alone is inadequate. This is so, for the reason that interpretation of “Values in Education” should also lead to more empowering and enabling practices in schools, particularly involving cultivating the notion of democratic citizenship. It is my contention that critical educational theory moves beyond the mere interpretation of events or human practices. It is also concerned with transforming the attitudes and practices of people, changing their opinions and activities. It is to such a discussion that I shall now return.

2.5 CRITICAL EDUCATIONAL THEORY

In this section, I shall argue as to why critical educational theory is an appropriate paradigm in terms of which research in education, in this instance, “Values in Education” can be pursued. It is my contention, as I shall argue for in later chapters, that the “Values in Education” initiative of the Department of Education has an empowering and emancipatory agenda which can contribute towards transformation in schools, as well as engendering democratic citizenship. Hence, my research will be framed according to the tenets of critical educational theory for the reason that the latter is geared towards bringing about a change in people’s self-understandings and practices; those instances of value-laden, ethical human actions.

The question arises: What constitutes critical educational theory? Whereas positivist and interpretive theories are at best concerned about “objective” (that is, empirically verified) facts and subjective human experiences respectively, a critical educational theory is more concerned about liberating (freeing) the attitudes of human beings towards practices which are more emancipatory. In other words, critical theory is primarily concerned with bringing about a change in people’s self-understandings and practices, that is, emancipating (empowering or enabling) human actions. Critical educational theory according to Fay (1976: 67) is more orientated towards actuating a change or transformation in the lives of people. Put differently, through critical educational theory people can become more transformed. For example, critical educational theory would not just be concerned about explaining or

clarifying “Values in Education”. Rather, values such as tolerance, openness, respect, dignity, accountability and social honour should not merely be analysed and interpreted but also, what Gutman (1998: 321) refers to as being “lived from inside”. These values should be enacted.

Moreover, critical educational theory is also concerned about actually transforming distorted practices toward becoming less distorted (Carr & Kemmis, 1987). For example, institutions which in the past discriminated against learners on the grounds of race, colour, ethnicity or social background should according to critical theory become more transformative in the sense that they honour and respect diverse learners from various socio-economic backgrounds. In this way, distorted and discriminatory practices can become more transformed. These practices could actually become emancipatory.

Consequently, critical educational theory is not merely interested in explaining and analysing “Values in Education”. Instead, its primary aim is to liberate the attitudes of people (educators and learners) toward becoming emancipated. It is my contention that “Values in Education” as formulated by the Ministry of Education should not only be interpreted according to the contexts in which schools function, but also be implemented with the aim to transform the attitudes of both educators and learners. In this way one could argue that “Values in Education” has a transformative role to play in post-apartheid schools. It is such a notion of critical educational theory which would be used to frame my research about “Values in Education”.

2.6 SUMMARY

In this chapter I have expounded upon conceptual analysis as a method to pursue educational research. I am attracted to conceptual analysis for the reason that any understanding and implementation of a concept should be subjected to rigorous analysis before suggesting ways as to how the concept can be lived out. And, for the reason that “Values in Education” (as I shall argue for) comprise moral notions which need to be lived out in school practices, my reason for choosing a critical educational methodology seems justified. This is so for the reason that before a concept can be meaningfully enacted in practice, as well as transforming distorted practices, one first needs to be convinced that such a concept can actually lead to bringing about a change in people’s lives. Critical educational theory offers such an emancipatory framework of thinking and acting.

Now that I have expounded upon conceptual analysis and theoretical frameworks of thinking and acting, I shall examine in the next chapter what constitutes “Values in Education” for the reason that an appropriate understanding of the concept is necessary in order to explore as to whether “Values in Education” can cultivate democratic citizenship in schools – the primary focus of this thesis.

CHAPTER 3

THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE “VALUES IN EDUCATION” INITIATIVE IN SOUTH AFRICA

3.1 INTRODUCTION

In the previous chapter I have expounded on the philosophical tool (strategy) of conceptual analysis. Central to the practice of conceptual analysis is the notion that in order to know what a concept means (in this case, “Values in Education”) one firstly, has to know the reasons which gave rise to the formation of a concept. And, getting to know the reasons which constitute concepts, invariably involves knowing its history, that is, the structural and conceptual processes which led to the construction of concepts. In other words, knowing the historical development of the concept “Values in Education” would be my first task in using conceptual analysis.

To begin with, the demise of Apartheid was propelled by the Kempton Park negotiations followed by the promulgation of South Africa's Interim Constitution in 1993, eventually resulting in the Final Constitution of 1996.

The transformation agenda of the country towards democracy and the procurement of the political, societal, economic and civil rights of all citizens became the primary focus of the first democratically elected government under the auspices of the African National Congress (ANC) in 1994. For the first time in its history South Africa had a serious commitment to redress the inequalities of the past in every facet of civil society. The most daunting task, which faced the new government, was the development and consolidation of its newly found democracy and the concomitant establishment of human (civil) rights and political accountability. It was in the area of education that the government found a propelling social force to ensure that issues of democracy, rights and citizenship (key concepts in this thesis) become firmly entrenched in political, societal and educational life. Spearheaded by the Minister of Education, Professor Kader Asmal, the national Department of Education launched its *Tirisano* (“Working Together”) project as a systematised attempt to manifest “Values in Education” in schools. In the next section, I shall give an historical account of the processes which led to the formulation of what became known as the “Manifesto on Values, Education and Democracy” of 2001. In this way, I shall elucidate the structural and conceptual reasons which precipitated the idea of “Values in Education” in South African schools, and later on, in chapter 5, their implications for the notion of democratic citizenship. This brings me to a cursory account of constitutional democracy in South Africa, in particular the promulgation of the Interim and Final Constitutions of 1993 and 1996 respectively for the reason that these Constitutions provide the legal framework according to which the notion “Values in Education” was shaped.

3.2 CONSTITUTIONAL DEMOCRACY IN SOUTH AFRICA SINCE 1994

The Constitutions (1993 and 1996) and Bill of Rights (second chapter of the 1996 Constitution) constitute the basis of the “Values in Education” initiative spearheaded through the Ministry of Education’s Tirisano project. Before I expound on this project, I first need to explore South Africa’s constitutional democracy, in particular how democracy seems to entrench the country’s current political order. With reference to the Interim Constitution (1993) and the final Constitution of 1996, I want to show how democratic principles are enshrined in both Constitutions, in particular the Bill of Rights. In this way, I locate democratic principles which invariably shape or need to shape political, as well as educational practices in South Africa.

The Preamble to the 1993 Interim Constitution declares the

need to create a new order in which all South Africans shall be entitled to a common South African *citizenship* in a sovereign and *democratic constitutional* state in which there is *equality* between men and women and people of all races so that all citizens shall be able to exercise their fundamental *rights and freedoms* (DoE, 1995: 39, my italics).

Thus, the Preamble to the 1993 Interim Constitution already accentuates the important link between establishing constitutional democracy premised on the

notions of citizenship, equality, rights and freedoms. Moreover, the closing paragraphs of the 1993 Interim Constitution distil the essential moral vision, and hence, democratic ethos of the Constitution makers:

- This Constitution provides the historic bridge between the past of a deeply divided society characterised by strife, conflict, untold suffering and injustice, and a future founded on the recognition of human rights, *democracy* and peaceful co-existence and development opportunities for all South Africans, irrespective of colour, race, class, belief and sex;
- The pursuit of national unity, the well-being of all South African citizens and peace require reconciliation between the people of South Africa and the reconstruction of society;
- The adoption of this Constitution lays the secure foundation for the people of South Africa to transcend the divisions and strife of the past, which generated gross violations of human rights, the transgression of humanitarian principles in violent conflicts and a legacy of hatred, fear, guilt and revenge; and
- These can now be addressed on the basis that there is a need for understanding but not for vengeance, a need for reparation but not for retaliation, a need for *ubuntu* but not for victimisation (DoE, 1995: 17, *my italics*).

After the first democratic elections in 1994, when the ANC came into power, South Africa's first democratic government was ushered in with the adoption of the Final Constitution in 1996. In the Preamble it is stated that the

Constitution seeks to:

- Heal the divisions of the past and establish a society based on democratic values, social justice and fundamental human rights;
- Lay the foundations for a democratic and open society in which government is based on the will of the people and every citizen is equally protected by law;
- Improve the quality of life of all citizens and free the potential of each person; and
- Build a united and democratic South Africa able to take its rightful place as a sovereign state in the family of nations.

What the above shows, is that constitutional democracy in South Africa is guided by value-laden moral principles which include: rights, freedom, equality, justice, reconciliation, social unity and peaceful coexistence. All these democratic principles as enshrined in the Constitutions and Bill of Rights advocate a notion of democracy aimed at reconciling, reconstructing and developing South African society. The point I am making is that South Africa's constitutional democracy provides a legal and epistemological framework in terms of which practices such as education and schooling need to be framed. I shall now offer a brief word on the Constitution.

Section 1(1) of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa of 1996 declares South Africa to be "one, sovereign, democratic state" founded on the values of human dignity, the achievement of equality, the advancement of

human rights and freedoms, non-racialism, non-sexism, supremacy of the Constitution and the rule of law, universal adult suffrage, a national common voters roll, regular elections and a multi-party system of democratic government with the aim to ensure accountability, responsiveness and openness (The Constitution, 1996: 3). My emphasis is on the advancement of freedoms which should be read in conjunction with the Bill of Rights (chapter 2), in particular sections 12 (Freedom and security of the person, which include: the right not to be deprived of freedom arbitrarily or without just cause, not to be detained without trial, to be free from all forms of violence from either public or private sources, not to be tortured in any way, not to be treated or punished in a cruel, inhuman or degrading manner, to make decisions concerning reproduction, to security in and control over their body, and not to be subjected to medical or scientific experiments without their informed consent); 15 (Freedom of religion, belief and opinion, which include: marriages concluded under any tradition or a system of religious, personal or family law, or a system of personal and family law under any tradition or adhered to by persons professing a particular religion); 16 (Freedom of expression, which include: freedom of the press and other media, freedom to receive or impart information or ideas, freedom of artistic creativity, academic freedom and freedom of scientific research); 18 (Freedom of association); 21 (Freedom of movement and residence, which include: the right to leave the Republic, the right to enter and to remain in and to reside anywhere in the Republic); and 22 (Freedom of trade, occupation and profession).

In essence, the Constitution of 1996 offers a framework of democratic enactment which needs to guide our educative practices. This brings me to a more detailed exposition of the notion of democracy for the reason that, as I shall argue for, the “Values in Education” notion is inextricably connected to an understanding of democracy as enunciated in the Constitution of 1996.

3.2.1 Democracy

Explanations of the concept democracy abound. To begin explaining the concept it is worth referring to a quote by Winston Churchill: “Democracy is the worst form of government except all the others which have been tried before” (Gutman in Waghid, 2002a: 84). This quote denotes democracy as a system of government, whether representative or participatory. Clearly the Constitutions accentuate two additional understandings of democracy which include: firstly, democracy as a form of social and political life, and secondly, democracy as discourse (debate or deliberation). I shall now deal with these three distinct notions of democracy in detail in particular how constitutive principles underscore the concept vis-à-vis the Constitutions and Bill of Rights.

Firstly, representative (liberal) democracy basically means that collective deliberations that concern the whole of the community are taken not directly by its members, but by people elected for this purpose (Bobbio in Waghid, 2002a: 85). Schumpeter (in Waghid, 2002a: 85) defines democracy as a representative form of government whereby decision-making is restricted to

elected representatives, electors having voted without participating any further. Steyn (2001: 23) posits that the distinctive feature of liberal democracy is freedom, and hence, emphasises the typical democratic values of human rights. According to de Klerk (2001: 39) there are two kinds of democracy deeply rooted in South Africa: liberal and social democracy. According to her, liberal democracy is characterised by individual freedom, decentralisation and individual competition with the emphasis on the individual. Certainly such a form of liberal democracy, which accentuates the importance of the individual over the community, is not in line with the democratic ethos of the Constitution which also announces the importance of people (individuals) engaging in collective action. And for the reason that the “Values in Education” initiative is primarily a project geared towards involving the community (for instance, individuals at schools), a liberal democracy as explained by both Steyn and de Klerk does not seem to be apposite here.

Secondly, participatory (social) democracy is described as a sphere of social relationships; social democracy undermines class distinctions and advocates equality of opportunity for all citizens (Birch in Waghid, 2002a: 86). According to de Klerk (2001: 39) social democracy is characterised basically by equality, communality and centralisation. Social democracy is also primarily aimed at welfare-orientated reforms within a market-related capitalist society (Gould in Waghid, 2002a: 86). For Pateman (in Waghid, 2002a: 87) social democracy emphasises participation on the grounds of equality and liberty; that is, people have the right to control their own lives, and to become competent at self-management and self-governance. She articulates this kind of democracy as

a direct or participatory form of democracy whereby people directly participate in economic, political and social life (Pateman in Waghid, 2002a: 87). To my mind, participatory democracy seems to be attuned to the democratic spirit of the Constitution and hence, for the “Values in Education” initiative of the Ministry of Education. In other words, the “Values in Education” project would be difficult to implement in schools if participatory democracy does not guide the practices of people (students, learners, parents, and so on) in schools. Therefore, the implementation of the “Values in Education” initiative would be favourable to the notion of participatory democracy, since its enactment in the first place, requires the collective (participatory) action of individuals. However, mere participation is not good enough. People can participate in matters of public concern, but this does not necessarily mean that they engage critically with one another’s thoughts and opinions. Consequently mere participatory democracy is not sufficient to implement “Values in Education”. Thus, we find the Constitution announces a kind of deliberative democracy which specifically refers to the rational deliberation (debate and discussion) amongst people with the intent to achieve reasonable decisions based on consensus and reflexive argumentation.

Thirdly, what constitutes deliberative democracy? It simply refers to “a conception of democratic government that secures a central place for reasoned discussion (rational deliberation) in political life” (Cooke in Waghid, 2002a: 92). The general principle of deliberative democracy is rationality, which involves a process of argumentation in which those taking part justify their reasons with consistent and unambiguous formulations (Habermas in

Waghid, 2002a: 111). For Gutman and Thompson a deliberative democratic theory offers “a conception of democracy that secures a central place for moral discussion in political life” (in Waghid, 2002a: 111). They argue that the promise of a deliberative democratic theory lies in a concern for “finding terms of cooperation that each citizen can accept” for the reason that contemporary societies are driven by deep conflict and moral disagreement (Gutman & Thompson in Waghid, 2002a: 92). Gutman also argues that deliberative democracy has an advantage over participative democracy for the reason that it recognises the provisional nature of justification in politics, that is, citizens’ understanding of issues change over time as well as through deliberative interchange – where justification involves respecting many moral and cultural differences within and across societies (Gutman in Waghid, 2002a: 107).

Habermas posits, “reaching mutual understanding (compromise) through (deliberative) discourse indeed guarantees that issues, reasons, and information are handled reasonably ...” (Habermas in Waghid, 2002a: 109). Thus to avoid perpetual conflict, which may bring us nowhere, we need to develop what Callan refers to as “shared group-interest in compromise” (Callan in Waghid, 2002a: 109), also known as patriotism. It is this kind of “shared compromise” through reflexive and rational deliberation which need to frame any implementation of the “Values in Education” project. It is my contention that participatory and deliberative democracy (emphasising the notion of debate) constitutes crucial aspects of democratic theory, which in turn, offer a justifiable conceptual framework that can (as I shall argue for in

later chapters) enhance the implementation of the “Values in Education” initiative.

