ON THE TRANSFORMATIVE DIMENSION OF CRITICAL CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Undoubtedly, this volume offers a cogent and coherent account of citizenship education commensurate with critical curriculum inquiry at universities. Using social transformation in South Africa as a backdrop, Costandius and Bitzer posit that university education ought to be framed according to theories and practices of critical citizenship education that can hopefully engender more inclusive pedagogical practices, in reference to teaching, learning, policy changes and research. Their understanding of critical citizenship education, as aptly articulated in the first chapter, is couched within the parameters of a transformative pedagogy that accentuates the importance of critical reflection, imagination, human co-existence in the face of diversity and the cultivation of social justice. Moreover, in Chapter 2, by drawing on the seminal thoughts of an illustrious scholar of critical pedagogy, Henry Giroux, they contend that the domination, exclusion and marginalisation of students in and through university curricula should be counteracted, and that appropriate epistemological, conceptual, structural, narratival and paradigmatic changes should be enacted so that higher education discourses might be attenuated more towards spaces of democratic action.

In Chapter 3, by referring to specific examples of how some South African universities have integrated notions of critical citizenship education into their curricula, they intimate that there is not a singular understanding of critical citizenship that underscores university curricula, and perhaps rightly so. In Chapter 4, they specifically connect critical citizenship education to multi-various forms of learning in order to show that the former ought to be at the forefront of students’ pedagogical activities. In Chapter 5, they use an example of how critical citizenship education can engage students and
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academics inclusively through curriculum engagement, thereby making the case for pragmatic democratic action as an instance of critical citizenship education more profound. They conclude the volume with Chapter 6, wherein they accentuate once again as to how inclusivity in and through pedagogical practices can be engendered and why university education cannot remain oblivious to critical citizenship education.

THEORETICAL ENLARGEMENT OF CRITICAL CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

If the purpose of the volume is to advocate a particular notion of critical citizenship education at the conceptual level concomitantly with a pragmatic example as to how the notion can, and perhaps, should be enacted, then the authors have succeeded. As with all contributions, what is evident about citizenship education is that the notion is invariably connected with an advocacy for criticality, inclusion, transformation, social justice and democratic engagement. What makes this volume slightly more pragmatic is that the authors use examples to illustrate how critical citizenship education can be enacted, and that the latter has the potential to realise its transformative and democratic aspirations. This is not a volume where one should demand more comprehensive theoretical accounts of critical citizenship education, and I do not think this is the authors’ intention. Here, I would refer readers to expositions of variants of critical citizenship education with reference to two significant collections published on the subject (Arthur, Davies & Hahn 2008; Peters, Britton & Blee 2008). Firstly, the volume by Arthur et al. (2008) comprises five sections and forty-two chapters dealing with themes such as key ideas underlying critical citizenship education, geographically based overviews – comparative research, key perspectives, characterisations and forms, and pedagogy. What is evident from the text is that democracy, citizenship and citizenship education “are complex, dynamic and controversial” themes (Arthur et al. 2008:1). The main concepts that seem to drive this text include globalisation, equity, democracy, diversity, justice, citizenship, education, culture, ethnicity, class and gender, teaching and learning. What becomes apparent from, and is important about, the text are the different ways in which citizenship is conceptualised – most significantly in relation to an individual’s legal and political status as connected to a nation state, identity, issues of practical engagement, as well as the guarantee of rights (Arthur et al. 2008:1). The text also emphasises that critical citizenship education is not just about knowledge transmission, but also about understanding and awareness: “Citizens need to know their rights, but they also need to know how these rights operate within a democracy. What students learn does not necessarily make them active citizens” (Arthur et al. 2008:7). In acknowledging the importance of building on the knowledge that is connected to the public life of students in universities, the editors aptly state the
following: “[T]he learning [about critical citizenship education] that takes place will need to be reviewed and evaluated although a rigidly objectives-driven system seems inappropriate when considered against the aims of citizenship education” (Arthur et al. 2008:9). It is in relation to the latter that I envisage that ideas on critical citizenship education be extended in and beyond university curricula, specifically in relation to how critical citizenship education can deal directly with social injustices.

