

MIDLANDS STATE UNIVERSITY



FACULTY OF EDUCATION

**DEPARTMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATIONS,
MANAGEMENT AND CURRICULUM STUDIES**

**The models of democracy that can be suitably applied to Zimbabwe school
education system**

BY

Magama Trust

(R113399T)

**A RESEARCH PROJECT SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATIONS, MANAGEMENT AND CURRICULUM STUDIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE MASTER OF
EDUCATION IN PHILOSOPHY DEGREE.**

GWERU, ZIMBABWE

NOVEMBER 2017

APPROVAL FORM

MIDLANDS STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATIONS, MANAGEMENT
AND CURRICULUM STUDIES

The undersigned certify that they have read and recommended to the Midlands
State University for acceptance a research project titled: **THE MODELS OF
DEMOCRACY THAT CAN BE SUITABLY APPLIED TO ZIMBABWE SCHOOL
EDUCATION SYSTEM**

Submitted by

TRUST MAGAMA

(R113399T)

In partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Master of Education in
Philosophy Degree.

.....
...Supervisor	Date
.....
....Chairperson	Date
.....
....External Examiner	Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost I would like to thank God the Creator for affording me an opportunity, intellectual and emotional strength to pursue and stay as well as finish the course of my masters studies, my long-esteemed dream.

It could have been impossible to produce this study without the assistance and support of different individuals. I would like to express my deep heartfelt appreciation for the role played by my supervisor Dr. I Jeko. He was really patient with my mistakes and he gave me an untiring guidance, support and expertise during the process of undertaking the study.

I would like also to thank my beloved for her unconditional support during the course of my study. Finally I would like to thank my parents and my relatives for their moral and financial support they rendered me during the research.

DEDICATION

This research project is dedicated to my parents Mr. J and Mrs. J Magama as well as my sisters Beauty, Valentine and Ellen for their tireless financial and moral support to me during the research.

ABSTRACT

The study explored the models of democracy that can be suitably applied to Zimbabwe school education system. This was driven by the fact that most African countries have not adopted proper models democracy in their institutions including schools. The study was also necessitated by the fact that democracy has historically proved to be closely to human flourishing. (Glaeser, Ponzetto & Shleifer, 2006; Halperin and Weinstein, 2005; Mangu, 2004; Pinar, 2003; and Carr, 2000). In light of the foregoing, the study argued that there are many models of democracy that can be suitably applied to Zimbabwe school education system. The theoretical analytical approach was used to critically analyze the issues under study. The study established that six models of democracy can be suitably applied to Zimbabwe school education system and these are classical democracy, direct democracy, indirect democracy, protective democracy, deliberative democracy and cosmopolitan democracy. The study, therefore, recommends that the government ensure that democracy is a chief ingredient in the education system. Various models of democracy ought to be embraced in the Zimbabwean education and be implemented in an integrated approach. There is also a need to have ubiquitous workshops with all the stakeholders in the education system on the importance of democracy in school. Learners must be allowed to have their freedom freely expressed in the schools without threats from the responsible authorities. There is need by the government and other organizations to enlighten learners in the schools so that they are empowered in regard to democracy. The study also recommends that any change in the education system ought to be a brain child of all the stakeholders and not a reform from above. There is also a need to jealously guard the freedoms, rights and opportunities of teachers, pupils and other stakeholders from infringement by the government. Deliberation ought to characterize the education institutions in the country and every learning must be characterized by critical thinking and rationality by all and finally any decision in the schools must be rendered valid after having voted for it and the majority endorsed it.

CONTENTS

APPROVAL FORM	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
DEDICATION.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
CHAPTER ONE	1
THE PROBLEM AND ITS CONTEXT	1
1.1 Introduction.....	1
1.2 Background to the study	1
1.3 Thesis statement.....	3
1.4 Research Questions.....	3
1.5 Significance of the study.....	3
1.5.1 Educational Practitioners and Teachers.....	4
1.5.2 The Researcher.....	4
1.5.3 Policy Makers and Curriculum Developers	4
1.5.4 The Government	5
1.6 Delimitations and limitations of the study	5
1.6.1 Delimitations.....	5
1.6.2 Limitations.....	5
1.7 Assumptions of the study.....	5
1.8 Definition of the key terms	6
1.8.1 Democracy	6
1.8.2 Deliberative democracy	6
1.8.3 Development	6
1.8.4 Education.....	6
1.9 Methodology	6
1.10 Chapter outline.....	7
CHAPTER TWO	8
THE CONCEPT OF DEMOCRACY	8
2.1 Introduction.....	8
2.2 What is democracy?.....	8
2.3 The history of democracy	12
2.3.1 Democracy in ancient times	12
2.3.2 Democracy since classical Greece era	20