Now that I have expounded upon the notion of democracy which guides constitutional practices, I shall now tease out the link between democracy and education for the reason that the “Values in Education” initiative has a reasonably democratic agenda.

3.2.2 Democracy and education

According to the White Paper 1 (DoE, 1995: 18), “(t)he unique pattern of South African inequality and under-development has been laid down over the generations of minority rule and ethnically-based economic, labour and social development policies. The national and provincial Ministries of Education are dealing daily with the legacy of South Africa’s historically separate education and training systems”. The White Paper clearly suggests that a link exists between the policy formulation, implementation albeit along democratic lines, and education.

Likewise, the Annual Report 1999 of the Department of Education (DoE, 1999) released six months after Minister Kader Asmal assumed office, establishes a link between breaking with the apartheid past and moving towards democracy, and systems of education. According to this report:

Apartheid legislation, evolving over decades, created parallel racial and

ethnic systems of education that precisely reflected the constitutional order, with its explicit and implicit ideologies, its hierarchies, its multiple power and patronage structures, its gross cruelties and inequalities, and its inherent contradictions. (DoE, 1999: 63)

In the Values, Education and Democracy Report of the Working Group on Values in Education 2000, (DoE, 2000) Minister Asmal remarked that “three centuries of oppression has left deep scars on the collective souls of our people” and it would take a supreme effort “to establish a society based on democratic values” (DoE, 2000a: 3). On the one hand, the democratic values of human dignity, equality and freedom as enshrined in the Bill of Rights and being essential for nation-building, are considered as the cornerstone for the implementation of the “Values in Education” initiative. On the other hand, the link between achieving democracy through education is clearly expressed.

Values cannot just be legislated for universal implementation in a society as multi-ethnic and pluralistic as South Africa. Value systems are primarily constituted and reconstituted in the home, in places of worship, the workplace, the sport field and more importantly, in schools. Therefore, schools or the educating systems are not simply vehicles for the construction of knowledge but, especially in developing societies, they have become the vehicles for instilling the value system of the newly independent society. In schools children are socialised in the values of the ruling power and become active citizens of such a society. In the face of South Africa’s pluralism, multi-ethnicity and diversity, the responsibility of producing democratic citizens

guided by values as announced in the Constitution has been taken up by the Ministry of Education. This shows that the link between democracy and education is a necessary condition for the implementation of the “Values in Education” initiative.

Since 1994, the Ministry of Education has been introducing policies, laws and programmes aimed at transforming the national system of education and training. “For the first time in South Africa’s history, a government has the mandate to plan the development of the education and training system for the benefit of the country as a whole and all its people” (DoE, 1995: 17). What this implies, is that the “old” education system, a legacy of Apartheid oppression, and colonial subjugation, had to be transformed and remoulded to serve the needs of a free and democratic South African citizenship. The White Paper 1 further states:

In a democratically governed society, the education system taken as a whole, embodies and promotes the collective moral perspective of its citizens, that is the code of values by which the society wishes to live and consents to be judged (DoE, 1995: 17).

In essence, the link between democracy and education is clearly enunciated in policy documents. This makes sense, for the reason that both democracy and education involve the active co-operation and engagement of people in shaping their discourses. The point I am making is that both education and democracy seem to be constituted by an underlying meaning of participation,

that is, for people to engage and co-operate in shaping their educative discourses. In this regard, I find Dewey's (1925: 115) comments on the link between democracy and education extremely appropriate:

Since education is a social process, and there are many kinds of societies, a criterion for educational criticism and construction implies a *particular* social ideal. The two points selected by which to measure the worth of a form of social life are the extent in which the interests of a group are shared by all its members, and the fullness and freedom with which it interacts (democratically) with other groups.

Now that I have established the link between democracy and education, I shall focus my attention on the Department of Education's *Tirisano* project which accentuates the way in which democratic values manifest in an education initiative spearheaded by the Ministry of Education.

3.3 THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION'S *TIRISANO* PROJECT

In its mission statement the Department of Education declares the following which also indicates the link between democracy and education:

Our vision is of a South Africa in which all its people have equal access to lifelong education and training opportunities, which will contribute

towards improving their quality of life and building a peaceful, prosperous and democratic society (DoE, 1999: 91).

After the second democratic elections in 1999, Minister Kader Asmal was appointed Minister of Education to confirm and accelerate the transformative work done by his predecessor, Professor Sibusiso Bengu. The year 1999 also welcomed in the new President, Thabo Mbeki, whose “watch word” was “accelerated delivery” (DoE, 1999: 7). In his State of the Nation address to Parliament on 25 June 1999, the President identified education and training as a critical priority for meeting the broader challenge of creating a democratic and prosperous society (DoE, 1999: 11).

On 27 July 1999, after vigorous discussions with the major stakeholders in the educational arena, the Minister launched what he termed a national mobilisation for education and training, under the slogan *Tirisano*, “Working together”, where he calls upon all South Africans, in the spirit of *Tirisano*, to join hands with the Ministry to tackle the most urgent problems in education. The Minister announced nine priorities for the *Tirisano* programme:

- Making provincial systems work by making co-operative governance work;
- The back of illiteracy among adults and youths had to be broken in five years;
- Schools must become centres of community and cultural life;
- Physical degradation in schools had to be ended;

- The professional quality of the teaching force had to be developed;
- The success of active learning had to be ensured through outcomes-based education;
- A vibrant further education and training system should be created to equip youth and adults to meet the next century's social and economic needs;
- A rational, seamless higher education system had to be implemented; and
- To deal urgently and purposefully with the HIV/AIDS emergency in and through the education and training system (DoE, 1999: 13)

These priorities (it is hoped) will contribute to the broader process of social and economic development through focusing on two central goals:

- Developing people for citizenship; and
- Developing skills for employment (DoE, 1999: 14).

My focus in this thesis is to find out whether "Values in Education" as propounded through the *Tirisano* educational campaign can in fact cultivate democratic citizenship. Therefore, my emphasis would primarily be on the Department of Education's first priority, that is, "Developing people for citizenship". Moreover, President Mbeki posed the question, "Is our education system on the road to the 21st century?" to Minister Asmal in the first Cabinet meeting of the new government, and the Ministry's release to the media summarised his statement as follows: "Call to action! Mobilising citizens to

build a South African Education and Training System for the 21st Century” (DoE, 1999: 8). In chapter 5, I shall address this issue in detail.

Thus one finds that the *Tirisano* Implementation Plan of January 2000 – December 2004, was launched by Deputy President, Jacob Zuma, on 13 January 2000 with one of its key foci being the “Values in Education” initiative. I shall now address this initiative in detail.

3.4 THE VALUES IN EDUCATION INITIATIVE

Prior to 1994, access to education remained a privilege – not a right – available to a small minority. And just as the schools and universities were open to only a minority, so too, they reflected the social values of the minority they served.

Before colonisation, according to Mugomba and Nyaggah (1980), indigenous African education was relevant and reflected the realities of African society. The education system produced people / citizens, equipped to meet the material, spiritual, and social needs of the society. The arrival of the European missionaries brought a new system of education, and imposed a new set of values, culture, history, religion, and way of life, through the school curriculum, on the colonised. A requisite for school enrollment was “the full embracement of Christianity”, and “acceptance of the cultural superiority of the metropolitan country” (Mugomba & Nyaggah, 1980: 2)

Education in the mission schools stressed virtuous qualities of humility, docility, and faithful acceptance without questioning. They also taught the importance of individual achievement and personal gain outside the context of a wider collective. Thus, the individualistic and materialistic ethic reinforced the spirit of capitalism. Colonial education seemingly did not intend to instill in learners a sense of pride as members of African societies, but rather to instill in them a “sense of deference to all that was European and capitalist”. However, according to Mugomba and Nyaggah, although the British missionary’s liberal education was less than ideal, it was at least better than that provided by the Apartheid regime, after 1948 (Mugomba & Nyaggah, 1980: 59). Apartheid education, continues Mugomba and Nyaggah (1980: 59), “has been part of an overall, well-conceived doctrinaire policy of systematically maintaining White hegemony over the Blacks ...” .

Before the slave emancipation in 1838, and after, the Boers (Whites) found it difficult to accept the British missionaries’ articulation of a humanitarian philosophy of education, in terms of extending equal human rights to Blacks. When the Nationalists came into power in 1948, the architects of the apartheid policy revised the education policy of the liberal British. African education were to be controlled by centralised government and would be administrated by the Ministry of Native Affairs. The apartheid policy was based on the premise that Blacks should develop separately in their “own areas or communities”. Consequently, a multitude of inhuman laws were passed which brought African education into conformity with the apartheid national policy of separate, ethnically segregated education.

After the 1994 elections, the transformation of the education system became the top priority of the new government. The democratic values as enshrined in the Constitution would have to be developed, and internalised, according to Minister Asmal, and the schools were the most convenient point of embarking upon this project.

3.4.1 The Commission and the Values on Education Report

As stated earlier, President Thabo Mbeki (as mentioned in the Report) identified education and training as a critical priority for meeting the broader challenge of creating a democratic and prosperous society. He stated that the transformation of the education system required a fundamental re-assessment and re-thinking in order to prepare our people for citizenship and nationhood. It is, therefore, no wonder that Minister Asmal, in his *Tirisano* Implementation Plan, focusses on “developing people for citizenship”, as one of its central goals – the focus of this thesis.

Minister Bengu announced on his appointment in 1994 that all schools and education institutions were open and without racial barriers of any kind, as promulgated in the 1993 Interim Constitution. The South African Schools Act of 1996, created the nation’s first national and non-racial school system (DoE, 1999: 63). On the one hand, a South African Human Rights Commission

study on racial integration in schools, however, found that racism was still extremely prevalent, in some schools. On the other hand, another question being debated was whether the education department should focus on “race” alone, as a form of discrimination. “Race may be the most obvious and historically potent of the issues on which discrimination occurs, but racial intolerance is commonly associated with other forms of prejudice and bigotry, towards women, gays, foreigners, the disabled, and other religious traditions” (DoE, 1999: 66).

It was during an informal discussion on religious education for the *Tirisano* Plan, that the idea of a “Values in Education” project, following the international trend of “education for democratic values and social participation” was born. Out of this broader concern for social solidarity and cohesion, the practice of peace, and civic participation in democratic institutions, Minister Kader Asmal requested a working group on “Values in Education” in February 2000, to be headed by Professor Wilmot James (DoE, 1999: 66 - 67).

The members of the Working Group on Values in Education were appointed by the Minister of Education, Kader Asmal, in their individual capacities. Headed by Professor Wilmot James (Dean of Humanities, University of Cape Town), the other members were: Dr Frans Auerbach (Retired educator; SA Jewish Board of Deputies); Ms Zubeida Desai (Chairperson, Pan South African Language Board; Senior lecturer in the Faculty of Education, University of the Western Cape); Dr Herman Gilliomee (Former Professor of

Political Studies at University of Cape Town); Dr Z Pallo Jordan MP; Ms Antjie Krog (Author, poet and journalist); Mr Tembile Kulati (Special Advisor to the Minister: Higher education); Mr Khetsi Lehoko (Deputy Director-General in the DoE); Ms Brenda Leibowitz (Director: National Research Centre for Curriculum Research in DoE); and Ms Pansy Tlakula (Member of South African Human Rights Commission) (DoE, 2000a: 53).

A school-based research project was conducted in October 2000, by a consortium of research organisations led by the Witwatersrand University Education Policy Unit, to explore the way that educators, learners, and parents think and talk about “Values in Education”. Ninety-seven schools across five provinces were chosen by provincial officials to represent the range of schools in their province. Questionnaires were administered to all the educators and principals. Three-hour participatory workshops were conducted separately with learners, educators, and parents in 13 schools (DoE, 2000b: 4).

After a process of research and debate, this working group presented a report of its findings and recommendations entitled, “Values, Education and Democracy: Report of the Working Group on Values in Education”, in April 2000. According to the Report of the Working Group, the democratic Constitution and Bill of Rights accepted in 1996 provide the frame of reference for a democratic educational philosophy. The three key elements of such an educational philosophy include:

- To develop the intellectual abilities and critical faculties among all children and young adults;
- To emphasise inclusiveness. All learners, irrespective of their backgrounds, should be actively included in school life; and
- To provide learners with the tools to manage the many problems encountered in life.

In this report they motivated the promotion of equity, tolerance, multilingualism, openness, accountability, and social honour in our schools, and suggested a range of ways in which schools could begin to promote these values (DoE, 2000b: 4).

I shall now briefly tease out meanings of these values as explained in the Interim Research Report. This is necessary for the reason that I shall explore in chapters 5 and 6 as to whether these six “Values in Education” can contribute towards cultivating a notion of democratic citizenship.

3.4.1.1 Equity

The educational policy from the previous apartheid regime left the majority of South Africans, mostly Blacks, with serious inequalities in education. They were subjected to an education which prepared them only for unskilled labour. Mathematics and science were offered by exception. Their teachers were mostly unqualified, and financial assistance from the State was minimal

compared to that for Whites. The consequence of this unequal system was a desperately under-educated Black African population. A survey of education levels of people over 20, in 1995 showed alarming figures. The percentages of adults who have no formal education at all are: Black Africans 92%, Coloureds 6%, Indians 1% and Whites 0,2% (DoE, 2000a: 21).

What equity means is that to redress the inequalities of the past, all sectors of society, business, government and civil society, need to support the learning environment in how they allocate resources, set priorities and define an ethos. They need to invest in the infrastructure and quality of teaching in schools situated in the most disadvantaged areas of our country.

3.4.1.2 Tolerance

Tolerance does not mean to put up with people who are different. It can be explained as mutual understanding, reciprocal altruism and the active appreciation of the value of human difference (DoE, 2000a: 22). The value of tolerance is essential in managing and supporting the linguistic, religious, cultural and national diversity of the South African community of learners and teachers. The working group regards the teaching of history as central to the promotion of all human values, for history is one of the many memory systems that shape our values and morality, because it studies, records and diffuses knowledge of human failure and achievement over the millennia. Firstly, they feel that the history of human evolution is not properly taught in our schools, the myths about the permanence and meaning of so-called racial difference,

are perpetuated. Secondly, teaching South Africans about their interconnectedness to the peoples of Africa, Asia and Europe, would secure understanding and respect for cultural, religious and national diversity. Thirdly, a history of past abuses of human rights can serve as a powerful reminder of the folly of repetition. Human beings have the remarkable capacity to repeat the mistakes of the past. The value of tolerance could also be promoted outside of the classroom, in extra-mural activities such as the performing arts and sport (DoE, 2000a: 22-26).

On the recommendation of the Working Group, Professor Kader Asmal, on 12 September 2000, appointed a panel of historians and archaeologists, the History and Archaeology Panel of the “Values in Education” initiative, headed by Professor Njabulo Ndebele, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Cape Town. They were briefed to advise the Minister “on how best to strengthen the teaching of history in South African schools” (DoE, 2000c: Preface).