Secondly, the Peters et al. (2008) collection of thirty-two chapters offers a variety of perspectives that pursue the case of “meaningful global citizenship education as a contribution towards the search for an elusive yet essential conception of global civic society” (Peters et al. 2008:2). More specifically, global citizenship education offers the prospect of extending the ideologies of both human rights and multiculturalism in a critical and informed way (Peters et al. 2008:11). The chapters presented in the collection demonstrate clearly that there can be no single, hegemonic understanding of global citizenship education, as notions of global citizenship and education are contested and remain subject to scrutiny. In the words of the editors, “[g]lobal citizenship education does not name the moment of global citizenship education or even its emergence so much as the hope of a form of order where the rights of the individual and of groups, irrespective of race, gender, ethnicity or creed, are observed by all governments and become the basis of participation in new global spaces that [...] might be called global civil society” (Peters et al. 2008:12). As such, the text is organised around terms such as “global citizenship”, “globalisation”, “cosmopolitanism” and “citizenship education”. Global citizenship education or a more inclusive understanding of critical citizenship education is “about cultivating an integrative attitude as much as it is about learning about systematic mechanisms that safeguard society [...] that [enable] individual citizens to acquire skills and encounter experiences that: promote, explore, examine, synthesise and evaluate meaning about individual lives and societal contexts, trans-nationally and cross-culturally” (Golmohamad 2008:523-524). To this end, I am interested in rethinking the notion of critical citizenship education in relation to new challenges that emerge, particularly in relation to societal injustices including transformation at universities.

What emanates from the above is that understanding the practice of critical citizenship education depends on having some understanding of both citizenship and citizen. The notion of citizenship refers to the relation of belonging that persons have to the social and political domain (De Ruyter & Spiecker 2008:352) – that is, a notion of citizenship in a minimal sense. In a maximal sense, citizenship also refers to a citizen as a culturally and intellectually well-developed person who contributes to the cultural enlightenment of a nation (De Ruyter & Spiecker 2008:354). Moreover, following
Yuval-Davis (2011:46), “the notion of citizenship can be seen as the participatory
dimension of belonging to a political community”. In other words, people have
citizenship when they participate in the affairs of a political community. Only then
are they expressing their sense of belonging. They cannot claim to belong to a
political community if they do not participate in the affairs of a political community
that have guided their development as individuals and social beings. For this reason,
citizenship is considered as “an individual contractual relationship between the
person and the state” (Yuval-Davis 2011:48). And what determines the contract and
relationship respectively are the political, civil, social, economic, cultural and spatial
security rights that protect citizens, and the duties and responsibilities people have
to enact through participation. Therefore, to educate people as citizens (citizenship
education) amounts not only to understanding what the practice means, but also to
instil in them capacities for participation to come to understand one another and to
engage in matters that affect them (Roth & Burbules 2007:5) – therefore, to enhance
their sense of belonging.

Of course, contrasting the notion of citizenship as persons belonging and participating
in the social, political and cultural domains of a nation state, with world citizenship,
De Ruyter and Spiecker (2008:352) aver as follows:

World citizens are persons who are able to identify with cultural
expressions and fellow human beings [...] [and] to be called a world
citizen, it is necessary that one adheres to public rules in a minimally
moral sense (not to kill or steal) and in a political sense: one has to
respect the rights of other people to live according to their own world
view or culture.

Therefore, minimal citizenship is concerned with an individual’s social and political
participation in the nation state, whereas maximal citizenship is also concerned with
the cultural dimension of the nation state. And citizenship is mostly concerned with
persons’ participation in the affairs of the nation state, in contrast to world/global/
cosmopolitan citizenship, which is concerned with the participation of human beings
beyond the affairs of the nation state – that is, citizens’ obligations to all other human
beings. Therefore, an examination of various forms of critical citizenship education
can be extended to elucidating the notion along the lines of a minimalist-maximalist
continuum. At a minimal level, critical citizenship education would be concerned
with reflection, participation and belonging to a nation state. At the maximal level,
the notion would advance more inclusive forms of deliberation and belonging as
cosmopolitans to the global world. It is in this way that the aforementioned major
texts on critical citizenship education offer minimalist and maximalist accounts of
the notion.
As a manifestation of theoretical enlargement of the notion of critical citizenship education, in my work with Nuraan Davids (Waghid & Davids 2013), we recognise the theoretically and pragmatically expansive contexts that constitute critical citizenship education. We revisit some of the major contributions on critical citizenship education, in particular how the practices of deliberation, compassion and responsibility have guided the rights, responsibilities and belonging discourses that have been linked to citizenship education over the past two decades. We attempt to rethink critical citizenship education, and contend that the latter is first and foremost a pedagogical encounter intertwined with equality, intelligibility and amateurism – aspects that would situate critical citizenship education firmly within discourses of rights, responsibilities and belonging, and simultaneously open up pedagogical spaces for a critical citizenship education of becoming. Our focus is on opening up new possibilities for participation on the part of schools or universities for that matter – an agenda that gives schools/universities a potentiality that would strongly tie in with a renewed form of citizenship education that involves summoning others to speech, seeing things differently, and suspending a rush to judgement of issues (Waghid & Davids 2013). Hence, if the volume of Costandius and Bitzer were to be appreciated more, in particular their pragmatic ways in which they intimate critical citizenship education should be enacted in university curricula, readers would be advised to broaden their own theoretical understandings of critical citizenship education.