2.4 Models of democracy	25
2.4.1 Classical democracy.....	25
2.4.2 Direct democracy	27
2.4.3 Indirect democracy	28
2.4.4 Protective democracy.....	29
2.4.5 Deliberative democracy	30
2.4.6 Developmental democracy	33
2.4.7 Cosmopolitan democracy	34
2.5 Principles of democracy	36
2.5.1 Citizen participation	36
2.5.2 Equality.....	36
2.5.3 Political tolerance.....	37
2.5.4 Accountability	37
2.5.5 Transparency.....	38
2.5.6 Regular, free and fair elections.....	38
2.5.7 Economic freedom	38
2.5.8 Control of the abuse of power.....	39
2.5.9 Bill of rights	39
2.5.10 Accepting the results of elections.....	39
2.5.11 Human rights.....	40
2.5.12 Multi-party system.....	40
2.5.13 Rule of law	41
2.6 Summary.....	41
CHAPTER THREE	42
DEMOCRACY, EDUCATION AND DEVELOPMENT	42
3.1 Introduction.....	42
3.2 Democracy Development Debate	42
3.3 Democracy and Development	44
3.4 Democracy and Education	50
3.4 Summary.....	53
CHAPTER FOUR.....	55
MODELS OF DEMOCRACY AND ZIMBABWEAN EDUCATION SYSTEM.....	55
4.1 Introduction.....	55
4.2 Relevance of the models of democracy in the Zimbabwean educations system	55
4.2.1 Relevance of classical democracy to Zimbabwean education system.....	56

4.2.2 Relevance of direct democracy to Zimbabwean education system.....	57
4.2.3 Relevance of indirect democracy to Zimbabwean education system	59
4.2.4 Relevance of protective democracy to Zimbabwean education system	60
4.2.5 Relevance of deliberative democracy to Zimbabwean education system	62
4.2.6 Relevance of cosmopolitan democracy to Zimbabwean education system.....	64
4.3 Proposed model of democracy for education system in Zimbabwe.....	65
4.4 Summary.....	69
CHAPTER FIVE	70
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	70
5.1 Introduction.....	70
5.2 Summary of chapters.....	70
5.3 Findings and conclusions from research.....	71
5.4 Recommendations.....	79
5.5 Suggestion for further study	80
REFERENCES.....	82

CHAPTER ONE

THE PROBLEM AND ITS CONTEXT

1.1 Introduction

This chapter focuses on background to the study, thesis statement, research objectives, delimitations, limitations, assumptions, definition of key terms, methodology and it ends with an outline of chapters. Hence contextualizes and introduces in entire study.

1.2 Background to the study

Worldwide, democracy has been echoed as a rallying cry of the human race in any of the social, economic and political institutions. Acrimonious debate has been witnessed among the contemporary scholars on whether democracy is a special ingredient for human entire development. Halperin and Weinstein (2005) have revealed that embracing democracy in any country can lead to expanding economic development and total social well-being.

At international level, democracy is one of the prime universal and core values and principles of the United Nations. It is wholly based on the freely expressed will of people and linked to the rule of law and the exercise of human rights and fundamental freedoms. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), adopted in 1948, has inspired the world and has contributed much to the global acceptance of democracy as a universal value. Due to the importance of democracy to human beings, the United Nations tirelessly supports democracy around the world as revealed by the work of United Nations Democracy Fund (UNDEF).

The countries at the World Summit Conference (2005) on assessing UN achievements and progress made towards implementation of the 2000 Millennium Declaration, agreed that, democracy is a worldwide value grounded on the freely conveyed will of people to define the

political, economic, social and cultural systems and their complete participation in all aspects of their lives. This shows that there is an irresistible unanimous view among most world countries, that democracy is an empowerment tool to be placed in the hands of people in any country and this can be done through education since schools are the best socializing agents.

In Africa, the African Union member states also take democracy seriously (Mangu, 2004), as it affects the entire aspects of the people's lives. The *African Charter on Democracy, Elections and Governance* binds the signatories to promote and develop necessary legislative and policy frameworks to establish and strengthen a culture of democracy. The emerging question will therefore be: To what extent has democracy been embraced in African states, especially, in schools as the best social institutions? This question is of vital importance bearing the importance of democracy in the education system. The existence of democratic principles in schools enables the system to promote social justice among the learners. Having been imbued with democratic spirit at school level, the learners will continue propagating democracy during their after-school life, hence leading to the existence of better societies and human flourishing. Studies have revealed that democracy in schools is so essential that it leads to better academic performance, high levels of rationality among school leavers leading to the existence of better harmonious societies.

However, despite the importance of democracy in schools, evidences from most African countries shows that schools are still staggering on adopting the proper democratic models in their systems. In Zimbabwe, there is evidence of some undemocratic issues in the school education system and this can be attributed to the politics of the country or to the ignorance of the educational practitioners and policy makers in regard to the importance of democracy. Thus, this study will open the intellectual eyes of all parties at play probably leading to the successful adoption of proper model of democracy in Zimbabwean schools. The introduction

and launch of the controversial National Pledge at primary and secondary schools in Zimbabwe by the Ministry of Primary and Secondary Education (MPSE), which the press and analysts view as indoctrination and an infringement of children's rights, gives evidence that democracy is marred in Zimbabwean schools. This exists because there is lack of philosophical orientation among the parties involved in regard to the issue of democracy in schools. Such philosophical murky waters show that philosophical aid is desperately needed in regard to the model of democracy that Zimbabwean schools should do good to embrace. This renders this study to be essential as it will reveal the models of democracy that can be suitably applied to Zimbabwe school education system.

1.3 Thesis statement

In the light of the importance of democracy in education, what models of democracy that can be suitably applied to Zimbabwe school education system so as to achieve quality education and for the betterment of the society and the country at large?

1.4 Research Questions

This study will be guided by the following research questions:

- What is democracy?
- What is the relationship among democracy, education and development?
- What is the relevance of different models of democracy for school education system in Zimbabwe?

1.5 Significance of the study

This study is potentially significant to the following: educational practitioners, the researcher, educational policy makers and the government.