3.4.1.3 Multilingualism

Apartheid attempted to divide the South African population by casting an ethnic frame over Black people and uniting an ethnically diverse population into a single, so-called White-race, group. The Constitution of 1996 granted equality of status to 11 official languages, Sepedi, Sesotho, Setswana, siSwati, Tshivenda, Xitsonga, isiNdebele, isiXhosa, isiZulu, Afrikaans and English. English has become the national language of politics and record in

the new South Africa. It remains the language of diplomacy and international commerce.

The language-in-education policy of the Department of Education recommended in 1997 that learners should study by way of either their home language or English and their home language. Two values are promoted in the area of language: firstly, the importance of studying in the language one knows best, or as popularly referred to, mother tongue education; and secondly, the fostering of multilingualism. South Africa is a multilingual country. In order to be a good South African citizen, one needs to be at least bilingual, but preferably trilingual (DoE, 2000a: 30-33).

3.4.1.4 Openness

Our schooling system has the responsibility of refining the intellectual development of every learner in an environment that is stimulating and emotionally supportive. It also has the responsibility of providing an approach to solving problems that will be useful throughout the life cycle. Curriculum 2005 provides a theoretical grid that defines the substantive areas of knowledge a learner must master. It is up to the teacher however to make the experience for the learner a quality one.

The value of numeracy and the scientific approach to problem-solving are essential life-skills. Numeracy is needed to maintain household accounts and the daily transactional business. Science is essential for a grasp of

environmental patterns, human biology and engineering logic. The value of reading is totally underestimated in South Africa. A strong reading culture begins in the home where children are imbued with a love of reading and through having books and newspapers available in the home. We are also bereft of a strong debating culture. It probably is rooted in our apartheid past, where rote learning and the slavish repetition of information were rewarded by a bureaucratic examination system; where asking questions were discouraged; and where an authoritarian attitude to learning and social conduct was expected of teachers. The ability to ask penetrating questions is a skill that has to be encouraged and developed. The ability to debate adds value to the quality of public understanding and the public discourse.

The quality of openness is difficult to define but the issue principally has to do with the value of being open and receptive to new ideas; the ability to ask good and penetrating questions and being willing to debate to arrive at quality decisions (DoE, 2000a: 36-39).

3.4.1.5 Accountability

For those who devote their lives to teaching and training, teaching is a vocation; a mission in life and not just another job. Exercising that responsibility requires a strong sense of commitment. Teachers and administrators should therefore uphold and insist on structure. Punctuality and monitoring of school work forms part of that structure. Teachers must set examples; the school governing body should become a legitimate and

working institution. Every role player should be accountable. Children and young adults are the responsibility of parents and teachers, who in turn are accountable to school governing bodies and the educational authorities, which in turn are accountable to the citizens of the democratic society (DoE, 2000a: 42-45).

3.4.1.6 Honour

The primary purpose of a school is to provide an environment where teaching and learning take place. Part of the learning experience involves an anticipation of the responsibilities of adulthood, including those of citizenship in a democracy. Before 1994 there was by definition no common loyalty to the state or to national symbols. The state and its symbols were partial to a White minority. The Constitution and Bill of Rights of the new democratic South Africa envisages a citizenry with a sense of honour and identity as South Africans. Schools are expected to teach learners the national anthem, the significance of the flag and the recently unveiled coat of arms. Also recommended is the learning of a pledge of allegiance which should be declared at school assemblies so that we can be reminded of the fundamental values to which South Africans in a democracy aspire. The following text illustrates what the working group feels ought to be conveyed, and invite responses from the public: "I promise to be loyal to my country, South Africa, And to do my best to promote its welfare ... And the well being of all its citizens. I promise to show self-respect in all that I do ... And to respect all of my fellow citizens ... And all of our various traditions. Let us work for peace,

friendship and reconciliation ... And heal the scars left by past conflicts, And let us build a common destiny together (DoE, 2000a: 48-50).

3.4.2 Saamtrek: Values, Education and Democracy in the 21st Century

The publication of the Report of the Working Group on “Values in Education” was made possible by the Royal Netherlands Embassy in 2000 and presented for public deliberation. The issues raised by public debate in newspapers, academic journals, letters and submissions to the Ministry, culminated in a national conference at the National Botanical Institute, Kirstenbosch, Cape Town on 22-24 February 2001, called “Saamtrek: Values, Education and Democracy in the 21st Century”. More than 400 of South Africa’s leading education specialists, researchers, politicians, intellectuals and members of non-governmental organisations, gathered to deliberate the issues in an attempt to formulate a “Values in Education” policy and its implementation in schools.

The following were the conference themes and discussions:

- Rooting the new patriotism in the Constitution;
- The role of teachers;
- The question of equity;
- Governance and institutional culture;

- The question of language;
- Infusing schools with the values of human rights;
- The oral tradition as a carrier of values;
- The value of history;
- The value of arts and culture;
- Religion education vs. religious education;
- The role of sport;
- Values and technology;
- The role of the media;
- Sexual responsibility and HIV/AIDS; and
- Gender and schooling (DoE, 2001a: Contents).

At the close of the conference Minister Asmal listed the following recommendations for further consideration and action:

- Outreach on SABC TV and Radio to publicise “the values”;
- Provincial units to be set up to deal with racism and values;
- Higher education institutions to get involved with performing arts outreach and to have artists-in-residence to service nearby schools;
- A national endowment for the arts to fund talented individuals in schools;
- The establishment of a national writing centre with prizes (as incentives) and projects;
- In-service and pre-service educator training to address training on values;
- A more deliberate pursuit of affirmative action to improve equity of access;
- The recruitment of teachers to ensure diversity in schools;

- A national action plan for the introduction of African languages into the schools, universities and adult education;
- Civics education as part of the new curriculum;
- A national conference for historians and history teachers to plan a strategy for teaching History and for the discipline;
- Ongoing upgrading of history teachers and special bursaries to attract students to study History;
- A national conference on HIV/ AIDS, values, and sexuality education;
- Publication of the report on religion education;
- The dissemination of the proceedings of this conference to participants; and
- The production of a revised document on values that would become the policy of the Department of Education (DoE, 2001a: 39).

3.4.3 The Manifesto on Values, Education and Democracy

The proceedings of the deliberations of the “Values in Education” initiative and the Saamtrek conference generated another document - the *Manifesto on Values, Education and Democracy*, published in August 2001.

This “Manifesto” expounds the vision of the leadership of a democratic South Africa when they chartered the Constitution and Bill of Rights in 1996. According to the late Chief Justice Ismail Mohamed, the Constitution

articulates the values shared by a nation; the values “which bind its people and which discipline its government and its national institutions ...” (DoE, 2001b: 11). However, former president Nelson Mandela in his opening address at the Saamtrek Conference stated: “We cannot assume that because we conducted our struggle on the foundations of those values, continued adherence to them is automatic in the changed circumstances ... Children must acquire them in our homes, schools and churches” (DoE, 2001b: 5). According to President Thabo Mbeki, taking pride in our values, would lead us to “The New Patriotism” (DoE, 2001b: 9).

In the Manifesto, the Ministry of Education identifies ten constitutional values, comprehensively elucidates them, and proffers sixteen educational strategies for their implementation into schools. The ten values include: democracy, social justice and equity, equality, non-racism and non-sexism, *ubuntu* (human dignity), an open society, accountability, the rule of law, respect, and reconciliation. These values together with the six values suggested by the Working Group as mentioned earlier will be explored in chapter 6, particularly how these “Values in Education” can contribute towards nurturing the idea of democratic citizenship.

3.5 SUMMARY

In this chapter I have given an account of the historical development of the “Values in Education” initiative of the Department of Education. As I have shown, three main events contributed towards the Ministry’s “Values in

Education” drive aimed at deepening South Africa’s quest towards democracy and nation building: The Report of the Working Group, the Saamtrek Conference on Values, Education and Democracy, and the Manifesto on Values in Education. Basically six “Values in Education” have been identified for enactment in schools and other areas of public life. My task in this thesis would be to explore the possibilities these “Values in Education” engender for the cultivation of the notion of democratic citizenship for the reason that the latter can help consolidate South Africa’s newly found democracy.

It is conceivable that South Africa, having emerged from apartheid with a legacy of an education system organised along the lines of discrimination, should seek to implement a “Values in Education” programme in the school curriculum. It is also significant that as in most countries, senior political leaders are involved in the formulation of the “Values in Education” curricula formulation processes. In the United States it was the Secretary of Education, in Singapore, the Deputy Prime Minister, and in South Africa, the Minister of Education.

Certainly, a “Values in Education” initiative has a purpose. The main objective of South Africa’s “Values in Education” initiative is to deliver on the Constitution, whose ultimate aim is to restore the dignity of every citizen. The government’s policy of “Values in Education” as set out in the Manifesto raises explicit expectations to build a nation of democratic citizens.

A second concern for the importance of establishing a “Values in Education” initiative derives from various recent horror stories salient in the media. South Africa were shocked by the gang-raping of four and five month old babies; the very recent shock report released by the Medical Research Council which said a third of all rapes of schoolchildren were committed by teachers (Van der Merwe, 2002); the indiscriminate killing of farmers and shopkeepers; the spate of family murders; and, still very rife, racial attacks and killings of innocent people. All these acts of moral decline justify a “Values in Education” initiative.

Minister Asmal told the Saamtrek Conference in his “Pride and Arrogance” speech that there was a critical distinction between pride and arrogance. Arrogance was the source of jingoism and chauvinism, it devalues the other, and it is the old patriotism. Pride on the other hand is the fount of patriotism, it values the self, and it is the new patriotism. A shared sense of pride in the values identified in the Manifesto would obviously result in a loyalty to one’s school, community and country (DoE, 2001b: 76-77).

Minister Asmal announced that a “Values in Education” Programme of Action was receiving the finishing touches, and would be announced publicly in due course. He had also taken the first step of establishing a new Directorate in the Department of Education to drive this campaign, called “Race and Values in Education”.

Before, I explore as to whether a “Values in Education” initiative can in fact nurture the notion of democratic citizenship, I first need to explore “Values in Education” initiatives in selected other countries in order to show that South Africa is not alone in its quest to implement such a programme of moral importance. In this way, I shall also be able to establish whether the six values and ten values suggested by the Working Group and Manifesto respectively are commensurate with international developments and whether South Africa’s Department of Education is perhaps not too ambitious. Hence, in chapter 4, I shall compare “Values in Education” in selected developed and developing countries before moving to chapter 5, and with reference to conceptual analysis, explain meanings which underscore “Values in Education” that is, finding out the underlying features which make “Values in Education” as identified by the Department of Education what they are and how they could frame a notion of democratic citizenship. In this way, I shall be better positioned to investigate the implications of some of the constitutive meanings of “Values in Education” for the notion of democratic citizenship – the focus of this thesis.

CHAPTER 4

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF “VALUES IN EDUCATION” INITIATIVES IN SELECTED DEVELOPING AND DEVELOPED COUNTRIES

4.1 INTRODUCTION

In the previous chapter, I have expounded upon the “Values in Education” initiative in South Africa in relation to the Ministry of Education’s *Tirisano Project*. This chapter specifically highlights important aspects related to “Values in Education” initiatives in the United States (US), Europe (United Kingdom (UK), the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG), the Netherlands, Denmark and Sweden), South East Asian countries (Japan, Taiwan and Malaysia) and Africa in general. It is my contention that these countries’ “Values in Education” projects – with their emphasis on re-evaluating civic (moral or religious) virtues in education – might offer useful lessons for South Africa’s moral education initiatives. In this way, a comparative analysis can be drawn between the international (global) and national perspectives on “Values in Education”. It is this position that I wish to explore in this chapter.

4.2 “VALUES IN EDUCATION” IN THE UNITED STATES

In the 19th century the United States was experiencing a massive influx of immigrants with diverse cultures and religions from Europe. In order to draw the culturally heterogenous migrants into the mainstream of American life, the state relied on public schools as an important socialising agent. Religious and moral education was largely avoided, but civic education was stressed through the teaching of History in schools. Civic education means exposing students to central and political traditions of the nation, teaching essential knowledge about the organisation and operation of modern governmental institutions, and fashioning the identification and moral sentiments required for performance as effective citizens (Janowitz, 1983: 194). A citizen is an individual who enjoys certain rights from his/her government but also owes allegiance to it.

Janowitz sees the period 1890 to 1940 as one in which the mass education system was concerned with acculturation of the continuing flow of immigrants (Janowitz, 1983: 73). Each nationality group was encouraged to master the English language, and to incorporate elements found in their locale of residence. The Black and Native American Indian population, until after 1945 however, remained at the periphery of the United States' educational system (Janowitz, 1983: 78).

Moreover, Janowitz draws on the sociological study of W.I. Thomas in distinguishing between acculturation and assimilation. "... (A)ssimilation implies abandoning or rejecting one's cultural traditions and communal resources to accept completely a new set of values and norms. The assimilated Jew, for example, is no longer a Jew. Acculturation is much more gradual and less drastic. It implies continuity with one's background but involves learning and internalising key elements of the new society into which the migrant has moved" (Janowitz, 1983: 76).

The relative success of civic education in primary and secondary schools up to the outbreak of World War II, facilitated by the "citizen soldier" concept which came into being during the American Revolution, could not withstand the influence of the academics and their transformation of the civic education curriculum. The "civics" approach gave way to a "behavioural science" analysis of contemporary society (Janowitz, 1983: 145). There was a struggle between various disciplines to influence and control the new civic education. History attempted to retain control. Economics, sociology and geography improved social studies, but it was political science that contributed most to the transformation of the curriculum. The Chicago school, under the leadership of Charles Merriam, drew on political theory concerning the centrality of citizen obligations and duties. His perspective was that of a political realist in pursuit of higher moral goals. The list of key elements in citizenship training he offered in 1931 included: Patriotism and loyalty; obedience to the laws of society; respect for officials and government;

recognition of the obligations of political life; minimum degree of self-control; response to community needs in time of stress; and ordinary honesty in social relations (Janowitz, 1983: 146-148).

However, after World War II, the United States emerged as an advanced industrial society, with an increase in personal hedonism (that is, the individual) at the expense of collective affiliations. Janowitz's assumption was that there could not be effective civic consciousness and no sense of political obligation unless citizens have a realistic and meaningful sense of nationalism, and he believed that a system of national service was needed to reconstruct patriotism (Janowitz, 1983: 152). He distinguished between national service organised to supply military personnel and service orientated to civilian tasks. Many plans have called for a voluntary national service to be run by public, non-profit national agencies instead of the government. This national service would produce more effective citizens for the reason that it would firstly, be committed to a heterogeneous population; secondly, the programme would increase awareness of socio-economic realities; and thirdly, cooperative endeavours would serve as forms of education that produce positive responses for a democratic society and lasting positive consequences for participants (Janowitz in Cummings *et al.*, 1988: 67). He recommends this national service programme after high school.

According to Lisman, an increasing number of colleges and universities throughout the country are developing service-learning programs. "Service learning, or academically based community service, is a form of learning in

which students engage in community service as part of academic course work” (Lisman, 1998: 23). He firmly believes that an important way to grow morally is to become engaged in service. In his words, “Dewey is often cited as a precursor of service learning, with his insistence on the importance of learning by doing” (Lisman, 1988: 27).