EXTENDING CRITICAL CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION BEYOND THE CRITICAL: MAKING AN ARGUMENT FOR RESPONSIBILITY

To talk about responsibility vis-à-vis citizenship education requires that one offers an account of what the practice means. For the purposes of articulating the notion of responsible citizenship education, I draw on Derrida’s (2004:91) seminal idea of responsibility. For him, to think of responsibility is to equate it with “a summons requiring a response” (Derrida 2004:91). That is, when people are summoned or called to act in a particular way by responding to a situation, they are said to act responsibly. The way in which people should act as they respond to a particular situation is considered by Derrida as acting with “freedom of judgement” (2004:97). If they can freely judge, Derrida (2004:105) posits, they act with unconditioned autonomy by accounting for something. And, by doing so, that is accounting for something, a person is “playing one risk off against another” (Derrida 2004:150). Therefore, by acting responsibly, a person accounts with justification for something (renders a reason) and simultaneously takes risky decisions in order to achieve what is not there and what is yet to come (Derrida 2004:155). In other words, acting with justification, as well as taking risks, can lead to achieving the unexpected or the
improbable. Only then can a person be said to act with responsibility. Now, if I relate the idea of responsibility to citizenship education, it can be said that responsible citizenship education ought to engender understandings that students should be encouraged to take risks coupled with giving an account of their citizenship. For example, when students are educated to responsibly offer an account of their reasons for why immigrants should be treated justly and that they (students) should actually take risks in building relationships with immigrant communities who might be of a different culture and disposition, the students have been educated to risk their own complacency for the sake of engaging others hospitably – a matter of exercising their citizenship. Therefore, responsible citizenship education lends itself to people taking risks to accomplish through giving an account of their reasons for the unexpected, albeit building relations with immigrant communities – a situation that, in turn, might lead to more inclusive relations among people. Responsible citizenship education therefore differs from critical citizenship education in the following way: Responsible citizenship education encourages students to take risks to do the improbable, whereas critical citizenship education demands that students do not necessarily take risks to critique the taken-for-granted and to counteract societal injustices. Put differently, responsible citizenship education potentially extends the act to deal critically with social injustices into the realm of risk taking.

In this regard, Cavell (1979:442) avers that human beings bear an internal relation to all others – that is, in respect of people’s fellow citizens, people are “answerable for what happens to them” (Cavell 1979:438). This means that people are responsible towards one another. In relation to responsible citizenship education, for Cavell (1979:440), responsibility implies that people owe one another some unrestricted revelation of their humanity. And, showing humanity towards fellow human beings implies that one conceives the other from the other’s point of view (Cavell 1979:441). The point is that responsibility implies that people do not merely wish how others should be and present themselves to one another as criticality often requires, but rather, for people to experience the other in their otherness and to be “answerable for what happens to them” (Cavell 1979:438). By implication, responsible citizenship involves showing our responsibility towards others and involves acknowledging their humanity, which restricts us from humiliating and excluding them – that is, treating people inhumanely. For example, hatred towards Muslim immigrants in several European communities, concomitant with their increasing marginalisation and lack of access to employment (Benhabib 2011:194), shows the damage being done to responsible citizenship that will perhaps not be so easily and quickly healed.
Therefore, responsible citizenship education extends the participatory dimension of critical citizenship education. In fact, like Smith (2007:31), I have decoupled an analysis of citizenship education from the nation state and recast the role of citizenship “within the multiple public spheres of global civil societies”. The task of responsible citizenship education “is to provide young people with opportunities to deliberately practice public ways of being that allow publics of citizens to flourish and impact formal political processes, within the nation state and beyond” (Smith 2007:31). Put differently, critical citizenship education has been recast, set apart from the nation state and newly theorised in terms of the actions of citizens in the public spheres of civil society, such as clubs, associations, religious institutions, interest groups and unions. My focus on responsibility points towards cultivating in students public ways of being, and capacities and understandings with which to navigate various complexities of political organisation. Inasmuch as critical citizenship education seems plausible enough to be cultivated in universities and curricula, responsible citizenship education has a disruptive dimension that can engender more equal, deliberative and responsible action in and through higher education.