1.5.1 Educational Practitioners and Teachers

The study will help educational practitioners to note the relevance of democracy in educational development in the schools. By unfolding the models of democracy that can be suitably applied in Zimbabwean school education system, these experts will develop strategies to ensure that the education system in Zimbabwe have advanced standards. The study will also inform teachers, as implementers of educational policies, to make informed decisions about incorporating democratic principles in their day today activities in schools such as in teaching and in sports.

1.5.2 The Researcher

It will also be of use to the researcher as it will expose him to the world of educational problems helping him to see the challenges that the education systems are facing due to the failure to fully embrace democracy. Thus developing a critical view of the educational problems in Zimbabwe and assist by providing useful knowledge to the concerned.

1.5.3 Policy Makers and Curriculum Developers

The research will be of value to policy makers and curriculum developers as they would be guided by this study in choosing the best democratic model for Zimbabwean schools and the quality of education in the country. The curriculum they will formulate will be pregnant with democratic principles, leading to improved quality education in the country. The policy makers will be informed not to make policies that infringe with the human rights and the democratic fundamentals of the learners.

1.5.4 The Government

The government will also be helped by this study as it will inform the desperate need of proper handling of democracy in Zimbabwean schools for the country to have better graduates, educational system and better societies. Hence it may endorse the restructuring of the education system leading to human flourishing.

1.6 Delimitations and limitations of the study

1.6.1 Delimitations

On the intellectual boundaries, the study will focus on democracy and its relation with the school education system. The study will then narrow down to unfold the models of democracy that can be suitably applied to Zimbabwe school education system.

1.6.2 Limitations

The researcher is likely to be affected by the researcher bias as he will be synthesizing and critically analyzing the data from voluminous sources in trying to find out the models of democracy that can be suitably applied to Zimbabwe school education system. This was reduced as the researcher would lean to the guidance of the supervisor who acted as a critical friend interrogating my analysis.

1.7 Assumptions of the study

It is assumed that democracy has been implemented in most Zimbabwean schools, both rural and urban.

1.8 Definition of the key terms

1.8.1 Democracy

Refers to a type of social organization which provides individual human beings a maximum of liberty, security of individual rights, and equality of opportunity for intellectual, social and economic advancement (Larry Diamond, 2004; Ghali, 2002).

1.8.2 Deliberative democracy

It is a form or model of democracy in which deliberation is central to decision making (Gutmann and Thompson, 2004; Chambers, 2003; Cunningham, 2002).

1.8.3 Development

It refers to the full range of economic, social, political and cultural improvement and advancement to which the human beings aspire (Rist, 2014; Ghali, 2002).

1.8.4 Education

Education refers to the slow and expert process of extracting the concealed potentialities of conception and dedication, in conflict with indoctrination (Jackson, 2011; Adeyemi and Adeyinka, 2002).

1.9 Methodology

The chosen way to systematically solve the research problem is referred to as research methodology (Kothari, 2004). This study employed the theoretical analytical approach. This research approach is important as it would allow the researcher to critically engage in models of democracy that can be suitably applied to Zimbabwe school education system. The researcher chose to employ the theoretical analytical approach in this study because it is very

philosophical requiring the researcher to look at issues from a critical philosophical stand point. The design gives room for critically analyzing sundry sources of information related to the study topic in the lens of the study's objectives.

1.10 Chapter outline

This thesis has five chapters. Chapter one is an introductory chapter focusing on: background to the study, thesis statement, research objectives, delimitations, limitations, assumptions, definition of key terms, methodology and it ended with a chapter outline. Chapter two will deal with an in-depth analysis on the concept democracy dealing with its definition, history, theories types and principles. Chapter three will be a critical analysis of the relationship among democracy, education and development in the world. Chapter four will unfolds the relevance of different models of democracy for education system in Zimbabwe and will give a proposed model of democracy in schools. Chapter five will be the last chapter highlighting the conclusions, summary and recommendations of the study.

CHAPTER TWO

THE CONCEPT OF DEMOCRACY

2.1 Introduction

This chapter explore the concept democracy focusing on its definitions, history, theories, models and principles of democracy. These aspects will be looked on to ensure that the research is grounded on a firm theoretical base such that the findings or the proposed models of democracy in the Zimbabwean school education system will be a reliable finding. Thus for this to be achieved professional literature is going to be critically examined in regard to the definitions of democracy, its history, its theories, varied models and some principles of democracy. The chapter will finish up with a summary.

2.2 What is democracy?

Democracy cannot be defined in one way because it is a complex concept which is certainly not amenable to a single definition by the scholars (Akindiyo, 2015). This is so because of various experiences of different countries in regard to what democracy is to them (Kothari, 2007; Kasongo, 2005). Generally most of the people in the world embrace the fact that democracy is a chief ingredient in human life. However they disagree on what it really means to human beings. According to Gallie (1956) democracy is fundamentally a contested concept, a focus of endless disputes that, even though not resolvable by argument of any kind, are never the less continued by effortlessly highly regarded arguments and evidence.

Indeed, attempts at a complete and stagnant definition of democracy are not only beleaguered by problems, they are also anti-democratic, determined to control and enclose something that, by its very nature, must act in response to the varying and compound needs of people over

time. It is democracy's dynamism, its sensitivity to the will of the people that must be central to any definition of democracy. In this vein, Jacques Derrida (2006) rejoices the multiplicitous feature of democracy in his understanding that democracy's 'emancipatory promise' is constantly to come.