According to Mary B. Stanley, a practitioner of service learning in higher education at Syracuse University, service learning is “... the re-discovery of society through action”. The National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993 defines it as entailing:

... a method under which students or participants learn and develop through active participation in thoughtfully organised service that is conducted in and meets the needs of a community and is coordinated with an elementary, secondary, institution of higher education, or community service program, and with the community; helps foster civic responsibility; is integrated into and enhances the academic curriculum of the students or the educational components of the community service program in which the participants enroll; and includes structured time for the students and participants to reflect on the service experience.

She agrees with David Thorton Moore who argues that the reflection that comes with service learning invariably becomes critical reflection, which generates fruitful tensions best explored through critical discourse. Moore draws from the works of Habermas, Derrida and Foucault (Stanley, 1996:

153).

Underlying the notion of service are the values of caring and concern; democratic values and human dignity; freedom and individualism; gratitude and privilege; and sensitivity to diversity.

In essence, prior to World War II, American society adopted a “civics” approach aimed at inculcating in people the value of becoming effective citizens, that is, patriotism and loyalty to the country; obedience to the laws of society; respect for officials and government; recognition of the obligations of political life; and minimum degree of self-control. After World War II, this form of civic education was extended to “service learning” primarily aimed at instilling in citizens values such as becoming responsive to community needs in times of stress; honesty in social relations; caring, human dignity, individual freedom and gratitude in co-operative endeavours; and sensitivity to diversity. All these values seem to be centrally linked to the notion of co-operative human relations geared towards achieving a common good, what I shall refer to throughout this thesis as inter-subjectivity.

4.3 EUROPE’S “VALUES IN EDUCATION” PERSPECTIVE

In this section, I shall focus on five European countries, namely the United Kingdom (UK), the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG), the Netherlands,

Denmark, and Sweden. These countries share a distinct history and their “Values in Education” policies are remarkably similar.

In these European countries, values are transmitted as an implicit dimension of many subjects and by means of schools’ ethos and what is sometimes called “the hidden curriculum”, and not as a separate course labelled “moral education” or “values education”. The subjects in which values are most clearly transmitted are religion, history, social studies or civic education, literature and guidance (Torney-Purta & Hahn in Cummings *et al.*, 1988: 36). The core values that are taught are work ethics, values rooted in Judeo-Christian religious teachings, democratic values of citizen participation and some blend of individualism and concern for the common good. Values related to gender equity are invariably transmitted in the hidden curriculum. You still find the ratio of males in authoritative positions in education incongruent to that of females. Female students seem to be less verbally assertive and less likely to take risks than males. Traditional expectations for women in occupations and in politics are reinforced by school patterns in all five countries (Torney-Purta & Hahn in Cummings *et al.*, 1988: 39).

In the UK, religious, economic and political conflicts influence the debate over schools’ curricula. The UK traditionally had a decentralised education system. Schools gave a high priority to values of public service, entrepreneurship and leadership skills. In the 1970s there was a call for more political education in view of the large numbers of migrants. In the 1980s social educators shifted emphasis to world studies, education about developing countries, multi-

cultural and anti-racist education, peace education, environmental education and human rights education (Torney-Purta & Hahn in Cummings *et al.*, 1988: 46).

The Federal Republic of Germany is a federated system and the responsibility of the schools' curricula lie with the different Ministries of Education. You will thus find differing curricula in each of the eleven Länder (provinces). The political context or climate seems to influence the value issues. In the 1980s calls to incorporate world studies, peace and development education have met with criticism. It seems the mass media and other instances beside schools have been responsible for the acquisition of certain values by the German youth. Significant also is the fact that more and more students choose religious studies as an option in some secondary schools (Torney-Purta & Hahn in Cummings *et al.*, 1988: 48).

In the Netherlands, the work ethic is an important part of values education. All Dutch schools teach *maatschaapijleer* (similar to social studies), which is a non-examined subject. It has six thematic fields – education, home and environment, work and leisure, state and society, technology and society, and international relations (Torney-Purta & Hahn in Cummings *et al.*, 1988: 42). The Dutch have a tradition of “pillarization”, which recognizes the religious pluralism of society as the basis for the organization of education. There are separate state-supported Protestant, Catholic, and non-denominational schools with their associated educators to teach the respective religious values throughout the formal and informal curriculum. There is discussion

over whether Judaism should be a new pillar with its own set of state-supported schools at present. Moreover, the renewed professional interest in values education stems from the concern over the immigrants and refugees, as well as parents' concern about the decline in respect and politeness in children (Torney-Purta & Hahn in Cummings *et al.* 1988: 47-48).

Denmark has a centralised system of education. Unique to Denmark is the fact that children stay together with the same group of pupils and the same class teacher for the first nine years of school. Discussion of controversial value issues is a generally accepted practice for Danish children. The principle aim, as stated in the Education Act of 1975 is "to give pupils the opportunity to acquire knowledge, skills and working methods and ways of expressing themselves ... to create opportunities for experience and self expression which allow pupils to ... develop their ability to make independent assessments and evaluations and to form opinions" (Danish Ministry of Education, 1983). Although great stress is laid on individualism, feeling for the class as a group is strong. The school law says the purpose of schools is to teach democracy through practice in decision-making and responsibility, therefore the student councils and school representatives seem to have considerable powers (Cummings *et al.*, 1988: 42-43). In addition, in the 1980s, the Danish Ministry of Education called for a return to those values related to "Danish pride". A re-emphasis on Danish language, history teaching and more structure in schools are reported (Cummings *et al.*, 1988: 48).

Sweden, like Denmark has a centralised system of education. The National Board of Education, after extensive consultation with educational, political and community groups, writes curriculum goals and guidelines and a syllabus for each subject. Concerns about school drop-outs and apathy, student fighting and vandalism led to renewed interest in "Values in Education". In 1978, the Minister of Schools established a Study Group on the Formation and Transmission of Moral Standards in Schools, consisting of representatives of parents, pupils, teachers, school administrators and education authorities, to report on the fundamental standards in schools. Papers were commissioned from experts resulting in the publication of a booklet with the English translation of the title, *Schools and Upbringing* in 1979. This is the core list of values necessary for democracy: tolerance, equality of rights, respect for truth, justice and human dignity. Schools were required to inculcate these values in students, with the help of workbooks published by the Ministry of Education. In 1980, some of the ideas of the Study Group were published in the Education and Development section of the national curriculum:

Schools must provide upbringing . . . and develop within their pupils such values as are capable of sustaining and strengthening the democratic principles of tolerance, partnership and equal rights . . . Schools must therefore work to promote the equality of men and women . . . Schools must endeavour to lay the foundations of solidarity with disadvantaged groups in this country and abroad ... (National Swedish Board of Education in Cummings *et al.*, 1988: 50).

Hence, it can be deduced that “Values in Education” initiatives in the five European countries discussed above are inextricably linked to the notion of social interaction towards achieving a common good, that is, inter-subjectivity as I shall argue for in the next chapter. Thus one finds that the UK focuses on the “public” or social dimension of education, Germany on diversity in education, The Netherlands on plurality in education, Denmark on group engagement in education, and Sweden on partnerships in education – all social practices which link to the public or intersubjective domain.

4.4 JAPAN’S “VALUES IN EDUCATION” PERSPECTIVE

Japan’s traditional values of filial piety, respect and obedience to the old, and loyalty to the state, may not be very popular themes today, even though parents are concerned with the recent incidents of violence in the home and school of their children. Moral education was introduced into Japanese schools in 1958 to strengthen the values of young people to refrain from enacting such anti-social behaviour.

I shall briefly look at the historical origins of moral education in Japan. During the Meiji¹ era in the late 19th century, the political leaders were divided into three groups, the Shintoist, Confucian and Western-orientated (Tomoda in Cummings *et al.*, 1988: 75). The western-orientated group predominated due to the fact that they were much impressed with the high level of European

science and technology. The cognitive and technical side of education was thus emphasised and became embodied in the Fundamental Code of Education of 1872, while the moral and affective side was neglected. The traditional Confucian and Shintoist leaders who played an important role in the Meiji Restoration, and who looked to the schools as a vehicle for the implementation of moral values, severely criticised this new system of education. A new Educational Ordinance was promulgated in 1879, with moral education, *Shushin*, elevated to top priority of all educational subjects. Japanese education moved from a liberal to a conservative orientation. Western historical biographies, although somewhat over-represented, were used to teach Japanese students the importance of effort, self-sacrifice, honesty, independence and humanism (Tomoda in Cummings *et al.*, 1988: 76).

In the 1930s ultra-nationalism and militarism came to the fore. Japanese history took the place of world history and students were inculcated with “the spirit of worship for the Imperial Family and patriotism ... (and) how Japan stands in the world” (Tomoda in Cummings *et al.*, 1988: 77).

After their military defeat, all ultra-nationalistic and militaristic influences were removed from the school curriculum under the directives of the Allied Occupation. *Shushin*, history and geography were abolished and a new subject, social studies was introduced. Social studies were split into history, geography and civics. Terms such as “democracy”, “equality” and “freedom”

¹ Meiji was the political leader in Japan in the late 19th century.

were introduced which the Japanese found difficult to understand.

Pressure from the conservative sectors of society as well as to counterbalance leftist teachers saw the Ministry of Education prepare *A Guide to Moral Education* in 1951, and in 1958, Moral Education became a formal school subject. The powerful teachers' union had peace, equality and democracy as its goals. The majority of parents opted for discipline, filial respect and patriotism. According to *The Guideline for Moral Education for Primary Schools (1958)*, the objective of Moral Education is:

To nurture the student to develop a spirit of human dignity to apply to every aspect of social life and contribute to the enrichment of Japanese culture and the development of a democratic state and society, and work for a peaceful international society ... (Tomoda in Cummings *et al.*, 1988: 82).

In junior high school, students discuss and try to work out solutions to social problems. In the subject civics, they learn about modern society and democracy. In senior high school the subject ethics was established in 1960 to promote students' morality. Though everyone agrees that moral education is necessary, it remains a controversial matter for education, politics and economics in Japan.

In essence, Japanese "Values in Education" has a social dimension aimed at achieving the moral good in public and intersubjective practices.

4.5 TAIWAN'S "VALUES IN EDUCATION" PERSPECTIVE

The Chinese can be characterised as being more concerned with social stability, relationships and the collective good – all constitutive features of intersubjective human action. A comparative study of value preferences among college students in Australia and China showed that Chinese students placed a higher value on respect, hard work, self-restraint and scholarship (Hofstede in Yuan & Shen, 1998: 191).

Since liberation in 1949, moral education has been introduced into the formal school curriculum after the nationalist government arrived in Taiwan from the mainland. It has both a formal and informal structure within the nine years of compulsory (and free) education (Cummings *et al.*, 1988: 109). In elementary schools (Grades 1-6), the moral education course is 6 years long and called *Sheng Huo yu Luen Li* (Life and principles of Ethics). In middle schools (Grades 7-9) the course continues for 3 more years and is called *Kung Ming yu Tao Te* (Civics and Morality). The curricular content is derived from Confucianism and is known as *szu wei* (four cardinal virtues), *pa te* (eight moral virtues) and *san ta te* (three pervasive virtues). The four cardinal virtues are *li*, which means ritual or etiquette, but implies a whole host of external expressions that indicate, as one relates to others, one's place in the total hierarchy in society; *i*, which refers to righteousness and justice; *lien*, which means honesty, cleanliness or integrity; and *chih*, which refers to a

sense of shame that prevents one from doing anything dishonourable. The eight moral virtues are *chung* (loyalty to one's group or nation), *shiao* (filial piety), *jen* (benevolence or humanity), *ai* (love), *shin* (trustworthiness), *i* (righteousness), *ho* (harmony) and *ping* (peace) (Meyer in Yuan & Shen, 1998: 195). Hence, practices such as relating to others, locating one in total hierarchy in society, and loyalty to one's group and nation all point towards the notion of inter-subjectivity.

Informal moral education is also evident in the entire curriculum, especially in the language, literature and social sciences courses. It also has an important place in various kinds of extra-curricular activity – contests, sport activities and celebrations of national holidays (Cummings *et al.*, 1988: 109).

An analysis of the textbooks used in the schools showed that the curriculum emphasised civic virtue, service to others and, particularly, loyalty to the national entity. Moral values are taught by competent teachers who are trained in their subject and backed by extensive materials in teachers' manuals (Yuan & Shen, 1998: 196). Lee (in Yuan & Shen, 1998: 196) maintains that the moral education endeavour in Taiwan is of historical significance, because it provides an arena in which the Chinese cultural heritage is able to interact with modern thought and be handed down to future generations.

4.6 THE MALAYSIAN “VALUES IN EDUCATION” PERSPECTIVE

Malaysia is a federation of thirteen states with a complex plural society at the time it gained independence from the British in 1957. The education system legacy was the outcome of the efforts of the British colonial government, missionaries and the immigrant communities to organise a system of schooling that would meet their individual, social, political and economic needs (Mukherjee in Cummings *et al.*, 1988: 148).

According to Mukherjee (in Cummings *et al.*, 1988: 148) the British colonial government did not regard itself as being responsible for education and it was left to the four cultural groups, namely the Malays, Chinese, Tamil Indians and Christian missionaries to establish their own schools. These four types of school helped to reinforce the separate racial, social, linguistic and cultural groupings of the country up to independence. In 1957 the Education Committee Report's blueprint for a national education system led to the Education Ordinance of 1957, changing the *ad hoc* streams into a formalised, planned system, with a common curriculum, a common medium of instruction and common public examinations.

However, change was slow, and after student riots broke out in 1969, the government subjected the schooling process to scrutiny, whereupon it was found that Malaysian national characteristics were found lacking in schools.

Bahasa Malaysia², the common medium of instruction, was phased in all English-medium schools. Although the Malaysian constitution and the 1957 Ordinance of Education uphold the preservation of the various ethnic cultures, Malaysia was engaged in mapping policies designed to inculcate a sense of national identity. This led to the formulation of the *Second Malaysia Plan* (1971-1975), and the *Third Malaysia Plan* (1976-1980) in which education was seen as the vehicle to assume the responsibility for the inculcation of a Malaysian identity and way of life. A set of five ideological principles or “pillars of the nation”, the *Rukunegara* was drawn up, which the school curriculum would reflect. They are: Belief in God; Loyalty to King and Country; Upholding the Constitution; Rule of Law; Good Conduct and Morality – all allegiances to the many, that is, the intersubjective whole.

At the same time of student unrest in the West, Malaysian drug abuse, violence and vandalism escalated. Concerns raised in parliament, led to the Ministry of Education’s setting up of machinery to get moral education as a subject implemented in schools. A series of workshops sponsored by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) and organised by the National Institute of Education Research (NIER) in Tokyo identified a core of values. After this list of values had been distributed to a wide spectrum of the public, official organisations and other stakeholders in education for deliberation, sixteen core values were agreed upon: Cleanliness of body and mind; compassion/empathy; cooperation; courage; moderation; diligence; freedom; gratitude; honesty/integrity; humility/modesty;

² Bahasa Malaysia refers to the indigenous language spoken by Malays.

justice; rationality; self-reliance; love; respect; and public-spiritness. The first six years of the syllabus (primary level) focussed mainly on habit-forming since the moral education's stand was that children should be morally socialised early in life for their own social well-being. At the secondary level, the focus is the problem-solving group discussions, with the aim to provide pupils with the tools of moral reasoning leading to moral judgement (Mukherjee in Cummings *et al.*, 1988: 152-157).

