

Democracy, Education and Development: Theory and Reality

Clive Harber^[1] & Vusi Mncube^[2]

^[1]University of Birmingham and University of South Africa, South Africa

^[2]University of South Africa, South Africa

Abstract *This article explores the relationships between education and democracy in developing countries. It discusses the nature of “development” and in particular the idea of political indicators of development. The paper then discusses modernisation theory in relation to education as providing a necessary, but not sufficient, bureaucratic basis for democratic political development. These ideas are then examined in relation to the realities of schooling in developing countries and the problems of providing learners with both an effective organisational experience and a democratic one. While there are many examples of good practice in relation to democratic education in developing countries, there are also many obstacles and the dominant model of schooling is still authoritarian. The article then focuses on South Africa as a case study of a developing country that has attempted to introduce more democratic forms of schooling but where authoritarianism persists in education despite some democratic progress. The paper ends by discussing why democratic education remains a minority practice globally and the key obstacles it faces.*

Keywords democracy, politics, development, modernisation, bureaucracy, democratic schooling, authoritarianism

The only form of society which facilitates the continued evolution of the human species is a democratic form of society, and furthermore, the development of such a democratic society is dependent to a large degree on the democratisation of schools and schooling. (Dewey, as cited in Meighan, 1994, p. 86)

Clive Harber (corresponding author)
University of Birmingham, UK.
c.r.harber@bham.ac.uk

Introduction

If you were to glance at a political map of the world 30 years ago where authoritarian and totalitarian regimes were coloured blue and democratic and semi-democratic ones were coloured red then most of Africa, South America, Asia and the Middle East would be coloured blue. The same map in 2012 would look strikingly different with large parts of the ‘developing’ world now coloured red rather than blue but the Middle East would have remained stubbornly blue. In recent years, however, the “Arab Spring” has witnessed a wave of democratic protest and reform across the Middle East.

There are many different definitions of democracy (Davies, 1999) but the following captures its salient features:

Democracy embodies the ideal that decisions affecting an association as a whole would be taken by all its members and that they would each have equal rights to take part in such decisions. Democracy entails the twin principles of popular control over collective decision-making and equality of rights in the exercise of that control. (Beetham & Boyle, 1995, p.1)

What most definitions have in common is a concern with:

- Rights: a set of entitlements which are protected and common to all individuals
- Participation: the free involvement of individuals in the decision-making process
- Equity: fair and equal treatment of individuals and groups
- Informed choice: the tools to make decisions which are based on relevant information and reason (Davies, Harber, & Schweisfurth, 2002, pp. 4-9).

There has long been an interest in the potential role of education in facilitating, supporting and sustaining democracy – or not. In *The Politics* Aristotle, for example, wrote:

But of all the safeguards that we hear spoken of as helping to maintain constitutional continuity the most important, but most neglected today, is education, that is educating citizens for the way of living that belongs to the constitution in each case. It is useless to have the most beneficial rules of society fully agreed upon by all who are members of the *politeia*, if individuals are not going to be trained and have their habits formed for that *politeia*, that is to live democratically if the laws

of the society are democratic, oligarchically if they are oligarchic.
(Aristotle, 1962, pp. 215-216)

However, as far as anybody is aware, human beings do not have any genes determining whether they are democrats or autocrats, therefore democratic or authoritarian values and behaviours must be learned. In both this article and the book from which it stems (Harber, & Mncube, 2012) we have chosen to explore not just the relationships between education and democracy in the countries of the “West” or “industrialised north” but to focus in particular how these relationships manifest themselves in so-called “developing” countries.

“Developing” Countries

Concern with the idea that societies and states “develop” over time, usually with the assumption that development means that matters are improving in some way, also goes back at least as far as Aristotle and has occurred in many different cultures (Fagerlind & Saha, 1989). Post-second world war discussions of development were originally primarily concerned with economic development – the growth of wealth and output as measured by indicators of national wealth such as the gross national product. The main division was therefore initially between the industrialised countries of the Northern hemisphere and the poorer, more agriculturally based countries of the Southern hemisphere. Over time attempts to measure development have become increasingly more diverse and sophisticated with a whole range of different social indicators such as health, education, gender, well being, and environmental protection being added.