By way of conclusion, I would like to offer readers some idea of a recent volume in which responsible citizenship education is most poignantly articulated. The overarching rationale of the volume edited by Petrovic and Kunz (2014) is to provide an account of responsible citizenship education grounded in a sustained reflection on what is humane, intellectually driven, and in service of democracy both locally and globally against the neoliberal grain of educational discourse. Our own chapter in the volume contains: “Some philosophical remarks on teaching and learning in South Africa”, which is not only an example of why responsible citizenship education can be considered as an extension of critical citizenship education. It is also, firstly, how and why hospitality ought to be cultivated in South African universities; secondly, how responsibility and humanness (ubuntu) ought to be nurtured; and thirdly, what a politics of teaching and learning ought to look like if informed by dialogical encounters of a provocative, disruptive and caring kind. We specifically show teaching and learning can be advanced through a responsible dimension of critical education considering the country’s break with its apartheid past.
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ANNEXURE A
CRITICAL CITIZENSHIP PROJECT 1
See Kayamandi – See Yourself, 2nd-year students

FIGURE A1   Cover of book

FIGURE A2   Contents page
Last year in the township I was not comfortable in Stellenbosch especially in the campus. I was used to being part of the majority, and I found myself being part of the minority. I was eating with a herd of cows at the Keystone and could not finish my food. It felt like people were staring at me. I felt the same way at home too. I could not concentrate. The lectures were asked by the by the first names. I could not get used to that. I felt like I was disrespecting them when I did that.

It took time for me to adapt to Stellenbosch. I could not relate to the place and the language barrier made it difficult. Most of the people spoke Afrikaans and I only knew the basics. Most of the students were driving “daddy’s car,” and my dad does not own a bicycle. I always thought that I belonged to the other world (township) not this one (Stellenbosch). After my visit to Kayamandi with my classmates, that made me doubt myself. I felt like I was stuck between two worlds. I found myself trying to fit in it Kayamandi. I went through a lot of things change including the perception of what happens in the township.

The minute we got to Kayamandi, I started questioning myself. Maybe they are going to think I am one of those rich spoilt kids (chewing tobacco, etc.).

I know people from the townships do not really like those. So I had to show them that I can also speak Xhosa and “taal”, you can tell someone from the township by the I shake and also by the whistle. Since I am from the town, I knew and understood why the Kayamandi people think this way. I even spoke Xhosa with my friends and felt comfortable.

FIGURE A3  Student 2B6

FIGURE A4  Student 2W57
ANNEXURE A • PROJECT 1: See Kayamandi – See Yourself: 2nd-year students

FIGURE A5  Student 2B5

FIGURE A6  Student 2W63
ANNEXURE B
CRITICAL CITIZENSHIP PROJECT 2
Action Research – Learning Life Skills in Kayamandi, 3rd-year students

FIGURE B1  Cover of book

FIGURE B2  Student 3W69
FIGURE B5  Student 3W74

FIGURE B6  Student 3C9
ANNEXURE B • PROJECT 2: Action Research – Learning Life Skills in Kayamandi: 3rd-year students

FIGURE B7  Student 3W72

FIGURE B8  Student 3W76
FIGURE B9  Student 3W77

FIGURE B10  Student 3W71
ANNEXURE C
CRITICAL CITIZENSHIP PROJECT 3
Design elements and principles, 1st-year students

FIGURE C1  Student 1W33

FIGURE C2  Student 1W27
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FIGURE C3  Student 1W41

FIGURE C4  Student 1C3
ANNEXURE C • PROJECT 3: Design elements and principles: 1st-year students

FIGURE C5  Student 1C5

FIGURE C6  Student 1W27
ANNEXURE D
CRITICAL CITIZENSHIP PROJECT 4
Design as healing, 3rd-year students

FIGURE D1  Student 3W53

FIGURE D2  Student 2B6
ANNEXURE D • PROJECT 4: Design as healing: 3rd-year students

FIGURE D3  Student 3B5

FIGURE D4  Student 3B6
FIGURE D5  Student 3W65

FIGURE D6  Student 3W54
FIGURE D7  Student 3W49

FIGURE D8  Student 3W51
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FIGURE D9  Student 3W56

FIGURE D10  Student 3W59
ANNEXURE E
CRITICAL CITIZENSHIP PROJECT 4
Design as healing, Learners

FIGURE E1 Learner BL4

FIGURE E2 Learner BL18
FIGURE E3  Learner BL17

FIGURE E4  Learners BL4 and BL10
FIGURE E5  Learner BL9

FIGURE E6  Learner BL8
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<td>DHET</td>
<td>Department of Higher Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoE</td>
<td>Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESF</td>
<td>European Science Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAESDU</td>
<td>Higher and Adult Education Development Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE</td>
<td>Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEI</td>
<td>Higher Education Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEQC/CHE</td>
<td>Higher Education Quality Committee/Council for Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HERDSA</td>
<td>Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HESA</td>
<td>Higher Education South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCHE</td>
<td>National Commission on Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>non-governmental organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMMU</td>
<td>Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPC</td>
<td>National Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFLII</td>
<td>South African Legal Information Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL</td>
<td>Service Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU</td>
<td>Stellenbosch University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCT</td>
<td>University of Cape Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UFS</td>
<td>University of the Free State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWC</td>
<td>University of the Western Cape</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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