This common curriculum for moral education as discussed above intensified the already fragile ethnic situation in Malaysia due to the fact that this curriculum was only applicable to the non-Muslims. The Muslim pupils have "Islamic religion (referred to as *Agama* in the school timetable) ... a major section of which is *Akhlak* or Islamic ethics (Mukherjee in Cummings *et al.*, 1988: 151). "Recent developments in the planning of the New Secondary School Curriculum [however] seem to reveal that these concerns are being given some attention. A new 'Citizenship Education' syllabus as well as a 'Personal and Social Values' syllabus are on the drawing board. These are being planned for both Muslim and non-Muslim pupils" (Mukherjee in Cummings *et al.*, 1988: 160).

In essence, the "Values in Education" initiative in Malaysia seems to be driven by a sense of public spiritedness which values centrality to the group or many, that is, intersubjective human action.

4.7 THE AFRICAN “VALUES IN EDUCATION” PERSPECTIVE

“Values in Education” In Africa is adequately illustrated by a lengthy quotation by Abdi. In his words,

In pre-colonial traditional Somalia, education was dispensed through informal systems of communal interaction. With the arrival of colonialism in the mid-late 19th century, formal programmes of learning were slowly but steadily established. These were limited in scope and were essentially designed for the colonisation. With independence in 1960, the education sector developed very quickly with pre-1991 civilian and military governments building hundreds of schools, training tens of thousands of teachers, adopting the Latin script for the writing of the Somali language, and successfully implementing nation-wide literacy programmes. But with the collapse of the Somali state in 1991, all modern systems of learning were destroyed by the fighting factions, and Somalia has since been a country without any formal programmes of education (Abdi, 1998: 327).

Abdi’s abstract above encapsulates almost the entire Africa’s education history. “Recent archaeological findings by the Leakey family point to Africa as the birthplace of man (woman)” (Olaniyan, 1982: 1). Why, then, is Africa in a crisis today? Why is Africa “... the least presented in the global debate and

dialogue on the future of the world”? (Adesida & Oteh, 2001: 10). Since Africa’s independence from colonial occupation, there have been various calls for Africans to take responsibility for their own destiny and to reclaim their past as well as their future.

In most of Africa, before colonisation, there were no formal systems of learning, although informal socio-political and economic arrangements were in place. Before colonisation, African culture and education seem to have been inseparable (Katjivena, 1999: 259). The first informal systems of learning according to Keto in Abdi (1998: 329) were the “training of the young by the elderly in history, manners, methods of exploiting the environment, responsibilities, and military and fighting skills”. When South Africa’s Minister of Defence was imprisoned on Robben Island in the 1980s, he wrote to his teenage daughter a letter in which he tells her not to hate the oppressors. He expounded the values of history and reconciliation which he believed the school was not teaching her, and which he believed she needed in order to grow up in South Africa. He said he learnt these values from the elders on the Island, who learnt it from their elders (DoE, 2001a: 58). The advantages of these indigenous features of African education were considered by Rodney (in Abdi, 1998: 329) as outstanding due to “ ... its close links with social life, both in a material and spiritual sense, its collective nature . . . its progressive development in conformity with the successive stages of physical, emotional and mental development of the child . . . [it] matched the realities of pre-colonial society and produced well-rounded personalities to fit into that society”.

The purpose of education in the African sense is to “sharpen” the mind, the soul and the body and the “honing” of the skills needed to sustain them. To the African, education begins at home, not in the classroom. The African child is the responsibility of a larger, extended family and clan. The role of the family and clan is twofold: to shape an individual child’s character and personality; and to prepare the child to assume a role in society – a highly intersubjective practice. This corresponds to Bertrand Russell’s observation: “We shall ultimately be better citizens if we are first aware of all our potentialities as individuals before we descend to the compromises and practical acquiescences of the political life” (Katjivena, 1999: 260).

In Africa, the first goal of education is to develop the individual child’s own abilities, moral code and personality in order to serve society. This is building “self-respect” and “personal dignity” for a “balanced” child. This personal balance gives one the ability to meet the values of the larger society with a sense of critical judgement. This critical judgement is inculcated into the individual child through a complex structure within the family system. This complex structure extends outward from the family to the clan as well. There is an African expression that says: “Live in the present with the knowledge of your past because your future is the seed, which grows out of the past and the present” (Katjivena, 1999: 261).

Moreover, colonialism was a planned response to specific historical and socio-economic moment of the Western world with the paramount aim to

acquire new lands and to exploit them (Rodney & Mudimbe in Abdi, 1998: 330). Colonial education in Africa “was designed and pragmatically implemented for the administrative and low-level technical needs of the imperial powers” (Abdi, 1998: 331). The strategy followed by the colonisers was the acculturation of their foreign values into the colonised. The language of the colonisers became the medium of instruction in formal schools. African culture through the eyes of the foreigners was found to be “primitive” and a hindrance to “civilisation”. The colonials’ task was to ensure that the African is alienated from his / her roots. Values taught in colonial schools included “subjugation”, “dependence”, and “difference”. Education in Africa under colonial rule led to a situation whereby enslavement rather than emancipation, disempowerment rather than empowerment and manipulation rather than enlightenment prevailed (Le Roux, 2001: 31).

Most of Africa received their independence from the colonisers in the 1960s. In Somalia for instance, the Italian colonial government was required under UN Trusteeship between 1950 and 1960 to prepare Somalia for independence, and in the process to educate the Somali population. Education came to be regarded as “building of character” (Marvin in Abdi, 1998: 332). Developments in education included the de-emphasising of the colonial language and replaced with Somali language, coupled with a core issue of national identity, and a programme in which students and civil servants were sent to the countryside to live, learn and study with the nomadic population for at least six months.

However, problems of corruption and mismanagement soon led to the collapse of the Somali state, in 1991. The deliberate destruction of schools, universities and libraries reminded one of the destruction of the Alexandria Library in Ancient Egypt by Julius Caesar in 48 BC (Jackson in Abdi, 1998: 336). Somalia's youth, in the absence of any organised systems of learning, is at the mercy of informal education, that is education in the context of what they learn from society – the basis of an intersubjective practice. They seem to have succumbed to a “culture of thuggery, war-like attitudes to life, and clan and sub-clan fightings” (Abdi, 1998: 336).

In order to save the children of Somalia (and Africa) organisations such as UNESCO and other wealthy nations should come on board, suggests Abdi. The responsibility to rescue the Somali (African) children lies on the shoulders of the world's citizens because its problems were a product of forces that have been at times out of the control of the country's citizens (Abdi, 1998: 338). All over post-colonial Africa, “(m)ilitary systems and one-party rule have resulted in dictatorial political systems that have been characterised by irresponsible and oppressive leadership ... This greatly damaged the African struggle towards achieving development and democracy” (Abdel Rahman in Adesida, 2001: 178-179).

In addition, President Thabo Mbeki is calling for an African Renaissance. Likewise, Makgoba is calling for an africanisation of education. Waghid contends, “... the anchor of an African Renaissance lies in the moral renewal of African values through the democratisation of education” (Waghid, 2002b:

13). Pityana in Waghid posits "...that the idea of an African Renaissance is logically connected to the preservation of human dignity, the achievement of equality, the enhancement of human rights and freedoms, and the enhancement of the common good" (Waghid, 2002b: 14). Furthermore, Makgoba (1996: 177) states: "Africanisation is the process or vehicle for defining, interpreting, promoting and transmitting African thought, philosophy, identity and culture ... It encompasses a mind-set shift from the European to an African paradigm ... It is a logic and way of life for Africans ...".

The question arises: Does a formal "Values in Education" exist in Africa? My reading of the literature indicates an emphatic "No". The challenge for Africa's people is to return to their roots in order to become "harmonious" individuals once again (Katjivena, 1999: 263). Africa has to re-examine its history. According to Abdel Rahman (in Adesida, 2001: 177): "A nation loses its character if it does not recognise its history". However, in order to become harmonious individuals, Africans need to function intersubjectively as a collective community of persons. This shows that "Values in Education" in Africa, although "informal" or "non-formal" have as its main objective the achievement of intersubjective, communicative action. In short, as has been mentioned earlier, "Values in Education" in Africa strives to shape an individual child's character and personality, as well as preparing children to assume a collective role in society.

4.8 COMPARISON BETWEEN SOUTH AFRICA AND OTHER COUNTRIES

Since 1993, after more than 300 years of colonial subjugation followed by the repressive and unjust Apartheid regime, South Africa has been vociferously active in a reconstruction programme for its people and country. The post-1994 period witnessed the ANC coming to political power, leading to the adoption of the Constitution and Bill of Rights in 1996, officially underpinning democratic values for all South Africans. Kader Asmal became Minister of Education and Training in 1999, with an explicit directive from President Thabo Mbeki to speed up transformation in education. Minister Asmal's *Tirisano* programme eventually led to the "Manifesto on Values, Education and Democracy" which identified ten core democratic values as underscored in the Constitution. These values would be introduced into school curricula in order firstly, to ensure that the future generation become a nation of democratic citizens, and secondly, to restore the human dignity of those dehumanised by their oppressors in the pre-democratic era. The "Values in Education" initiative in South Africa is in agreement with Theodore Roosevelt's statement: "To educate a person in mind and not in morals is to educate a menace to society" (Roosevelt in de Klerk, 2001: 1).

The "Values in Education" initiative in South Africa compares favourably with initiatives in developed countries such as America and Europe. Although America did not formally adhere to a formal "Values in Education" programme,

it opted for civic education and its concomitant link with service learning in order to develop intersubjective practices in American society. Their main aim was to produce effective citizens. In the European countries discussed, a formal “Values in Education” initiative seems to be linked to civics education. In recent years, due to an escalation in crime and a crumbling in the moral fabric of its citizens, there has been a public outcry and upsurge in interest in “Values in Education”. Developed countries seem to focus on social values, as well as instilling pride in the country’s image abroad.

In the Asian developing countries, “Values in Education” was “introduced as a means of strengthening the values of young people so they would not engage in anti-social behaviour” (Tomoda in Cummings *et al.*, 1988: 75). “Values in Education” was implemented in schools to facilitate nation-building, and to meet the challenges of their multi-ethnic, multi-cultural and pluralistic society – all practices with an intersubjective agenda in mind.

How does South Africa’s “Values in Education” initiative compare with those of countries discussed above? South Africa and all the countries discussed in this chapter seem to have a common guiding principle which shapes their “Values in Education” initiatives. This guiding principle or constitutive good can be framed as inter-subjectivity – a mode of social, mutual interaction (I shall explore this concept in more detail in the next chapter with reference to a notion of democratic citizenship).

4.9 SUMMARY

“Values in Education” as discussed above are primarily aimed at producing a “good person”, that is, a citizen who can energetically contribute towards building a prosperous nation in relation to others. A good person and invariably a good citizen is one who assumes responsibility since he (she) has internalised constitutive goods of democracy. Put differently, a good citizen practices equality, liberty and dialogism. He (she) is capable of working intersubjectively together with others on the basis of non-repression, non-discrimination, tolerance, openness and transparency. It is this understanding of inter-subjectivity which I shall further explore in the next chapter for the reason that it can best enhance the notion of citizenship within an evolving democratic society such as South Africa.

Now that I have comparatively explored the “Values in Education” initiatives on global and national levels, I shall look into more detail as to the guiding principle (what Taylor refers to as “constitutive rule”) that shapes “Values in Education”, namely inter-subjectivity, and which in turn, holds (as I shall show) much promise for cultivating a notion of democratic citizenship.

CHAPTER 5

THE GUIDING PRINCIPLE OF “VALUES IN EDUCATION” AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR DEMOCRATIC CITIZENSHIP

5.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, I shall argue that the guiding principle which underpins “Values in Education”, as explored in chapters three and four, is inter-subjectivity. I shall firstly, show that inter-subjectivity which involves the idea of common, shared meanings agreed upon in deliberative action (rational argumentation and justifiable moral points of view) guides the notion of “Values in Education”. Secondly, I shall show that inter-subjectivity also underpins a defensible understanding of democratic citizenship. Finally, in this way, I shall argue that since inter-subjectivity underscores both “Values in Education” and democratic citizenship, the possibility does exist for “Values in Education” to engender a notion of democratic citizenship.

This brings me to a discussion of inter-subjectivity.

5.2 INTER-SUBJECTIVITY

Literally inter-subjectivity “means occurring between or among (or accessible to) two or more separate subjects or conscious minds” (Schwandt, 1997: 29). Inter-subjectivity implies that education is not a one-way process in which knowledge is transferred from educator to learner. Instead, education according to inter-subjectivity is considered a “co-constructive process” (Taylor, 1985: 137) in which both learners and educators play an active role and in which meaning is not transferred but collaboratively produced. Education in an intersubjective frame requires by necessity a personal relationship in terms of which learners and educators engage in purposeful social collaboration. Following inter-subjectivity, education cannot be a uni-directional process of transferring ready-made knowledge constructs to learners. Inter-subjectivity, in the sense used by Taylor (1985: 137), is a “new insight” that challenges the rationale or general principle that education can be uni-directional.

Inter-subjectivity as a “new insight” has the effect whereby learners and educators are actively engaged in producing knowledge constructs through collaborative engagement in the classroom. The crucial issue for inter-subjectivity is that meaning is the outcome of collaborative engagement. For education this means that the collective activities of learners and educators constitute the meaning of what is learned. It is not the case that educators offer meaning through specifying “outcomes” and learners receive it.

Learners and educators are collaborators in the making of the outcome. In this way, inter-subjectivity alters the practice of education from being uni-directional to that of collaborative engagement.

In a different way, developing educative meanings is a practice of collaborative engagement or intersubjective action whereby individuals in a society or community do not just have a given set of ideas or goals to which they subscribe. Intersubjective ideas and norms are not the property of individuals in a society, but are “constitutive of the social matrix in which individuals find themselves and act” (Taylor, 1985: 36). Thus, inter-subjectivity implies that human beings in society have a common discourse shaped by the right and equal chance to initiate and to question shared social practices. This does not mean that human beings in educational discourse have to reach agreement with one another. To have intersubjective constructions of knowledge implies that human beings have to nurture and develop those constructions of meaning which are constituted in the social practices of a community; constructions of meaning are not conjured up on the basis of what is arbitrarily decided, but meanings which have developed out of the practices of a community, that is, meanings which are constituted in a community’s collaborative practices, and which, in turn strengthen that community. In essence, intersubjective practices are collaborative ways of engaging in rational action expressed in the common meanings constitutive of human activities (Taylor, 1985: 36).

5.3 “VALUES IN EDUCATION” ARE CONCEPTUALLY LINKED TO INTER-SUBJECTIVITY

The question arises: What is the connection between inter-subjectivity and “Values in Education”? “Values in Education” as have been discussed in the previous chapter are primarily aimed at producing a “good person”, that is, a citizen who engages with other individuals and groups in pursuit of their conceptions of the good within the bounds prescribed by principles of justice: equality, liberty and dialogism. I shall now explore these notions of equality, liberty and dialogism in order to find out the underlying meanings which constitute these concepts. In this way, I would be able to establish a link between aims of “Values in Education” and inter-subjectivity for the reason that the afore-mentioned principles of justice (as I shall show) are linked to collaborative engagement.