David Collier and Steven Levitsky (1997) posit that democracy has been given more than a hundred definitions which brings confusion in the academic world. As an upshot some scholars try to group these definitions into the following groups: economic, social, communitarian or political definitions. It must be pointed out that the first of these three categories tend to define democracy in terms of the outcomes, for example the equalization of wealth, income, status or maintenance of a feeling of belonging in a community. However the political category is different because in this regard democracy is defined by its procedures and institutions rather than its outcomes. Whatever outcomes resulting from a proper procedure expected during the process, are accepted.

In the face of this bitter divergence of conception in regard to what democracy is, some scholars resorted to the etymology of the word democracy. The term democracy as noted by Lindell and Scott (1999) comes from the Greek words which means rule of the people. It is in this light that Larry Diamond (2004) argues that democracy is a system of government with the following four elements: a system for selecting and substituting the government through free and fair elections; active involvement of the citizens or people in the politics or civic life; protection of the rights of all citizens and rule of law in which the laws and procedures apply equally to all people.

From the above it is crystal clear that democracy is a system of the government where the people's voices are heard and respected by those in power. It is in the same intellectual vein that the United States president Abraham Lincoln (1863) defined democracy as government of

the people, by the people and for the people. A critical analyser can be prompted to pose the questions to Lincoln's definition of democracy with a strong critical impetus: who are these people? Do people refer to those in positions or out of positions? These questions open a tin of snails in the philosophical world.

In another view, Schumpeter (2003) gave a procedural definition of democracy by criticising the eighteenth century philosophy of democracy. This eighteenth century philosophy of democracy states that, democracy is an arrangement for arriving at political decisions which recognises a common good by making individuals vote expressing their will. It must be argued that there is no "common good" to be reached by all through rational argument. Even those with good intentions can disagree on what is the best for the society. Moreover, if people agree on the common good or ends, it is logical that they cannot all agree on the means. In this regard one can note that Schumpeter criticises the orthodox doctrine of democracy. Schumpeter (2003) sees democracy as the competition of leaders for votes and argued that the will of the people is not genuine but manufactured by the leader.

Generally, the debates over definitions of democracy can be understood as belonging in one of two groups. The first is echoed by the minimalist, 'scientific' definition of democracy, which argues that the intrinsic elitism of representative institutions is a small price to pay for functionality, civil rights and justice. This position has a long account, which goes back to Thomas Hobbes; but it was most interestingly justified by Joseph Schumpeter in the face of fascism and has undergone its most considerable revision in the recent work of John Rawls (Hobbes, 2002; Rawls, 2001; Schumpeter, 1947). The second broad class asserts that democracy should be more all-encompassing, with all citizens, not just the elites, having an equal part in the decision-making process. Central to this understanding of democracy were Jurgen Habermas' understanding of the role of communicative action in creating a politics of

freeing, and Ernest Laclau's and Chantal Mouffe's backing of a radical democracy that embraces difference (Habermas, 1987; Laclau and Mouffe, 1985). From both the above views, one can say democracy is a liberal, equal system where all the people, elites and citizens, are involved in decision making.

Sonnreich (2008) argues that democracy is a system of governance that solicits to maximise three elements, that is, accountability, representation and participation. Accountability means that every person must be answerable to someone. Thus in a democratic society any social, economic, moral or political ills; needs someone to give a satisfactory answer as to why the state of affairs is like that. Sonnreich goes on to say that the judiciary, legislative and executive arms of the government ought to be answerable for any cause. Representation, as noted by Sonnreich (2008), refers to the fact that in democracy people give their leaders mandate and credibility. Thus without the people, the leaders are nothing. This, however, is problematic because democracy is also about voting and that process benefits majorities more than the minorities since the decision to be followed after voting is that of the majority. Thus the burning question will be how the minorities be assured of proper representation? This question still leads a perennial debate among the scholars. Sonnreich also insists that democracy must be a government system where everyone participates in the social, economic and political life without restraint.

Regardless of the divergence of views by many scholars on the proper definition of democracy, in this research democracy is defined as a way of group decision making characterised by equality among the participants at an essential stage of collective decision making. From this definition there are some key aspects to be taken note of. These are collective decision making and equality in participation. The researcher boldly argues that from an examination of most of the literature on definitions of democracy, these are essential ingredients in the concept of

democracy. Thus with all the literature on defining democracy it is essential to trace the history of democracy so as to get more glimpse on this concept.

2.3 The history of democracy

Many scholars believes that democracy can only be traced from the Greek classical states such Athens. Thus by doing this they are arguing that there was no democracy in other societies in the world. The burden of this research in this regard is to reveal that democracy can be traced in various primitive societies in the world, and in traditional African societies. Thus what is regarded by many scholars as the standard history of democracy, is not really the complete history of democracy. As it will be unfolded, a more robust engagement with the global history of democracy undercuts the belief that democracy is a Western idea, and has the potential to contribute significantly to better political theory. Views of many scholars on the history of democracy will be critically discussed in this research in order to provide an accurate history of democracy. The history of democracy will be traced from ancient times to modern times.

2.3.1 Democracy in ancient times

Josephus (1700) states a serious problem in the intellectual world when he questions why most individuals resort to the Greeks only when trying to understand concepts such as democracy. This problem highlighted by Josephus is to be corrected by this research. This section seeks to be a curative to the problem highlighted by Josephus. It seeks to probe deeper into the ancient history of democracy than is normally permitted or well-known, back into a time prior to the developments of classical Athens, when the earliest signs of organized society and complex governmental systems emerged across the ancient world societies.