Most recently of all, and of direct significance to the subject of this article, has been the design and inclusion of political indicators of development. In the 2010 United Nations Human Development Report, for example, the quantified indicators of “empowerment” were political freedom and democracy, human rights violations, press freedom, journalists imprisoned, corruption victims, democratic decentralisation and political engagement (UNDP, 2010, pp. 164-167). As this suggests, the UNDP now has an explicit model of political development where the goal for all countries is the attainment, sustainability and consolidation of democracy. Strongly influenced by the ideas of Amartya Sen on human capabilities (who writes the introduction to the twentieth edition) the 2010 report continues its long term explicit support for democracy:

The 1990 HDR began with a clear definition of human development as a process of “enlarging people’s choices,” emphasising the freedom to be healthy, to be educated and to enjoy a decent standard of living. But it also stressed that human development and well-being went far beyond these dimensions to encompass a much

broader range of capabilities, including political freedom, human rights and, echoing Adam Smith, “the ability to go about without shame.” (UNDP, 2010, p. 2)

It notes with approval that the proportion of formal democracies has increased from fewer than a third of all countries in 1970 to half in the mid-1990s to three fifths in 2008 and that many hybrid forms have also emerged. Overall, it argues that:

While real change and healthy political functioning have varied, and many formal democracies are flawed and fragile, policy-making is much better informed by the views and concerns of citizens. Local democratic processes are deepening. Political struggles have led to substantial change in many countries, greatly expanding the representation of marginalized people, including women, the poor, indigenous groups, refugees and sexual minorities. (UNDP, 2010, p.6)

However, Leftwich (1996, p. 18) argues generally in relation to developing countries that unless there are conducive existing state politics in the countries into which democracy is introduced, then it will fail and can actually have anti-developmental consequences. If politics in such countries are, and continue to be, predatory, corrupt, patrimonial and cronyist, then democratisation will not and cannot take place. In “fragile” states, for example, where corruption, violence and lack of transparency and trust are normal then state, institution and human capacity building will need to precede, or at least accompany, any attempt at democratisation (Davies, 2011).

Leftwich turns to modernisation theory to argue that unless certain socio-economic and political preconditions exist which are associated with development towards a “modern” society such as an ethic of science and rationality, industrialisation, urbanisation, bureaucratisation, differentiation and specialisation of social structures, the principles of individualism and political stability, then democracy will not take root or succeed (1996, pp. 6-11). Without an existing, relatively “modern” social and economic infrastructure and accompanying values and behaviours, then attempts at political democratisation will fail as they will not have the required social foundations to build on. He argues that:

[T]he history of developing societies in the last 30 years suggests that it would be foolhardy to ignore some of the insights of that large body of theoretical and empirical scholarship on modernisation...For whatever its many limitations, modernisation theory in general terms assumed the intimacy of politics with other social and economic

processes, especially in the course of change, not its extrusion from them. (Leftwich, 1996, p. 21)

Modernisation, Schooling and Democracy

While political modernisation theorists were primarily concerned with what constituted the modern polity, the work of Alex Inkeles (1969a, 1969b, Inkeles & Smith, 1974) focussed much more on individual modernity, what a modern individual might look like and which socialisation agencies most contribute to individual modernity. For him a modern citizen is one who takes an active interest in public affairs, is informed about important events and participates in civic affairs. Most importantly, the citizen must understand the ways in which bureaucratic rules and impersonal judgement replace treatment based mainly on personal qualities, on family ties or friendship and connections, for the modern polity is “suffused with bureaucratic rationality” (1969a, p. 1122), whether this citizen lives in a democratic or authoritarian state. In his empirical work he found education to have the strongest relationship of all variables to the possession of modern (i.e. bureaucratic) attitudes, values and behaviour. This is partly because the pupil at school learns new skills such as reading, writing and arithmetic so that he or she will be able to ‘read directions and instructions and to follow events in the newspaper’ but also because of the bureaucratic nature of the hidden curriculum:

School starts and stops at fixed times each day. Within the school day there generally is a regular sequence for ordering activities: singing, reading, writing, drawing, all have their scheduled and usually invariant times. Teachers generally work according to this plan... Thus, principles directly embedded in the daily routine of the school teach the value of planning ahead and the importance of maintaining a regular schedule. (Inkeles, & Smith, 1974, p. 141)

Indeed, Kendall (2009) argues that this near-hegemonic, bureaucratic model of formal, Western-style and state-provided schooling defines and constitutes “education” for development in the twenty-first century as sanctioned at the global Education for All conferences at Jomtien in Thailand 1990 and Dakar in Senegal in 2000 and as inscribed in the United Nations Millennium Development Goals. The essential features of this taken for granted model of modern education are that children learn primarily from adults about high stakes academic subjects, on a fixed schedule, in an indoor setting that includes particular features (desks, chairs, chalkboards, written teaching and learning materials). Moreover, there is an imagined linear development model from informal, family-provided education concerning daily tasks and survival skills to “modern” schooling systems:

The international development model of education posits that mass, state-sponsored schooling is: (1) central to the creation of a “modern” nation-state; (2) central to the development of “modern” workers and families; and, thus (3) central to a state’s “modern” economic growth and international acceptance. The general conceptualisation of education and development has received critical attention since its inception, but has yet to be significantly challenged. (Kendall, 2009, p. 422)

However, if formal education potentially contributes to democracy mainly indirectly through providing the basic, modern bureaucratic and organisational skills, attitudes and behaviours upon which more explicitly democratic values might be then be built, then its role may be necessary but it is not sufficient. On to a modern, efficient bureaucratic institutional base must be added knowledge and experience of explicitly democratic values and practices in order to contribute to a democratic political culture as well as a bureaucratic, modern one for, as Diamond has argued:

[p]rominent theories of democracy, both classical and modern, have asserted that democracy requires a distinctive set of political values and orientations from its citizens: moderation, tolerance, civility, efficacy, knowledge, participation. (1993, p. 1)

Early on in the development of a literature on political culture, Inkeles (1961) contrasted the components of an ideal type authoritarian political culture with democratic political culture. The former included faith in powerful leaders; hatred of outsiders and perceived deviates; a sense of powerlessness and ineffectiveness; extreme cynicism; suspicion and distrust of others and dogmatism. The converse, a democratic political culture, would embody flexibility, trust, efficacy, a critical open-mindedness, tolerance of other viewpoints and mutual respect for the persons holding them, a belief in the equality of people as human beings, and a respect for evidence in forming opinions. And, as Inkeles put it, an attitude towards authority which is neither blindly submissive nor hostilely rejecting but rather responsible even though always watchful. These facets of a more democratic culture have important implications for the structure, processes and relationships of education beyond bureaucratic organisational efficiency.

The Realities of Schooling in Developing Societies

However, there are two major problems with these ideas. The first is that modernisation theorists assumed that all schools in developing countries actually operated at a minimal level of bureaucratic efficiency – teachers are appointed on

merit and qualifications alone, they turn up to school every day, they are there all day long, they are punctual, they plan their lessons, they mark work, they treat learners equally and fairly according to the school rules and they take only their teacher's salary as a form of income. This is not necessarily the case. Harber and Davies (1997) used Riggs's (1964) theory of "prismatic society" to argue in some detail that many schools (and other modern organisations) in developing countries have both "traditional" and "modern" organisational, social, cultural, economic and behavioural characteristics coexisting side by side within them. The result is an organisation that seems like a modern, bureaucratic school but this is often something of a façade as the school functions quite differently in reality in terms of marked features such as, for example, teacher absenteeism, lateness, un-professionalism, sexual misconduct and corruption as well as cheating in examinations and violent conflict (Harber, & Davies, 1997). In Tanzanian schools, for example, Van Der Steen (2011, p. 162) recently found the following examples of such practices:

- A teacher being physically assaulted by an education officer at the municipal office when complaining about a work-related issue
- A teacher reportedly not being paid salary for five months as she refused to pay "commission" to the accountant in charge
- Teachers ordered to carry out demographic surveys in their neighbourhood on behalf of the municipal office without financial compensation
- The monthly payment of teacher salaries rarely being on time
- A teacher using her influence in the municipal education office not to be transferred to a school she did not want to go to
- Reporting of inaccurate information of progress such as exaggerating the provision of education to disadvantaged children and the number enrolled in schools
- Punitive action against a head teacher who refused to use school funds to provide visiting officials with meals
- Bribery in the allocation of secondary school places to primary school leavers

The second problem, and the one we want to focus on here, is an assumption that schools in developing countries (as elsewhere) also can be, or already are, an institution in which young people learn democratic values and behaviours. This is also not necessarily the case, indeed is often far from being the case. First, however, what do we mean by a democratic school? The following overview or model of a democratic school is based on a number of sources which have attempted to tackle this question in relation to both primary and secondary schools, which includes

Davies, Harber and Schweisfurth (2002, 2005), Trafford (2003), Davies and Kirkpatrick (2000) and Davies (1995). First of all, a democratic school would make clear and explicit its commitment to the values of education for democracy in its published documents – its prospectus, mission statement etc. Its structures and practices would then involve a significant sharing of power over decision-making between key groups – staff, pupils and parents. In practice in most schools in most countries this would mean a significant shifting of power away from senior management and staff to others and particularly pupils. At the whole school level this might well necessitate some form of freely elected school council where, depending on the size of the school, pupils and staff were represented and some form of school governing body where staff, pupils and parents were represented. Such bodies would have some power of decision-making and rule-making over meaningful educational areas of concern such as budgets, staffing, curriculum, pupil and staff discipline/codes of conduct and the use of premises and not just more minor matters like social events or the school tuck shop. The operation of such bodies in terms of language used and scope of decision-making might well vary according to the age of the pupils involved but age is not a reason for excluding pupils from decision-making.

A democratic school culture or ethos would also be characterised by democratic relationships built on trust and mutual respect and therefore corporal punishment would be absent as would other forms of physical punishment and all forms of bullying, whether staff to pupil or pupil to pupil. More peaceful forms of discipline such as peer mediation and restorative justice would tend to prevail instead.

At classroom level pupils would have a say in making class rules of classroom behaviour – a learning contract - and some say about curriculum content (what was to be learned and when), which classroom teaching methods were used and which methods of assessment were used. As a result, more democratic schools tend to be characterised by more classroom variety and engagement in relation to both. Also, in the classroom teaching and learning would not shy away from controversial issues but there would be a clear understanding of the ways they were to be discussed and debated by both staff and pupils. As well as experiencing more democratic relationships in the classroom as a result of the above, knowledge of how wider democracy works would also form part of the curriculum.

For all this to work, both staff and students and parent governors would need to be explicitly trained in democratic skills or capabilities such as speaking skills and putting a case, listening skills, chairing skills, organising and planning skills, assertiveness and conflict resolution skills. No single school would probably ever completely match this model and each would have its own characteristics, some less democratic and some perhaps even more so.

In Harber and Mncube (2012) we look at both the positive evidence for schools being organised along these lines and the opposite, negative evidence that they are

an authoritarian obstacle to democratic development. The good news is that we found many examples of democratic practice in schools in a wide range of developing countries, including, for example, Namibia, South Africa, India, Thailand, the Philippines, Brazil and Ecuador, in terms of: educational policy; democratic school leadership; whole-school decision-making and pupil voice; curriculum decision-making; methods of classroom teaching and learning; democratic forms of discipline; democratic teacher professionalism; explicit programmes of civic education; the development of a democratic school culture; teacher education and school inspection. There was certainly sufficient evidence of democratic practice from developing countries in Africa, Latin America, Asia and the Middle East to confirm that it can be, and is, done where the will, determination and skills are there.