Firstly, in pursuit of achieving aims of “Values in Education”, more specifically liberty (freedom) is an understanding that people ought to have choices to exercise control over their lives (Jarvis, 1998: 95); that is, they practise a particular kind of liberty (freedom) accepted and supported by all those involved in the educational discourse. In short, in order to achieve liberty, they engage with others. But what kind of liberty seems to be the most desirable to make sense of collaborative engagement? Berlin’s (1969: 131) view of positive liberty seems to be the most appropriate kind of liberty, one which

can ensure the validity of a collaborative engagement in educational discourse.

Central to positive liberty is the notion that people are rational, that is, self-directing and self-determining beings. Reason, purpose and potential shape their own choices and decisions in life. In a different way, achieving self-direction through reason is, according to positive liberty, a way of attaining liberation. When the individual rationally analyses, understands and then takes appropriate action, such an individual has acquired self-mastery and is liberated. Berlin (1969:131) explains it as follows:

I wish to be the instrument of my own, not of other men's (women's) acts of will. I wish to be a subject, not an object; to be moved by reasons, by conscious purposes, which are my own, not causes which affect me, as it were from outside. I wish to be somebody, not nobody; a doer – deciding, not being decided for, self-directed ... This is at least part of what I mean when I say that I am rational, and that my reason distinguishes me as a human being from the rest of the world.

But taking appropriate action based on reason and understanding does not mean that one can do only what one wants to do because this could seriously curb the freedom of others. Here positive liberty undermines the notion of individual freedom unhampered by the interference of other human beings, that is, negative liberty. Whereas negative liberty limits the control of others to infringe on the individual person's freedom, positive liberty is concerned with

“what” or “who” should interfere with the individual’s activities. Positive liberty is concerned with the individual’s “higher self” as the source of control, that is, it aims to increase the individual’s conscious and willing enactment of one’s own decisions and actions in life otherwise a person is not free. It is in the context of Berlin’s notion of positive liberty that I understand the argument by Bowles and Gintis (1987: 4) that “liberty entails freedom of (individual) thought and association, freedom of political, cultural and religious expression, and the right to control one’s body and express one’s preferred spiritual, aesthetic, and sexual style of life”. Hence, collaborative engagement, that is to say, inter-subjectivity appeals to the notion of positive liberty identified with the idea that people are by nature rationally self-controlling, self-directing and collaborating. Berlin (1969: 136) emphasises this as follows: “... the essence of men (women) is that they are autonomous beings – authors of values, of ends in themselves, the ultimate authority of which consists precisely in the fact that they are willed freely – then nothing is worse than to treat them as if they were not autonomous, but natural objects ...”. Hence, achieving liberty implies that individuals become self-directing with the intent to engage collaboratively and rationally with others – a matter of becoming intersubjective beings. And, for the reason that the principle of liberty is an aim to be achieved through the implementation of “Values in Education”, its connection with inter-subjectivity can be justified. The point I am making is that “Values in Education”, if implemented, should lead to greater intersubjective educative human experiences.

Secondly, as I have alluded to in the previous chapter, the Department of Education's "Values in Education" initiative invokes an understanding of equality aimed at redressing the unequal racial and ethnic division of the South African education system due to apartheid discrimination and because of the inequalities in access which characterised it. Optimal educational opportunity and the full realisation of the potential for all are indications of the emphasis on equality that would be facilitated through transforming the entire education system.

Moreover, achieving equality in education is itself to be concerned with what Howe (1998: 214) refers to as an "enabling good" whereby individuals acquire the knowledge and skill associated with educational transformation; the least transformed becoming more transformed. Equality is as an enabling function to ensure "that individuals ... are free to pursue any form of education they freely choose (in relation with others)" (Howe, 1998: 203). Equality as an "enabling good" functions according to what Frankel (1971: 203) refers to as a context in which "the primary desideratum is developmental, educational, the evoking of potentialities (individually and collaboratively)" in learners. And, bearing in mind that "Values in Education" aims to achieve equality aimed at "the evoking of potentialities" in learners both individually and collaboratively, its connection with inter-subjectivity as an "enabling good" seems justifiable.

Thirdly, "Values in Education" also aims to achieve dialogism. Jones (1998: 151) argues, "in a pluralist context respecting people of other cultures involves seeing oneself and those others as prejudiced members of different forms of

life". But recognising the prejudices of others through rational consideration is to achieve a collaborative discourse whereby people in a diverse society consciously agree to act "collectively" (Gutman, 1998: 34). In a different way they agree to intersubjectively hold a sort of dialogism. Dialogism in this sense creates the possibility whereby, in the words of Jones (1998: 150),

Citizens of different ethnic, national and cultural backgrounds can participate in an investigation of one another's acknowledged prejudices (in particular their feelings about the sort of life they want to lead) with the aim of arriving at compromise to which all participants can acquiesce without resentment and which aims at the optimal satisfaction of the conflicting prejudices of all participants.

Dialogism for the sake of compromise opens up the possibility for individuals or different groups to interrelate among themselves aimed at revealing their preferred perspectives. Talking together in different voices, aimed at addressing the differences of opinion which emerge through dialogism, participants have an opportunity to acquire a better understanding of each other. They also develop a greater self-understanding whereby they bring their prejudices to the fore and express them to others (Hernandez, 1997: 19; Jones 1998: 150). This dialogism seems to be grounded in a notion of positive liberty, which rests on the principle that freedom entails a sense of belonging together in a particular society with which the individual shares "permanent characteristics". Berlin (1969:158) regards this "solidarity" with the group or

community as a desire “for union, closer understanding, integration of interests, a life of common dependence and common sacrifice”.

What makes dialogism a collaborative discourse through which people can achieve compromise? Dialogism allows individuals and groups to live their differences (pluriculturalism) and at the same time creates the opportunity to exchange and share new forms of living and new cultural hybrids with others (interculturalism) (Fletcha, 1999: 150). In other words, dialogism extends and radicalises collaborative engagement whereby it is possible for different human beings to share and live together in solidarity, in the sense that individuals want their actions to be directed by the community of which they are members. Jones (1998: 150) adequately summarises this sort of dialogism:

This is not the usual debate about truth and who is right or wrong. It is an attempt to understand others and ourselves as people from different backgrounds and is the basis for a compromise aimed at allowing us to live together as a functioning and unified social unit rather than as a collection of warring factions living in geographical proximity.

Of course, the alternative to working towards solidarity by way of collaborative educational discourse in the sense outlined would be to accept a move towards “fragmentation of society in groups” which is neither desirable nor defensible. A pessimist who argues that dialogism in our educational discourse would not work is not rationally considering how conflict can be

avoided and how tolerance and compromise towards different prejudices can be encouraged. In short, dialogism can be achieved through the implementation of “Values in Education” if people work collaboratively with others – they engage in intersubjective action.

In essence, for the reason that equality, liberty and dialogism (key outcomes of “Values in Education”) are linked to collaboration and engagement, one can safely claim that “Values in Education” cannot be separated from a notion of inter-subjectivity.

This brings me to a discussion of the link between inter-subjectivity and democratic citizenship.

5.4 DEMOCRATIC CITIZENSHIP AND ITS CONNECTION TO INTER-SUBJECTIVITY

There are as many definitions of democracy as there are of citizenship. De Klerk points out that the origins of democracy can be traced back to ancient Greece a few centuries before Christ (De Klerk, 2001: 37). In some debates the original meaning of democracy, “power to the people” is still the only way of interpreting this concept. Cloete (in Steyn *et al.* 1999: 4) explains democracy as “... that system of government in which the ruling power of the state is legally vested in the people”. And furthermore, he cites, it can be viewed as “... a matter of values essential for a way of life characterised by

equality of opportunities for all, respect for the dignity and rights of everyone and freedom of suppression". Steyn (2001: 23; 1999: 6) distinguishes between two kinds of democracy, namely, liberal democracy and social democracy. Liberal democracy, he contends, emphasises the typical democratic values which we know as human rights. Its distinctive feature is freedom, especially individual freedom. Social democracy emphasises the value of equality and is particularly concerned with the community as a whole. Waghid (in Le Grange, 1999: 72) argues that there are two broad conceptions of democracy: democracy as a representative system of political decision making and democracy as a sphere for social and political life in which people may enjoy equal opportunities and are engaged in self-development, self-fulfilment and self-determination. For him, representative democracy means that collective decisions concerning the community as a whole are made by elected members of the community. Also, the latter kind of democracy is a participatory form of democracy whereby people directly participate in economic, political and social life.

My concern in this chapter is with democratic citizenship and I thus point to Zecha's description of a democratic society. It is "a socio-political form of living for people in a certain community who enact, acknowledge and control on a majority basis via general elections, representative government and legislation rules or laws that are conceived to direct a socially peaceful, economically prosperous and just life with equal opportunities for each member of that community" (Zecha in de Klerk, 2001: 37). For the efficient and effective functioning of a democratic society, Scheffler (in de Klerk, 2001:

37) describes the democratic ideal as: “that of an open and dynamic society: open, in that there is no antecedent social blueprint which is itself to be taken as a dogma immune to critical evaluation in the public forum; dynamic, in that its fundamental institutions are not designed to arrest change but to order and channel it by exposing it to public scrutiny and resting it ultimately upon the choices of its members”. Thus, a democracy and citizenship are inextricably linked. A democracy is sustainable to the extent of it producing effective, capable and good citizens.

Schoeman (2000: 181) points out that throughout history there have been conflicting views on what it is to be a citizen in a democratic society. He refers to the essential areas of citizenship as membership, rights and duties, and participation in practice. He draws from McGloughlin who describes a minimalist and maximalist view of citizenship within each of three areas, namely:

- *Membership:* A minimalist view of membership would see membership of society in terms of a formal and legal status, often bestowed by the state and involving such things as having a passport or voting rights. A maximalist view of membership would involve a sense of real equality and justice for everyone and a conception of identity as one which is central to citizenship and which is recognised both individually and culturally.
- *Rights and duties:* A minimalist version of rights and duties is concerned with formal rights but has an emphasis on public duty, while a maximalist version would put rights and duties in the context of a wider understanding

of cultural and social inequalities.

- *Participation in practice:* A minimalist view of participation would be restricted to notions of representation, voting and pressure group politics, while a maximalist view would see citizens as being fully engaged in all decisions affecting their lives (McGloughlin in Schoeman, 2000: 181).

According to Thompson (1970: 2) "Citizenship is not meant to suggest merely those rights possessed by a passive subject by virtue of residing under a particular territorial jurisdiction. Nor is it meant to connote patriotism or loyalty to a nation ... It implies active involvement in political life". Political theorists claim that "the citizenry should be supportive of the political system and share a deep commitment to democratic ideals such as pluralism, free expression, and minority rights ... The public must be a paragon of civic virtue in order for democracy to survive" (Dalton, 1988: 14).

Moreover, Schoeman (2000: 182) points out that citizenship in a constitutional democracy such as South Africa means that each citizen is a full and equal member of a self-governing community and is endowed with fundamental rights and entrusted with responsibilities. However, if they want their voices to be heard, they have to become actively involved in political processes. He agrees with other scholars on the subject of citizenship education, who have identified three essential components of citizenship education, namely, civic knowledge, civic skills and civic dispositions. Civic knowledge and civic skills deal with issues relating to producing informed, effective and responsible participants of society. Civic dispositions refer to the traits of private and

public character essential to the maintenance and improvement of constitutional democracy. These dispositions develop over time as a result of what one learns and experiences in the home, school community and other organisations.

In summary, citizenship provides the reference point for people to equally and actively engage in decisions affecting their lives – which means they are endowed with rights and entrusted with social responsibilities in order to act morally. Miller (2000: 44) posits that citizenship should be understood as (1) a set of rights (civil, political and social) enjoyed by every member of the society in question and which embody an idea of social justice; and (2) a practice whereby one sees oneself as among many free and equal individuals governed by moral principles all can potentially accept.

The above views on citizenship clearly relate to a liberal conception of citizenship, that is, linking citizenship to notions of rights (for example, the right to property, free speech and to participate in public discussion), obligations (for example, to pay taxes and defend the rights of others). However, literature on citizenship also recognises a republican conception which involves people having a say in matters which legitimately concern them, as well as reaching consensus with others. Miller (2000: 84) aptly states the following:

Because the citizen identifies with it (a community of people), he or she wants to have a say in what it does. And he or she also wants as far as

possible to reach an agreement with other citizens (through collaboration) so that what is done is done in the name of all of them.

For purposes of this thesis, my interest in citizenship is in its potential to hold people together as equals through collaborative engagement. And, as has been argued for previously, when one engages in collaborative engagement with others, one practices a profound sense of inter-subjectivity. For this reason, inter-subjectivity seems to be the guiding principle which underscores democratic citizenship. Now that I have shown that inter-subjectivity or collaborative engagement constitutes the guiding principle of citizenship, I shall now explore whether “Values in Education” can cultivate a sense of democratic citizenship.

5.5 “VALUES IN EDUCATION” CAN CULTIVATE DEMOCRATIC CITIZENSHIP

Now that I have shown how the implementation of “Values in Education” can in fact bring about intersubjective human actions, I shall argue that practising “Values in Education” can also lead to an enhanced form of democratic citizenship for the reason that the latter (that is, democratic citizenship) is constituted by inter-subjectivity. My first task is to show the link between democratic citizenship and inter-subjectivity.

The notion of democratic citizenship, while not denying the importance of

rights and obligations enjoyed equally by citizens of a community (albeit educational) in question, places more emphasis on the idea of “the active citizen who takes part along with others in shaping the future direction of his or her society through political debate” (Miller, 2000: 82). Democratic citizenship is here less a legal status than a role a citizen assumes as a collaborating member of, in this instance, an educational community. My emphasis on such a view of democratic citizenship is the active and collaborative engagement of citizens with others through debate. This involves at least two important activities: Firstly, the rights of each individual to pursue his or her plans of life and ideals through “free speech” (Miller, 2000: 83). This means that each individual has the right to articulate his or her point of view to others in a logically sound, consistent and coherent manner. This then implies that others have to be willing to listen to an individual who in turn, is prepared to accept justifiable criticisms of his or her points of view. Miller (2000: 149) makes the claim that debate “must proceed by presenting arguments that everyone has reason to accept, arguments in other words that appeal to common ground – to share principles of justice, or to ideas of the common good”. Once again Miller (2000: 146-147) states that

... debate should be structured in such a way that, first, as wide a range of relevant views and arguments as possible should enter the debate, so that the ensuing discussion should genuinely reflect the concerns, interests and convictions of the members of the deliberating body; and second, that as a body attempts to move towards a solution to the issue that they confront, it should be the weight of the reasons

offered in support of the different positions that counts. This means that participants, rather than trying to win, in the sense ensuring that their initial preferences prevail, should be listening to and weighing up what others are saying, searching for the solution that has the strongest reasons behind it.