Hattersley (1930) developed a remarkably depiction of the history of democracy. In his book he begins with a chapter focusing on *Primitive Democracy*, revealing that there is much evidence to propose that democracy was practised even by our most remote ancestors. He also deliberates democratic thought in the Middle Ages and the impact of the Reformation on the escalation of democracy, discovering evidence that concepts such as *rule by consent* were being debated throughout the 13th to 15th centuries. Nevertheless, apart from his early and brief affirmations to primitive societies, Hattersley's hallucination of the history of democracy remains Euro-centric.

In contrast to Hattersley, Muhlberger and Paine (1993) argues that most people in the world can call on some of their local tradition on which democracy is manifested. To prove their argument, these two scholars focused on the examples of democratic governance in contexts of traditional Chinese village life, African tribal societies, ancient Indian states and Native American societies. Thus they established that democracy does not only have a far richer and more multifaceted history than is normally accepted, but also that, if one fail to admit this alternative legacy of democracy, he or she is in effect narrowing his or her vision of human political history. This universal history of democracy is consistent with the view of Amartya Sen, who argues that democracy can be understood as a universal value with global rather than Western origins. Sen (2003) gave a reason why democracy must not be traced from Western countries only such as Greece. He posits that the advocating of pluralism, basic liberties and diversity, can be found in the history of many world societies. In this light one can note that primitive societies in the world were democratic in verity. In the same vein Goody (2006) says that the notion that democracy only appeared as a feature of modern western societies, is a dangerous simplification because there are many early political systems which had consultative procedures intended to decide the will of the people.

This subject of exploring the deeper history of democracy formed the central motivation of John Keane (2009) in his work, *The Life and Death of Democracy*. In his attempt to find out a comprehensive history of democracy, Keane unfolded many previously unacknowledged democratic moments and concludes that democracy's universality emerges from its active obligation to what might be called pluriversality. This can be understood as the longing of the democratic ideal to shelter the weak and to empower people ubiquitously, so that they can continue living their different lives on earth unconstrained from the pride and prejudice of tyrants and tycoons. In this regard, it is clear as the sky that the history of democracy cannot be traced from the Greece city states only. It is the intention of this work to unfold the evidences that shows that democracy predates the ancient civilization of Greece, as most scholars believes exclusively.

Studies reveals that long before the pre-historic peoples clustered together around fires or under trees, to deliberate and discuss the issues facing their communities. In the book, *Democracy and Despotism in Primitive Societies*, Glassman the author identifies campfire democracy. Glassman argues that this type of democracy was at work in hunting and gathering societies, where the need for synchronised food collection and defensive strategies gave rise to some of the original forms of collective decision-making. He concluded by arguing that these, took on various political and judicial functions (Glassman, 1986). Later, in the more classy horticultural or herding tribal societies, kinship democracy is said to have developed. This entailed of a more complicated system, in which the council of the whole clan gather to send off representatives to the broader tribal assembly (Glassman, 1986). In the light of Glassman's argument one can be prompted to note that democracy was even present in the precolonial states in many African societies such as Mapungubwe, Great Zimbabwe, Mutapa, Torwa, among many. These states had councils and assemblies where each citizen had the right to speak and vote on social,

administrative and political matters, hence unfolding the existence of democracy in the long past.

In the city state of Shuruppak, which had its political and economic zenith from 2600 to 2350 BC, studies reveals that, power was shared between the temple priests and a second chamber of magistrates, with more ordinary and common concerns, who formed a plural executive and had limited powers and a revolving tenure (Bailkey, 1967). Such dealings, as noted by Oppenheim (1969), were stretched in later city-states such as Sippar, which, from 1890 to 1590 BC, appears to have been governed by a twin-chamber assembly: an upper house of nobility and a lower house of commoners. This was often the case in Attica, the upper house comprised of the more senior, qualified and wealthy members of the society, who interchanged leadership of the various magisterial and administrative positions on an yearly basis, while the lower house encompassed of the free adult male population (Leick, 2001).

Furthermore, assemblies were also evidenced in the great empires of the ancient Middle East. For instance, the population of the Assyrian capital, Ashur, was able to congregate in an assembly which got agreement under the guidance of the more senior, wealthy and dominant members of the community. These assemblies were often beckoned when differences of opinion between the palace and the elders reached a stalemate. Here Schemel (2000) argues that historical documents describe assemblies of citizens discussing for days where the majority votes were frequently sought after and reached and it was possible that the minority views would raise the problem again if its legal resolution was a failure.

This suggests that democracy can be traced universally and not from the Greeks only. The power of the state was balanced by a flourishing private sector, as the Assyrian merchants grew in wealth, and consequently in influence. The great merchant families appear to have assembled in a building commonly known as the city house where they made decisions on moneymaking

policy, fixed the rates of export taxes and controlled the relations with Anatolian rulers on whose collaboration and security, the caravans and resident merchants depended on (Leick, 2001).

Examples of sophisticated democratic assemblies can also be found amongst the ancient Israelites. The book of Exodus reveals that Israelite leaders such as Moses were selected through a mandate coming directly from God, which was confirmed by the assembly of elders (Mullen, 1980). In this vein, Wolf (1947) demonstrates the evidence of councils and bodies of elders throughout several of the key books of the Old Testament, in an era which saw the Israelites pass through a tempestuous time in their political history. Wolf notes that there was a democratic relationship in the history of the Israelites.