However, although there are many examples of good practice in relation to education for democracy in developing countries, it is also clear that these are still very much in a minority and that there is a range of significant factors or barriers hindering change or progress in this direction. Indeed, the book presents overwhelming evidence of the continuing authoritarian nature of education for most children in developing countries, further confirming that in Africa, Asia, the Middle East and South and Central America and the Caribbean:

In terms of schooling, the dominant or hegemonic model globally, with exceptions that will be discussed later in the book, is authoritarian rather than democratic. Education for and in democracy, human rights and critical awareness is not a primary characteristic of the majority of schooling. While the degree of harshness and despotism within authoritarian schools varies from context to context and from institution to institution, in the majority of schools power over what is taught and learned, how it is taught and learned, where it is taught and learned, when it is taught and learned and what the general learning environment is like is not in the hands of pupils. It is predominantly government officials, headteachers and teachers who decide, not learners. Most schools are essentially authoritarian institutions, however benevolent or benign that authoritarianism is and whatever beneficial aspects of learning are imparted. (Harber, 2004, p. 24)

We now briefly take post-apartheid South Africa (ranked 110th on the UNDP's Human Development Index (out of 169 countries) in 2010 (UNDP, 2010) as a case study of the difficult realities of democratic educational change. In South Africa there is a clear and consistent support for more democratic forms of education in official policy statements and evidence of positive change in a more democratic

direction in some schools and among some teachers in South Africa (e.g. Harber, 2001; Harber, & Muthukrishna, 2000; Mncube, & Harber, 2010). However, there is also evidence of the stubborn persistence of authoritarianism in education. A study of schooling in rural South African schools found that, while 90% of teachers claimed to be using a variety of active teaching methods the responses from pupils and the observations of the researchers strongly suggested that the majority of teachers continued to use traditional, teacher-centred methods of monologue and rote learning. Classroom activity is dominated by three modes: reading, writing and correcting (Nelson Mandela Foundation, 2005).

Studies on the functioning of the new, democratic school governing bodies with learner representation (Mncube, 2005; Bush, & Heystek, 2003; Brown, & Duku, 2008; Ministerial Review Committee, 2004) found that members of governing bodies tended to be male, that principals still played a dominant role in meetings and decision-making processes and that teachers tended to participate in meetings more than other stakeholders. Parents, the numerically dominant group under the legislation, were hampered in many areas by a skills capacity deficit and communication and transportation problems. Learner participation was only moderate and concentrated on fundraising, learner discipline and sports activities. So, while the structural dimension of democratic governance had been established, power relations, i.e. the dominance of the principal, remained much the same.

A study using observation and interviews Hunt (2007), found that corporal punishment was still used in three out of four of her study's schools in the Cape Town area and that learners were subjected to incidents of verbal insult and humiliation. Corporal punishment also remains widespread in rural areas, despite being illegal (Nelson Mandela Foundation, 2005, p. 17). In a recent study of schools in three provinces of South Africa:

Corporal punishment is banned in South Africa, yet such incidents were observed on numerous occasions. For instance, during recess at one school in Pietermaritzburg an act of bullying by a male learner towards a female learner resulted in...six strokes of a stiff plastic tube across the palm of the hand. (Hammett, & Staeheli, 2011, p. 275)

Finally, sexual abuse of female students by male teachers exploits unequal power relationships and sexual violence against girls also remains a particular problem in South African schools. In 2001 Human Rights Watch produced a detailed report entitled *Scared at School: Sexual Violence against Girls in South African Schools*. The report states,

Based on our interviews with educators, social workers, children and parents, the problems of teachers engaging in serious sexual

misconduct with underage female students is widespread. As the testimony offered below demonstrates, teachers have raped, sexually assaulted and otherwise sexually abused girls. Sometimes reinforcing sexual demands with threats of physical violence or corporal punishment, teachers have sexually propositioned girls and verbally degraded them using highly sexualised language. At times, sexual relations between teachers and students did not involve an overt use of force or threats of force; rather teachers would abuse their authority by offering better grades or money to pressure girls for sexual favours or “dating relationships.” (Human Rights Watch, 2001, p. 37)

In 2006 the Minister of Education, Naledi Pandor, simply stated outright that schools were “not safe” for girls (as cited in Motala et al, 2007, p. 93).