Secondly, debate demands that people become obliged to respect one another which means that everyone should be allowed to give his or her point of view in an atmosphere of openness without experiencing the threat of being marginalised and excluded. Miller (2000: 9) posits that debate envisages “an open and uncoerced discussion of the issue at stake with the aim of arriving at an agreed judgement”. The point is that one has to respect the reasons advanced by others (even opponents) even though one does not share them. Besides having taken account of the viewpoints of others, citizens should also gear their discussions towards reaching consensus. This makes sense, for the reason that extended discussion and deliberation should not be led to any form of deadlock or impasse. According to such a view, discussion and deliberation must proceed by, in the words of Miller (2000: 149)

... by presenting arguments that everyone has reason to accept, arguments in other words that appeal to common ground – to shared principles of justice, or to ideas of the common good. Equally there must be a high probability of arriving at consensus – if everyone appeals only to reasons that everyone else can accept, it is hard to see how there can be substantive disagreement about what should be

done.

For example, school governors deliberating a particular issue should not unnecessarily engage in conflict and antagonistic relations. All members of a school governing body, before implementing any decision should subject what they agree upon to critical scrutiny by others before reaching consensus. According to Miller (2000: 10) democratic citizens in debate (such as school governors) always strive to express opinions about which policy matter best meets various claims that have been advanced, or represents the fairest compromise between competing points of view that have been expressed. Simultaneously, a democratic citizen also takes active steps to defend the rights of other members of the educational community, and more generally to promote its common interests (Miller, 2000: 83).

In essence, democratic citizenship involves intersubjective or collaborative human practices aimed at cultivating a sense of debate or deliberation among members of a specific community, whether educational, political or economic. Debate in turn, involves firstly, the rational articulations of points of view in a coherent and justifiable manner and, secondly, achieving a compromise amongst collaborating and competing members of a community in question.

Of course, my potential critic might claim that debate is too demanding and would not necessarily be ideal for the transformation of education in schools. I agree, for the reason that at least two conditions have to be in place in order for debate to happen amongst educators. Firstly, debate requires educators to

be sufficiently motivated to carry out educational tasks that transformation requires. Debate does impose cost on an educator's time, and may often not be experienced as pleasant (in many schools some educators dislike having to disagree and argue in staffrooms with other colleagues). Secondly, another perspective in which debate is demanding is that it requires educators to act responsibly. They have not merely to get involved in educational decision making, but they have to try to promote the common good which involves, for instance, taking a long-term view of educators' interests rather than a short one, and being willing to set aside personal interests and ideal in the interest of achieving a democratic consensus.

I want to come back to the question of the relationship between "Values in Education" and inter-subjectivity. Now for the reason that "Values in Education" is constituted by inter-subjectivity, its connection with achieving an enhanced form of democratic citizenship seems justifiable. This is so for the reason that democratic citizenship involves the intersubjective domain. Miller (2000: 84) correctly states that although some people seem to view democratic citizenship mainly in terms of rights and duties, the view that citizenship needs to be extended to a community's welfare through debate seems more justifiable. Hence, "Values in Education" can enact a heightened form of democratic citizenship for the reason that both notions are inseparably connected to inter-subjectivity.

5.6 SUMMARY

In this chapter I have argued that the guiding principle of “Values in Education” is inter-subjectivity. Inter-subjectivity is logically connected to democratic citizenship which emphasises that people enjoy certain rights and responsibilities, as well as enacting certain decisions along the lines of critical debate, that is, argumentation and consensus. Therefore, I can safely say that the idea of “Values in Education” can create spaces to cultivate a form of democratic citizenship.

CHAPTER 6

DEMOCRATIC CITIZENSHIP, VALUES IN EDUCATION: A WAY FORWARD

6.1 INTRODUCTION

This thesis has been a modest attempt to show that “Values in Education” as espoused by the Ministry of Education can cultivate a form of democratic citizenship. I shall now show how this notion of democratic citizenship can be lived out in schools, with specific reference to classroom practices.

6.2 DEMOCRATIC CITIZENSHIP AS AN OBJECTIVE IN EDUCATION: SOME SIGNPOSTS

Like any other social practice, education also involves the critical and collaborative engagement of people in various modes of action, that is, intersubjective action. Educators do not merely teach learners without also engaging them in some form of critical and participatory discourse. Neither do learners just acquire knowledge constructs without subjecting what they learn to some form of examination or challenge. This makes education an

enhanced form of intersubjective practice. Similarly, “Values in Education” are not simply a set of do’s and don’ts which educators and learners have to familiarise themselves with but rather, constitutive practices of a form of good life which educators and learners have to enact. With reference to examples related to classroom practices, I shall show how democratic citizenship and its link with inter-subjectivity can be realised. In this way, I also hope to show how “Values in Education” with reference to equity, tolerance, multilingualism, openness, accountability and honour can be enacted in schools.

The question is: How can “Values in Education” cultivate democratic citizenship? Firstly, the attainment of equity has to be understood as an intersubjective practice. This means that educators (including principals), educators, learners and community members (including parents) should view the attainment of equity as a priority of the social, that is, every stakeholder involved in the process of schooling should regard his or her role as significant to the transformation of the entire school environment, that is, school curriculum, staff, management team, governing body, as well as relations with the local education authority. For instance, the move towards the implementation of new school governance structures has to occur according to equitable standards and intersubjective actions which involve the collaborative participation of all members of governing bodies. Democratic citizenship demands that all stakeholders engage in the critical consolidation of school governance structures. In rural areas, parents are often asked to become involved with the affairs of several school governing bodies (SGBs). However, the mere participation of parents on SGBs should not be interpreted

as intersubjective engagement since many parents serving on SGBs are illiterate and would not meaningfully contribute towards enacting transformation in schools. It is here that the notion of democratic citizenship could have the effect whereby such illiterate parents are supported and skilled to become more literate and informed governors. Certainly the idea of achieving equitable standards would mean that parent governors should be skilled with professional capacities associated with, say, effective participation, argumentation and knowledge as to how to interpret education policy matters related to school financing, management and transformation. In other words achieving equity means that parent governors should be trained to perform SGB tasks skilfully even if it means investing more in parents from disadvantaged communities than those parents who are more privileged. Moreover, achieving equitable standards in relation to school governance also means that opportunities should be equalised for less privileged parents to become acquainted with policy about effective governance even if it means affording more opportunities for parents from these communities. My contention is that once effective school governance structures in disadvantaged schools can be established along equitable and intersubjective lines, the possibility for meaningful change at these schools would undoubtedly become a reality.

Secondly, tolerance as a “Value in Education” certainly has the potential to cultivate a sense of democratic citizenship in schools. As has been argued for in the previous chapter, democratic citizenship is not only associated with affording people rights and responsibilities but also the capacity of people to

listen to others and to subject the viewpoints of others to critical examination. This capacity to listen to what others have to say, as well as the practice of scrutinising the opinions of others can only be achieved within a climate of profound tolerance. Tolerance does not simply mean that one recognises the views of others but that one also engages critically with the views of others – a matter of intersubjectively considering the merits and demerits of the arguments of others. I tolerate someone not because I acknowledge what a person does is good or bad but rather, I tolerate someone if I can find reasonable justification for considering critically the different views of others. In other words, one tolerates someone when one can find reasons for considering the legitimate views of others in a critical way. Often educators say they tolerate the views of principals without bothering to find out the justification behind the viewpoints of principals. Similarly principals do not tolerate educators on his or her staff when he or she listens to everything educators might have to say. Principals tolerate educators when they consider the merits and demerits (together in an intersubjective manner with educators) of their arguments or points of view.

Thirdly, multilingualism does have the potential to engender democratic citizenship in schools. I certainly agree with the Ministry of Education that educators and learners should acquire prowess in a third African language considering that the two dominant languages in most schools are English and Afrikaans. Any language, in particular those representing the mother tongue of the majority of South African learners and educators can only be useful and liberatory considering that democratic citizenship requires that people engage

critically in debate about, in this instance, educational matters. To in fact have debates with others from amongst those whose first language is an African language would facilitate argumentation and deliberation. And, bearing in mind that language discourse in any case requires intersubjective communication, my contention is that such a “Value in Education” does have the potential to engender a sense of democratic citizenship.

Fourthly, openness is a necessary condition to exist before logical and reasonable argumentation – critical debate – can occur in schools. I agree with the Ministry when it proposes that debating societies need to be established. But then such societies should not be alone in fostering critical debate in schools. My contention is that educators should also create conditions in class whereby they encourage learners to engage in open and critical debate. This can be done through the design and development of teaching and learning strategies which are conducive to cultivating debate and discussion. South African classrooms cannot ignore the meritorious effects of open discussion and deliberation (critical debate) if transformation is going to happen in our schools. Therefore, my argument is that a “Value in Education” such as openness holds the possibility for better intersubjective communication and hence, the cultivation of democratic citizenship in schools.

Fifthly, accountability as a “Value in Education” opens up space for providing a justification for one’s points of view. In other words, to be accountable means that one has to offer justifiable reasons as to why certain acts should be performed or not. For instance, educators do not only tell learners what to

do in the classroom but also offer reasons why they have to do certain things. An educator might want a learner to do a Mathematics problem. The educator would explain the problem and provide reasons why Mathematics knowledge is constructed in certain ways and why solutions to Mathematics problems are what they are. In other words, the educator is accountable since he or she provides reasons for his or her explanations and / or actions. Similarly learners are accountable when they offer reasons in justification for their performances in the classroom. If a learner performs badly he or she would be able to offer reasons for his or her inept performance – a matter of offering a justification, of being accountable.

Sixthly, honour as a “Value in Education” in my view cannot just be associated with the singing of the national anthem or raising the South African flag. One can do these actions without being honourable. We honour others when we challenge them or showing as to why they are right or wrong. For this reason practising honour is inextricably connected to critical debate and hence, the fostering of democratic citizenship. Educators honour their learners when they create opportunities to be challenged and questioned in the classroom. In turn, learners honour educators when they subject their views to critical scrutiny. To do less is to treat educators with contempt, that is to say, to treat them with dishonour.

In summary, “Values in Education” can cultivate democratic citizenship in classroom practices. This is so for the reason that “Values in Education” have the potential to engender intersubjective communication and critical debate

amongst educators and learners.

This brings me to another question: How can the “Values in Education” as identified in the *Manifesto on Values, Education and Democracy* be lived out in schools?

Firstly, democracy (as a “Value in Education”) is explained as a means to equip citizens with abilities and skills to engage critically and to act responsibly (DoE, 2001b: iv). In this regard, educators and learners need to learn to engage with one another’s thoughts and ideas. Hernandez (1997: 98) asserts that a democracy in education engages educators and learners in such a way that it provides substantial elements for reflection, constructing and reconstruction of more liberatory pedagogical practices. The upshot of this is that the points of view of educators and learners involved in a democratic engagement are equally relevant and must be addressed within the context that they are attempting to change. In a different way, the potentialities of educators and learners can be evoked (they can become more transformed) if they are allowed to reflect, construct and reconstruct the patterns of meaning available to them. For example, one can best evoke the potentialities of members comprising a school governing body if their transformative actions are driven by equal opportunities to reflect upon, construct and reconstruct information related to effective school governance.

Secondly, social justice and equity are highlighted as “Values in Education” since such notions afford educators and learners rights to “freedom of

expression and choice” (DoE, 2001b: iv). Laclau and Mouffe (1985) argue that the democratic discourse of liberty can ensure emancipation on an ongoing basis. Democratic discourse considers the importance of liberty as the individual freedom of action within diverse social spaces to promote transformation and change. In the words of Bowles and Gintis (1987:4), “liberty entails freedom of thought and association, freedom of political, cultural and religious expression, and the right to control one’s body and express one’s preferred spiritual, aesthetic, and sexual style of life”. Hence, through the value of liberty, the idea of a democratic classroom becomes unavoidable.

Thirdly, equality is associated with the practice of non-discrimination, that is, not only understanding one’s rights as an educator or learner, but that others have them as well (DoE, 2001b: iv). Equality emphasises the equal position for all ethnicities, cultures, groups and individuals (they are not superior to one another) such as to prevent marginalisation and exclusion. In others words, equality allows everyone to see themselves not as homogenous, but as equals (Fletcha 1999:164). Everyone (educators and learners) is an equal and should be allowed to acquire the competencies to transcend their present social barriers and to act in diverse areas of classroom life.

Fourthly, non-racism and non-sexism (as “Values in Education”) imply all learners have to be afforded the same opportunities (DoE, 2001b: iv). The idea of affording all learners the same opportunity in classroom opens up the possibility for different social groups to tolerate each other and to work

together in the same public sphere. Non-racism and non-sexism also repudiate the idea that the hegemonic power of the dominant culture can be imposed on diverse peoples in the name of integration (Fletcha, 1999). In fact, non-racism and non-sexism provide the conditions for subordinate groups to articulate their needs, and deepens the emancipatory possibilities of different social groups (including subordinate ones) to maintain, promote and develop their own culture and identity in a process of collective empowerment that allows them to reflect about their experience and situation within the classroom (Fraser, 1990).

Fifthly, *ubuntu* (human dignity) “embodies the concept of mutual understanding and the active appreciation of the value of human difference” (DoE, 2001b: iv). *Ubuntu* allows individuals and groups to live their differences (pluri-culturalism) and at the same time creates the opportunity to exchange and share new forms of living and new cultural hybrids with others (inter-culturalism) through mutual understanding and the recognition that learners in class are not all the same (Fletcha, 1999).

Sixthly, the remaining five “Values in Education”, namely, sustaining and open society that embraces the virtues of debate, discussion and critical thought; being accountable and responsible; adhering to the rule of law; having respect; and practising reconciliation all point towards bringing about an atmosphere of solidarity in the classroom. Only when the possibility for solidarity (collective action) is opened up through debate, discussion and critical thought whereby learners and educators become more accountable

and responsible, as well as developing respect and a reconciliatory attitude towards one another, do these different groups actually begin interrelate among themselves, “to talk together in different voices, addressing the differences that make them outsiders and insiders with respect to each other” (Hernandez 1997:19). This view is corroborated by Apple (1979: 29) for whom solidarity and common interest come into being only through communicative organisational practices in the classroom.

In essence, like the six “Values in Education”, the ten values as identified in the *Manifesto* can also cultivate democratic citizenship in classroom practices for the reason that “Values in Education” have the potential to engender inter-subjective communication and critical debate amongst educators and learners.

6.3 POSSIBILITIES FOR FUTURE EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

Usually the penultimate section of a thesis of this scope includes a set of recommendations for future educational research. My exploration of “Values in Education” in relation to notions of democracy and citizenship in schools does make a relevant contribution to current debates on the matter. In South Africa I have not directly come across any Masters thesis which explicitly deals with the “Values in Education” initiative as proposed by the Department of Education through its *Tirisano* project, in particular linking it to the ideas of democratic citizenship and inter-subjectivity. Therefore, my contribution can be considered as a voice in the exploration of issues of meaning in the field of

Philosophy of Education. Yet, I am very reluctant to follow the conventional way of thesis writing by concluding with a section on “recommendations”. To recommend means to have considered other alternatives, studied them and then offered ways as to how educational issues could be used to contribute to the knowledge base of the subject. Certainly, my thesis can contribute to a knowledge base in relation to “Values in Education”. However, I would be guilty of academic arrogance to think that my thesis should make recommendations as to how the subject of “Values in Education” needs to be researched in relation to my own contribution. Therefore, I would rather like to offer possibilities as to how research in this field of study can be pursued without becoming too dogmatic about my suggestions.