In the same vein, these assemblies appear to have been organised for both religious and political purposes and they were held at the city gate or at the door of the tabernacle, that is, the sanctuary. The more elderly, experienced or gifted speakers amongst them tended to be widely respected, and hence they dominated much of the proceedings. When deliberations came to a close, a proclamation was made that repeated the vital decisions and announced the people's accord. Wolf (1947) adds that later during times of monarchy, such assemblies continued to exert strong advisory powers, if not full veto power, over the king. One can there note that the potential for despotism was kept in check by the people's assembly, and the actions of the king required the approval of a complex bureaucratic hierarchy of temple officials, prophets, priests, courtiers and, in some cases, the entire body of citizens (Martin and Snell, 2005). In this light one can argue that the origin of democracy precedes classical Greece.

There is a scholarly controversy on whether Phoenician cities (such as Sidon, Tyre, Arwad, Byblos, Beirut and Ugarit on the eastern edge of the Mediterranean, around present-day Lebanon), had their own form of democratic government before Athens. The debate is also on

whether Phoenician trade into the Greek sphere of influence contributed to the intellectual environment that gave rise to the Athenian model, particularly via earlier city-states identified by Eric Robinson as the first democracies (Robinson, 1997). Regrettably, the Phoenicians were ill-served by their stationery. The papyrus on which they used their phonetic alphabet to record their business, diplomatic and their political history has mostly perished. Despite the challenge, this research gave ample time to draw together the threads of available evidence about the constitutions of the Phoenician states and about the Phoenician contribution to the Greek experiments with democratic forms prior to the word *demokratia* was coined and before democratic practice was established in Athens.

In line with the afore-said, the rise of the Phoenician cities depended to a large extent on the kings' coordination of free sailors, who in turn required autonomy to trade all around the world, distant from the influence of their kings. These traders were biblically termed the 'merchant princes', and it is evident that they formed councils to assist the kings in the administration of complexities of their cities, and subsequently they gained some power (Isaiah 23 verse 8). The earliest available material regarding Phoenician politics is found among the Amarna Letters, that is, the Egyptian clay tablets containing many diplomatic reports from the mid-fourteenth century BC (Moran, 1992). The Amarna Letters mentions councils of elders with whom local kings consulted on important matters of the state and who could even frustrate a king's will (Moran, 1992). Another significant source relating to constitutional provisions in a Phoenician city, as noted by Goedicke (1975), is the Report of Wenamun. This report dates from the early part of the 11th century BC, about 250 years after the Amarna Letters, and it endorses that deliberative municipal forums were still blossoming in the Phoenician city of Byblos. Scholars argues that the Phoenician traders brought some democratic culture to the Greeks, who then developed it to a mature stage. Thus the evidence revealed, establishes significant democratic experimentation in Phoenician cities throughout their history as from 1500 to 300 BC and also

unfolds that the Greek Athenian democracy was an output of the Phoenician proto-democratic principles.

Democracy was also present in traditional African societies, long back before the encounter of the Africans with the Europeans. Most scholars, especially the Eurocentric ones, tends to tissue reject the reality that the traditional African societies were democratic to a certain degree. These scholars only align the Africans with barbarism and docility, and argue Africans to be like senseless creatures who cannot lead to the development of history. Ample evidence in this research reveals that democracy can also be traced from the traditional African societies.

The broadly held belief that democracy as an administrative system was unknown in most African societies until the colonialists introduced it is increasingly brought into question in this study. While it is true that there were numerous ethnic groups on the African continent that appeared lawless, such groups were not in any way confined to Africa. As this research will unfold, a good number of African ethnic groups had existing democratic practices governing their daily activities before the coming of the colonialists. Joe Teffo (2002), for example, posits that the Africans were in the past not ruled against their will. Teffo emphasizes that the people in Africa always had a voice and representation in their governance through their traditional systems, which included kingships and ruling councils. Thus one can note that it should not be difficult for an unbiased mind to perceive signs of democracy in traditional African political life.

Furthermore, Dia in Deng pin point with the certainty that the traditional African systems of governance was democratic indeed. Dia posits that despite the ranked system of traditional governments, these were normally governed by agreement and comprehensive participation through group representation at the central level and village councils at the local level (Dia, cited in Deng, 2004). This is in harmony with the following words of Ake (1996) who said that

traditional African political systems were filled with democratic standards. It must be pointed out that they were consistently patrimonial and consciousness was communal upon which everything was everybody's business, prompting a strong stress on participation. The standards of accountability in African Societies were even stricter than in Western societies (Ake, 1996).

This clearly reveals that democracy was evident in many societies in the whole world and in African societies specifically. Traditionally, African families had a division of labour which made every member of the family a respectable provider to the welfare of one's family. Under this division of labour arrangement, each one had a say in the total functioning of one's family and most decisions were arrived at by consensus, each individual clearly articulating issues related to that person's specific tasks. The clan operated under the governance of a clan leader, usually chosen by unanimity. All the clan members had a voice in the running of the clan, even on issues such as getting rid of clan heads who failed to treat clan members with respect. The largest unit in African societies was the ethnic group, which was a throng of clans that shared common origins, historical and cultural traditions, language, and a mutually accepted way of life. Although there was a significant number of kingships among these groups and kings were born into their positions, most of them knew that they could be toppled if they mistreated their subjects, and the constitutional checks as well as dual-sex authority measures guarded against unlimited power (Robinson, 1986).