Why Democratic Education Remains the Minority Other

While there are particular, contextual reasons for problems of implementing more democratic forms of education in South Africa (Jansen, 2001; Spreen, & Vally, 2010), there are also powerful historical reasons why authoritarianism is deeply embedded in education systems globally and still persists. In Europe in the late nineteenth century schooling provided a means of social and political control, in particular to counter the threat to the state of increasingly industrialised, urbanised and potentially organised working populations. As Green’s study argues, “The task of public schooling was not so much to develop new skills for the industrial sector as to inculcate habits of conformity, discipline and morality that would counter the widespread problems of social disorder” (1990, p. 59). Toffler put it that:

Mass education was the ingenious machine constructed by industrialism to produce the kind of adults it needed ...the solution was an educational system that, in its very structure, simulated this new world...the regimentation, lack of individualisation, the rigid systems of seating, grouping, grading and marking, the authoritarian style of the teacher – are precisely those that made mass public education so effective as an instrument of adaptation for its time and place. (1970, pp. 354-355)

This authoritarian model of schooling with its origins in social and political control gradually extended globally from European societies through colonisation (Altbach, & Kelly, 1978) where the key purpose of schooling was to help to control indigenous populations for the benefit of the colonial power. Even if it was not always entirely successful in this, and indeed in the end helped to sow the seeds of its own destruction, the organisational style of schooling bequeathed by both the

needs of industrialised mass production and then colonialism remains as a firm legacy in many post-colonial societies. So, built into the structures and processes of the dominant model of formal schooling historically is a deeply-routed authoritarian ideology which it is possible, but not easy, to change – and particularly in any large scale manner. And this is as true in many developed countries as it is in many developing countries.

In Harber and Mncube (2012) we look at a wide range of evidence of a range of key factors that contribute to the persistence of school authoritarianism in developing countries. The following are some of them:

- The authoritarian role of the principal or headteacher in many schools in developing countries, the unequal ethnic and gender relations in many schools, the inconsistent use of rules so that pupils were punished for offences (such as being late) for which teachers were not punished
- The continuing and widespread use of physical and other forms of corporal punishment
- The widespread persistence of teacher-centred, transmission models of teaching and learning – Freire’s (1972) banking method of education
- The continued dominance of knowledge-based, traditional examinations leading to a backwash effect on methods of teaching and learning
- The contribution of teacher education to the problem because of “do as I say, not as I do” i.e., teacher educators lecturing in a non-participatory manner to student teachers about how they should use participatory methods in the school classroom, while the students didn’t actually experience them in their own teacher education
- In some countries there is no official political desire for greater democratisation in schools anyway as this would challenge or threaten the dominance of the ruling party or power elite
- Interestingly, a key obstacle to more democratic teaching methods often cited by teachers in developing countries is a shortage of material and human resources – books, teaching aids, class size, and teacher skills and capacity. While these are important issues and having sufficient resources is certainly helpful (and in relation to teacher skills and capacity probably essential) there is some disagreement about whether a more active and participatory approach ultimately requires a plentiful supply of material or physical resources or whether it can still take place in conditions of resource stringency (Schweisfurth, 2011, p. 428; Harber, & Davies,

1997, pp. 24-25). Certainly, the converse is not true – contexts with a plentiful supply of teaching materials do not guarantee the existence of more democracy in schools (Harber, 2004).

- Finally, corruption in education is an issue confronting the introduction of education for democracy in many developing countries (as sometimes elsewhere) because it contradicts some of the basic tenets of democracy such as openness, fairness and social equality (Hallak, & Poisson, 2006).

Conclusion

So, democratic institutions and democratic citizens have increasingly become key political goals for education and development. There is also evidence that schooling can be changed in a democratic direction in a complete way, in substantial ways and in various minor but significant ways in developing countries. Yet such examples still represent the minority of cases as democratic change in schools requires transformational change away from the currently dominant authoritarian model. The literature on educational change (for example: Fullan, 2007) makes it clear that significant shifts in the practices of schools and teachers are rarely achieved and they cannot simply be mandated from above. Pedagogical and organisational practices are stubborn and resistant to change both at the cultural level (Alexander 2000) and at the level of individual teachers (Schweisfurth, 2002).