Up to this point I have sketched a notion of democratic citizenship along the lines of extending rights and responsibilities to people, as well as for people to engage intersubjectively and critically in conversation, that is, to rationally challenge and critique points of view. I want to move on to consider arguments for expanding these borders. It is my contention that a version of citizenship that remains tied to rights, responsibility and intersubjective debates in relation to “Values in Education” would be equally outmoded.

Firstly, arguments for democratic citizenship in itself should not be confined to the implementation of six core “Values in Education” for the reason that it might constrain a dynamic and recursive analysis of the concept. There is certainly scope for a discussion of democratic citizenship in other facets of education which might not necessarily have to involve “Values in Education”.

“Values in Education” can also be interpreted as what is of value or worth to do in the practice of education. But this might not give us a credible justification for only confining a discussion of democratic citizenship to “Values in Education”. A lot of what is wrong in education as suggested by the Ministry of Education is linked to references dealing with its proposed “Values in Education” initiative. Equity, tolerance, multilingualism, openness, accountability and honour are indeed “Values in Education”. However, they are perhaps not the best or only “values” to enact change in schools. I am worried as to why virtues (as distinct from values) such as respect, practical reasoning and deliberation have not been selected explicitly by the Ministry of Education since these virtues in an Aristotelian sense would in any case lend themselves to issues of equity, tolerance, multilingualism, openness, accountability and honour. For example, openness and tolerance are constitutive goods of practical reasoning.

Secondly, democratic citizenship as a concept could also be analysed in relation to Outcomes-based education (OBE). Why? OBE in any case requires a strong, intersubjective commitment on the part of educators, parents, learners and educational authorities to ensure its effective implementation, monitoring and evaluation. I have not come across any study in South Africa, which explicitly looked at the potential of linking the implementation of OBE in schools to the notion of democratic citizenship.

Thirdly, many studies on school governance structures seem to be linked to the idea of democracy without any reference to citizenship. There is definitely

huge potential (conceptually and empirically) to explore possibilities of citizenship education in relation to democratic school governance and management structures in school. My thesis did not address such a crucial issue in the transformation of education in South Africa.

Finally, the possibility also exists for democratic citizenship, in particular its emphasis on critical debate not really to live up to the claims that have been made on its behalf. Although critical debate has won favour among many democratic educators, it has not escaped powerful criticism. I shall just mention one kind of criticism which would be worthwhile exploring in future educational research. Critics are often realists who point to the huge gap between the ideal of debate and its practice in existing democratic schools. These critics challenge critical debate's credentials as a fair method of reaching collective decisions in pluralistic (diverse) classrooms; it claims that critical debate is biased against historically disadvantaged groups – the poor, ethnic minorities, girls, and so on. In other words, critical debate is not a neutral procedure, but one that works in favour of learners with certain cultural attributes, especially White learners. This is a serious challenge because it directly contests one of the main claims advanced in support of critical debate, namely that it is possible of reaching decisions that are more socially just. Debate may be formally inclusive, in the sense that every learner is permitted to speak in democratic forums, but if debate by its very nature favours some groups at the expense of others, it is not inclusive in a substantive sense (Miller, 2000: 144). In this regard, Young (1996: 323) makes the point that equal access to debate is not sufficient because it provides no guarantee that

learners of disadvantaged groups will be treated as equals once they are inside schools. They may, for instance, be reluctant to engage in arguments, feeling that they have no right to speak or that others will not take their interventions seriously. Here, Young (1996: 123) remarks that “deliberation (debate) is competition. Parties to the dispute aim to win the argument, not to achieve mutual understanding”. It may follow from this that such contexts “privilege those who like contests and know the rules of the game. Speech that is assertive and confrontational is here more valued than speech which is tentative, exploratory or conciliatory (which) favours male speaking styles over females” (Young, 1996: 123). It is in this regard that Miller (2000: 146) claims that democratic citizenship requires that debate should be structured in such a way that,

.... first, as wide a range of relevant views and arguments as possible should enter the debate, so that the ensuing discussion should genuinely reflect the concerns, interests and convictions of the members of the deliberating body; and second, that as the body (classroom of learners) attempts to move towards a solution to the issue that they confront, it should be the weight of the reasons offered in support of the different positions that counts. This means that participants, rather than trying to win, in the sense of ensuring that their initial preferences prevail, should be listening to and weighing up what others are saying, searching for the solution that has the strongest reasons behind it.

Moreover, Young (1996: 124) makes the point that debate privileges speech

that is “formal and general”, “dispassionate and disembodied” and “proceeds from premise to conclusion in an orderly fashion that clearly lays out its inference structure”. She maintains that these norms of acceptable speech discriminate against women and ethnic minorities, whose perspectives and demands need to be presented in others ways, which I contend can be explored in (future) South African educational research on “Values in Education”. For instance, Young (1996: 129) mentions three alternative modes of communication, say, in schools: greeting, rhetoric and storytelling. Greeting refers to a “virtuous form of the communication mode” in which parties to discussion recognise one another prior to and during the discussion: “I call this the moment of communication ‘greeting’ to evoke the everyday pragmatic mode in which we experience such acknowledgement. Here is speech necessary to communication that does not say anything – it has no assertion and has no specific content: ‘Good morning’, ‘How are you’, ‘Welcome’, ‘See you later’, ‘Take care’. In the category of greeting I also include such expressions of leave taking, as well as forms of flattery, stroking of egos, and deference (Young, 1996: 129).

Rhetoric announces the “situatedness of communication” and involves forms of speech and argument that identify the speaker with a particular audience, and which evoke symbols and cultural values that resonate with this audience. “Rhetoric constructs speaker, audience, and occasion by invoking or creating specific meanings, connotations, and symbols, and it serves this connecting function whether the speaker and audience share meanings or not” (Young, 1996: 130). For Young, one function of rhetoric is to get and

keep attention: "The most elegant and truthful arguments may fail to evoke assent if they are boring. Humor, wordplay, images, and figures of speech embody and color the arguments, making the discussion pull on thought through desire".

Finally, storytelling refers to speech in which someone presents a personal narrative or life story as a way of revealing "the particular experiences of those in social locations, experiences that cannot be shared by those situated differently but that they must understand in order to do justice to others" (Young, 1996: 131). For instance, the position of Black learners may remain incomprehensible to Whites unless Blacks can describe their historical experiences through forms of personal testimony and vice a versa. In the words of Young (1996: 131) "narrative exhibits subjective experience to other subjects. The narrative can evoke sympathy while maintaining distance because the narrative also carries exhaustible latent shadow, the transcendence of the Other, that there is always more to be told".

Of course, I agree with Young and contend that critical debate in South African classrooms need to be considered in relation to other alternative modes of conversation, albeit greeting, rhetoric and storytelling. Yet, it seems to me rather insulting to historically disadvantaged learners that norms of rational argumentation are loaded against them since they cannot give coherent arguments for the changes they perhaps want to enact. Thus, it seems as if Young's suggestion should also be subjective to critical scrutiny to find out whether it can actually work in democratically organised schools.

However, this has not been the main focus of my thesis and would suggest that this area of communication be explored in other theses related to democratic citizenship and education, more specifically “Values in Education”.

6.4 CONCLUSION

This thesis argued that inter-subjectivity is at the core of both the notion of “Values in Education” and democratic citizenship. At best, “Values in Education” does hold the potential to cultivate democratic citizenship in South African schools. At worst, a lack of implementing “Values in Education” in relation to democracy and citizenship might not effect the kind of transformative change South Africa’s education system, in particular schools require.

REFERENCES

Abdi, A. 1998. Education in Somalia: history, deconstruction, and calls for reconstruction. *Comparative Education*, 34 (3): 327 – 340.

Adesida, O. & Oteh, A. (eds.). 2001. *African Voices – African Visions*. Stockholm: Elanders Gotab.

Bennett de Marrais, K. (ed.). 1998. *Inside Stories: Qualitative Research Reflections*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Berlin, I. 1969. *Four Essays on Liberty*. London: Oxford University Press.

Biesta, G. 1994. Education as practical inter-subjectivity: towards a critical-pragmatic understanding of education. *Educational Theory*, 44(3): 299-317.

Bowles, S. & Gintis, H. 1987. *Democracy and Capitalism: Property, Community, and the Contradictions of Modern Social Thought*. New York: Basic Books.

Carr, W. & Kemmis, S. 1987. *Becoming Critical*. Lewes: Falmer Press.

Cummings, W., Gopinathan, S. & Tomoda, Y. (eds.). 1988. *The Revival of Values Education in Asia and the West*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

De Klerk, J. 2001. The values underlying quality and equality in educational transformation. *Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung Seminar Report: Democratic Transformation of Education in South Africa*. Johannesburg: KAF Publishers: 37 - 44.

De Klerk, J. 2001. Value education in a young democracy – searching for a way through the moral maze. Unpublished Paper, University of Stellenbosch.

Department of Education, 1995. *Education White Paper 1 - The Reconstruction and Development of the Education and Training Programme*. Pretoria: Government Gazette No 16312.

Department of Education, 1996. *The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa*. Annotated version. Act 108 of 1996. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Department of Education, 1999. *Annual Report*. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Department of Education, 2000a. *Values, Education and Democracy*. Report of the Working Group on Values in Education. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Department of Education, 2000b. *Values, Education and Democracy*. Interim Research Report. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Department of Education, 2000c. *Values in Education Initiative*. Report of the History/ Archaeology Panel to the Minister of Education. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Department of Education, 2001a. *Saamtrek: Values, Education and Democracy in the 21st Century*. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Department of Education, 2001b. *Manifesto on Values, Education and Democracy*. Cape Town: Cape Argus Teach Fund.

Dewey, J. 1925. *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education*. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Fay, B. 1976. *Social Science and Political Practice*. London: Keegan Paul.

Fay, B. 1987. *Critical Social Science*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fletcha, R. 1999. Modern and postmodern racism in Europe: dialogic approach and anti-racist pedagogies. *Harvard Educational Review*, 69(2): 150-162.

Frankel, C. 1971. Equality of opportunity. *Ethics*, 81(3): 191-211.

Fraser, N. 1990. Rethinking the public sphere: a contribution to the critiques of actually existing democracy. *Social Text*, 25(6): 56-79.

Gutman, A. 1998. Undemocratic education. *Philosophy of Education: Major Themes in the Analytic Tradition*, Volume III Society and Education. Hirst, P. & White, P. (eds.). London and New York: Routledge, 28-43.

Hernandez, A. 1997. *Pedagogy, Democracy and Feminism: Rethinking the Public Sphere*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Hirst, P. & Peters, R. 1998. Education and philosophy. *Philosophy of Education: Major Themes in the Analytic Tradition*, Volume I Philosophy and Education. Hirst, P. & White, P. (eds.). London and New York: Routledge, 27-38.

Hernandez, A. 1997. *Pedagogy, Democracy and Feminism: Rethinking the Public Sphere*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Howe, K. 1998. In defence of outcomes-based conceptions of equal educational opportunity. *Philosophy of Education: Major Themes in the Analytic Tradition*, Volume III Society and Education. Hirst, P. & White, P. (eds.). London and New York: Routledge, 192-218.

Janowitz, M. 1983. *The Reconstruction of Patriotism: Education for Civic Consciousness*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Jarvis, D. 1998. Postmodernism: a critical typology. *Politics and Society*, 26(1): 95-143.

Katjivena, U.E. 1999. Epilogue: education and self-respect. *Prospects*, XXIX (2): 259 - 264.

Kelchtermans, G. & Schratz, M. 1994. The development of qualitative research: efforts and experiences from continental Europe. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 7(3): 239-255.

Kuhn 1978. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Laclau, E. & Mouffe, C. 1985. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy*. London, New York: Verso.

Le Grange, L. 1999. Educational research as democratic praxis. *Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung Seminar Report: Democratic Transformation of Education in South Africa*. Johannesburg: KAF Publishers.

Le Roux, A. 2001. African Renaissance: a quest for the *transformation* and *africanisation* of South African education. *South African Journal of Education*, 21(1): 31 – 36.

Lisman, C.D. 1998. *Toward a Civil Society: Civic Literacy and Service Learning*. Westport: Bergin & Garvey.

MacIntyre, A. 1981. *After Virtue*. London: Duckworth.

Marcinkowski, T. 1993. A contextual review of the 'quantitative paradigm' in EE research. *Alternative Paradigms in Environmental Education Research*.

Mrazek, R. (ed.). Ohio: North American Association for Environmental Education, 29-79.

Miller, D. 2000. *Citizenship and National Identity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Mugomba, A.T. & M. Nyaggah. 1980. *Independence Without Freedom: The Political Economy of Colonial Education in South Africa*. Santa Barbara: Clio Press Ltd.

Olaniyan, R. 1982. African history and culture: an overview. In R. Olaniyan (ed.). *African History and Culture*. Longman: Nigeria: 1 – 12.

Rorty, R. 1980. *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Schoeman, S. 2000. Charting a course: teaching Citizen Education within the human and social sciences learning area. *South African Journal of Education*, 20(3): 180-186.

Schwandt, T. 1997. *Qualitative Inquiry: A Dictionary of Terms*. London: Sage Publications.

Soltis, J. 1998. Perspectives on philosophy of education. *Philosophy of Education: Major Themes in the Analytic Tradition*, Volume I Philosophy and

Education. Hirst, P. & White, P. (eds.). London and New York: Routledge, 196-204.

Stanley, M.B. 1996. Service learning as civic education: Difference, culture war, and the material basis of a good life. In J.N. Burstyn (ed.). *Educating Tomorrow's Valuable Citizen*. Albany. State University of New York Press: 151 - 177.

Steyn, J.C., J. de Klerk & W.S. du Plessis. 1999. *Education for Democracy*. Bellville: Wachwa Publishers cc.

Steyn, J. 2001. Balancing quality and equality in educational transformation. *Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung Seminar Report: Democratic Transformation of Education in South Africa*. Johannesburg: KAF Publishers.

Taylor, C. 1985. *Philosophy and the Human Sciences: Philosophical Papers* 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Taylor, C. 1989. *Sources of the Self*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa 1996. Annotated Version. Wynberg: Hn Communications.

Thompson, D.F. 1970. *The Democratic Citizen*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van der Merwe, J. 2002. Gaum puts schools on abuse alert. *Cape Argus*, 1 February: 8.

Waghid, Y. 2002a. Community and democracy in South Africa: Liberal versus communitarian perspectives. Unpublished DPhil Thesis. Matieland: University of Stellenbosch.

Waghid, Y. 2002b. Democracy, higher education transformation and citizenship in South Africa. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, in press.

Waghid, Y. 2002c. Philosophy of education and moral values: democratisation of education or mere talk of an African Renaissance? *South African Journal of Education*, in press.

Wittgenstein, L. 1953. *Philosophical Investigations*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Young, I. 1996. Communication and the Other: beyond deliberative democracy. In S. Benhabib, (ed.). *Democracy and Difference: Contesting the Boundaries of the Political*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press: 121 - 135.

Yuan, B.J. & J. Shen. 1998. Moral values held by early adolescents in Taiwan and Mainland China. *Journal of Moral Education*, 27(2): 191-206.