Furthermore, division of labour was practised strictly. The men were doing the hunting, mostly of wild game, while the women focussed on gathering edible plants; but the leadership and guidance were duties for all the people in the entire village. Conflict resolution was a very well-practised technique among the African people. It must be noted that the affairs regarding the well-being of the group were debated by everyone, and propositions and recommendations were wholly discussed, until a compromise was reached. Among the herdsmen and pastoralists (like

the Ashanti, Oyo, Benin, Songhai, Mali, and Ngoni in West Africa; Buganda, Bunyoro, and Ankole in East Africa; Mwenemutapa in Central Africa, and the Zulu) age groups were administrative units, the councils of elders were in overall control, and the public had an observable input to all its affairs by attending village assembly meetings. Most of the disputes in African societies were settled in open discussions in these meetings, and decisions were reached by consensus. Thus democracy has deep roots in African indigenous systems of governance.

Since a good number of Africa's ethnic groups developed intricate socio-political administrative systems that gave all people a voice in governance, emphasized group participation, could get rid of despotic-unpopular leaders, privileged agreement over conflict in decision-making and governance generally, and had an efficient judicial systems that shielded an individual's rights, freedoms and property, those groups deserve to be included in a history of democracy.

2.3.2 Democracy since classical Greece era

Many scholars believe that the standard history of democracy originated in classical Greek states probably from the 5th century BC because that is when the idea and its institutions bounced into life, fully formed, in Athens, after the restructurings of Cleisthenes. The notion that Athenian democracy was in some way exceptional and superior to comparable experiments elsewhere, has today attained the position of intellectual orthodoxy. It must be pointed that to contest the idea that Greece was the home of the first democracies is to swim in contrast to the great tide of scholarly consensus (Isakhan & Stockwell, 2011:20). Most of the analysts are content to affirm that something exclusive did happen among the Greeks, and they are unenthusiastic to look any further, even if just to pay a passing homage to past democratic developments in the world.

It needs one's attention to realise that some of these scholars do not reject the fact that democratic principles were evident in almost all world societies, but they are convinced that what can be properly termed standard democracy originated in Greece (Isakhan & Stockwell, 2011). This has led to a perennial debate as to what democracy really mean. This study does not try to involve itself in that debate, but it burdens itself in examining democracy from ancient Greece.

The story of classical Greek democracy actually begins when the nobility of Athens issued Cleisthenes with a mandate around 508 BC, to frame a political system that would disdain the centralisation of power. Cleisthenes, an expert and well-known politician who had long encouraged a system of rule by the people, formulated a model of governance that became known as *demokratia*. One of the vital standard by which Cleisthenes' model is measured is the Athenian assembly, an outdoor meeting which chaired over issues as vast as war, peace, treaties, finance, legislation and public works (Finley, 1973). All adult male citizens were encouraged to attend these assemblies, which were convened about forty times in a year and normally attracted numbers of around six thousand.

The Athenian political system was government by the people because it was based on the sovereignty of the citizens, gathered in an assembly of equals, speaking and voting spontaneously as well as constructing enforceable laws. The Greek citizens had the right to *isegoria*, that is, the autonomy to voice their concerns in front of their fellow citizens. In a very actual sense, the people governed themselves, debating and voting independently on issues that are great or small, from matters of war and peace to the appropriate qualifications for ferry-boat captains. Decrees of the Assembly inaugurated with the phrase, "It seemed best to the *Dēmos* [people]..." (Blackwell, 2003). Moreover, the assembly selected a few key officials

and experts to positions of ability, while every citizen had a good opportunity of being chosen by lot for a short-term position in public office (Isakhan and Stockwell, 2011).

It must be critically argued that the Athenian democracy is hardly a model of ideal democracy from the researcher's vantage point because it excluded women and slaves, while the latter's excess labour gave male citizens time to participate; it was militaristic, inclined to violence against other city-states and imperial in its outlook; it was dogmatic in its decision-making, quick to revert to tyranny and able to execute critics even when people, like Socrates, would have served their city well.

After the Greeks, most of the scholars argues that the Romans had some element of democracy in their government. Truly, in the remaining fragments of Cicero's dialogue *The Republic*, the author contends that the Roman Republic was in fact the perfect form of government for the reason that it combined elements of democracy with a virtuous aristocracy, devoted to avoiding moral corruption and anxious with the welfare of the broader community (Cicero, 1998). However, despite the point that the Roman Republic outlived the Athenian *polis*, by Greek standards Rome was far from being a democracy (Isakhan and Stockwell, 2011). Even though in early Roman history the machineries of the Senate and the *comitia curiata* (the common assembly of all arms-bearing men) were multifarious but relatively egalitarian, the Republic progressively sloped into the oligarchy that the Athenians had been so determined to avoid. While the common people had certain access to the inner workings of the government through their representative tribunes, the state dealings stayed the sphere of the elite.

Eventually the Roman Republic was undermined by a sequence of wars, corruption, scandals and a decline in civic spirit. Hence the light of democracy was dimmed in this regard. In *Modern Democracies*, James Bryce (1921) claims that with the fall of the Roman republic the rule of the people ended in the ancient world for about fifteen centuries. Autocratic monarchies

everywhere held the field and when a rising occurred it was due to the fact that men desired good government and not self-government.