However, just because something is very difficult and slow to change doesn't mean that nothing should or could be done and perhaps there are even some grounds for a restricted optimism. What, then, is realistically possible and achievable and should be a firm goal for education in the context of developing countries? First, it is important to have the ultimate or eventual goal of democratic education clearly and authoritatively stated in policy documents and the implications thought through at the policy level to provide a legitimising framework – even if not necessarily achievable in the short term on a large scale. South Africa provides a good example of this official commitment. Second, before or at the same time as attempting to change towards more positive, democratic forms of education it is equally important to stop doing harm via education. Before any sort of major or minor educational change in a democratic direction it is, at the very least, vital to stop the direct forms of harm and violence inflicted on young people via schooling. Elsewhere (Harber, 2009:142) the gradual reduction of corporal punishment in schools globally has been described and, similarly, it is to be hoped and expected that increasing international awareness and debates about sexual harassment and abuse in schools will, probably slowly but eventually, stop this practice in schools. Third, reducing the instances of practices such as these would also help with a reduction of un-professionalism and the gradual development of a minimum level of restricted professionalism where a majority, or at least a critical mass, of teachers

and other educational professionals actually turn up and on time, teach and assess competently and impartially and behave in a generally professional manner. This would help to contribute to the development of individuals, institutions, societies and polities that political scientists and sociologists have seen as essentially modern and the social foundation onto which democratic behaviours and institutions can be built. Fourth, and finally, continuing (and continuing writing about, talking about and publicising) the types of work of individuals and organisations involved in more democratic forms of education even though at the moment it remains minority practice is important.

References

- Alexander, R. (2000). *Culture and pedagogy: International comparisons in primary education*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Altbach, P., & Kelly, G. (1978). *Education and colonialism*. London: Longman.
- Aristotle. (1962). *The politics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Beetham, J., & Boyle, K. (1995). *Introducing democracy: 80 questions and answers*. London: Polity Press/UNESCO.
- Brown, B., & Duku, N. (2008). Negotiated identities: Dynamics in parents' participation in school governance in rural Eastern Cape schools and implication for school leadership. *South African Journal of Education*, 28(3), 431-450.
- Bush, T., & Heystek, J. (2003). School governance in the new South Africa. *Compare*, 33(2), 127-138.
- Davies, L. (2011). Learning for state-building: Capacity development, education and fragility. *Comparative Education*, 47(2), 157-180.
- Davies, L. (1999). Comparing definitions of democracy in education. *Compare* 29(2), 127-140.
- Davies, L. (1995). International indicators of democratic schools. In C. Harber (Ed.), *Developing democratic education*. Ticknall: Education Now.
- Davies, L., Harber, C., & Schweisfurth, M. (2002). *Democracy through teacher education*. Birmingham: CIER/CfBT.
- Davies, L., Harber, C., & Schweisfurth, M. (2005). *Democratic professional development*. Birmingham: CIER/CfBT.
- Davies, L., & Kirkpatrick, G. (2000). *The EURIDEM project: A review of pupil democracy in Europe*. London: Children's Rights Alliance.
- Diamond, L. (1993). *Political culture and democracy in developing countries*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Reiner.
- Fagerlind, I., & Saha, L. (1989). *Education and national development: A comparative perspective*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. London: Sheed and Ward.
- Fullan, M. (2007). *The new meaning of educational change*. London: Routledge.
- Green, A. (1990). *Education and state formation*. London: Macmillan.

- Hallak, J., & Poisson, M. (2006). *Corrupt schools, corrupt universities: What can be done?*. Paris: IEP.
- Hammett, D., & Staeheli, L. (2011). Respect and responsibility: Teaching citizenship in South African high schools. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 31(3), 269-276.
- Harber, C. (2009). *Toxic schooling: How schools became worse*. Nottingham: Educational Heretics Press.
- Harber, C. (2004). *Schooling as violence: How schools harm pupils and societies*. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Harber, C. (2001). *State of transition: Post-apartheid educational reform in South Africa*. Oxford: Symposium.
- Harber, C., & Davies, L. (1997). *School management and school effectiveness in developing countries*. London: Cassell.
- Harber, C., & Mncube, V. (2012). *Education, democracy and development*. Oxford: Symposium Books.
- Harber, C., & Muthukrishna, N. (2000). School effectiveness and school improvement in context: The case of South Africa. *School Effectiveness and Improvement*, 11(4), 421-434.
- Human Rights Watch. (2001). *Scared at school: Sexual violence against girls in South African schools*. New York: Human Rights Watch.
- Hunt, F. (2007). *Schooling citizens: a study of policy in practice in South Africa*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Sussex, Brighton, England.
- Inkeles, A. (1969a). Participant citizenship in six developing countries. *American Political Science Review*, 63(4), 1120-1141.
- Inkeles, A. (1969b). Making men modern. *American Journal of Sociology*, 75(2), 208-225.
- Inkeles, A. (1961). National character and modern political systems. In F. L. K. Hsu (Ed.), *Psychological Anthropology* (pp. 172 – 208). Homewood: Horsey Press.
- Inkeles, A., & Smith, D. (1974). *Becoming modern*. London: Heinemann.
- Jansen, J. (2001). Explaining non-change in education reform after apartheid: Political symbolism and the problem of policy implementation. In J. Jansen & Y. Sayed (Eds.), *Implementing education policies: The South African experience*. Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press.
- Kendall, N. (2009). International development education. In R. Cowen & M. Kazamias (Eds.), *International handbook of comparative education* (Springer International Handbooks of Education, Vol. 22). Springer: Dordrecht.
- Leftwich, A. (Ed.). (1996). *Democracy and development*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Meighan, R. (1994). *The freethinkers' guide to the educational universe*. Nottingham: Educational Heretics Press.

- Ministerial Review Committee on School Governance. (2004). *Review of school governance in South African public schools* (Tech, Rep.). Pretoria, South Africa: Department of Education, Government Press.
- Mncube, V. (2005). *School governance in the democratisation of education in South Africa: The interplay between policy and practice*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, England.
- Mncube, V., & Harber, C. (2010). Chronicling educator practices and experiences in the context of democratic schooling and quality education. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 30(6), 614–624.
- Motala, S., Dieltiens, V., Carrim, N., Kgobe, P., Moyo, G. & Rembe, S. (2007). *Educational access in South Africa: Country analytic review* (Project, rep.). Falmer, UK: Consortium for research on educational access, transitions and equity (CREATE).
- Nelson Mandela Foundation. (2005). *Emerging voices*. Cape Town: HSRC Press.
- Riggs, F. (1964). *Administration in developing countries: The theory of prismatic society*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Schweisfurth, M. (2011). Learner-centred education in developing country contexts: from solution to problem? *International Journal of Educational Development* 31(5), 425-432.
- Schweisfurth, M. (2002). *Teachers, democratisation and educational reform in Russia and South Africa*. Oxford: Symposium.
- Spreen, C. & Vally, S. (2010). Prospects and pitfalls: A review of post-apartheid education policy research and analysis in South Africa. *Comparative Education*, 46(4), 429-448.
- Toffler, A. (1970). *Future shock*. London: Bodley Head.
- Trafford, B. (2003). *School councils, school democracy and school improvement*. Leicester: SHA.
- UNDP. (2010). *Human development report*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Van Der Steen, N. (2011). *School improvement in Tanzania: School culture and the management of change*. PhD Thesis, Institute of Education, University of London, London, England.

Author Details

Clive Harber is Emeritus Professor of International Education at the University of Birmingham and an Associate of the University of South Africa. Contact address: School of Education, University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham, B15 2TT, UK. E-mail: c.r.harber@bham.ac.uk

Vusi Mncube is an Associate Professor at the University of South Africa. P O Box 392, UNISA, 0003, Pretoria, South Africa. Email: Mncubvs@unisa.ac.za

© Copyright 2012. The authors, Clive Harber and Vusi Mncube, assigns to *Other Education: The Journal of Educational Alternatives*, and to educational and non-profit institutions a non-exclusive license to use this document for personal use and in courses of instruction, provided that the article is used in full and this copyright statement is reproduced. The author also grants a non-exclusive right to *Other Education: The Journal of Educational Alternatives* to publish this document in full on the World Wide Web. Any other usage is prohibited without the express permission of the author.