Regardless of Bryce's words, it must be pointed out that the history story of democracy usually picks up with the ratification of the *Magna Carta* around AD 1215. In this momentous document, as according to Isakhan & Stockwell (2011), the king shared his authority with a Great Council comprised by noblemen and ecclesiastics. Ultimately, this Great Council grew into the more familiar Parliament during the rule of Edward I (1272–1307), who beckoned it in order to ask it to approve his taxation needs. In the middle of the 14th century, under the patronages of Edward's grandson, Edward III (1327–77), the Parliament was fragmented into the House of Lords and the House of Commons. This system certified for the power of the king to be balanced by that of the Parliament, which itself was divided by the interests of the two chambers.

Even though the introduction of the House of Commons plainly influenced the development of representative democracy, it must be recalled that it initially comprised of borough representatives who had been elected by a mere 10% of the adult male population, whose right to vote was established on wealth and whose duty was to authentic the King's tax regime. It was not until the English Civil War (1642–51) and the Bill of Rights (1689) that the Parliament and the fundamental democratic rights were constitutionally rooted (Isakhan & Stockwell, 2011).

Moving on with the history of democracy, the emigrants who arrived on the shores of New England at the commencement of the 17th century generated a condition in which a democracy more unadulterated than the distant past had dared to dream of, started in full size and exhibition from the midst of an ancient feudal society (Tocqueville, 1864). This progression started with the American Revolution and the 1776 Declaration of Independence, in which the colony threw

off the fetters of monarchical regime. At that juncture, the framers of the Constitution of the United States pondered over, and drafted, their document until it was finalised in Philadelphia in 1787 (Isakhan & Stockwell, 2011).

In 1789 in France, the representatives of the middle classes and peasants established the National Assembly, encouraging a system of widespread government constituted by the whole French nation. The citizenry regarded this call, and a bloody agitation swept across France chanting loudly, “liberty, equality, fraternity, or death!” (Isakhan & Stockwell, 2011:7), the mutineers went on to storm the Bastille in Paris on the 14 July 1789, and they set in motion a sequence of events that terminated with the demise of the monarchical kingdom of Louis XVI. Later in 1789, the French Constituent Assembly did adopt the *Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen* and in 1791 this became the prelude for the constitution and set in place a representative democracy with a near-universal male suffrage. Nonetheless interrupted by Napoleon’s rise, France had itself as a foundation of democratic models and ideas to which modern democracy can be linked. The influence of the French protests for democratic government influenced many European countries or empires in 1848 leading to the widespread revolutions and consequent democratic reforms occurred in the Habsburgs’ Austrian Empire, Germany, Italy and Poland.

After the Second World War, the United State sponsored democracy spread in the entire world, beginning with the occupied nations of Germany and Japan, then across Europe and its colonies (in the 1950s and 1960s), and in South America and Asia during the 1970s and 1980s (Isakhan & Stockwell, 2011). From the end of Second World War, democracy has continued to flourish in almost all the continents. Democracy is now the rallying cry of each citizen in the country under the ruler-ship of an undemocratic regimes. From the research on the history of democracy, as has been unfolded, it needs to be pointed that it is an intellectual error to

subscribe to the growing orthodoxy that Europeans are originators of democracy, since it has been noted that democracy can be traced from most primitive societies in the world.

2.4 Models of democracy

Different countries and scholars worldwide interpret the meaning of democracy in their own precise way. It must be remembered that with a comprehensive range of dissimilar geopolitical atmospheres, one can notice a large spectrum of democratic governments in existence around the world. The researcher wants to shed light on some of the scholarly-backed major types of democracy. The focus will be on the following models of democracy: classical democracy, direct democracy or participatory democracy, indirect democracy or representative democracy, protective democracy, deliberative democracy, developmental democracy and cosmopolitan democracy.

2.4.1 Classical democracy

Scholars sometimes refer to this model of democracy as the Athenian democracy. The classical democracy was kind of direct democracy (which I will look at later) and Athens was the dwelling of such a kind of democracy. Besides Athens, it needs to be noted that there were other Greek city states, though among all the city states Athens was most powerful. This kind of democracy developed in between 800-500 BCE. The chief political standards were equality among all people or citizens, liberty and reverence for law and justice. The Athenians highly venerated justice and law. It needs one's attention to note that what is now called rule of law is a system which prevailed in ancient Greece and later on it was forked in other parts of Europe and the world.

The classical democracy ensures all the citizens the chance to participate in the decision making procedure of the state. The classical democracy followed the form of mass meeting as exhibited

by the fact that the Athenians occasionally met collected to evaluate the situation of the state and make policies as well as decisions. All the public officials were elected by the Athenian citizens through lottery or at times election (Isakhan & Stockwell, 2011). The procedure was made in such a style that every citizen could get, at least once in his lifespan, the opportunity of participation in the offices of the state. Official positions alternated among all the citizens and there was no special training was mandatory to run the administration, save the training measures for military generals. It needs to be pointed out that most of the marking features of the classical democracy is evident in the present world as most of the modern democratic styles are grounded on participation of the citizens and collective decision making. In educational institutions it is evident that there is participation for the both the students and the teachers or lecturers in certain decision making processes.

Despite the importance of classical democracy of Athens, many critics are unsympathetic to it. Some of the criticisms levelled are unfolded in this research paper. The Athenian democracy was limited only to a small group of the population. It needs to be unpacked that only the male citizens aged twenty and above could actively participate in the affairs of state. All the female citizens, as noted by Isakhan & Stockwell (2011), had not the liberty or right of participation in the policy-making affairs of the state. Accordingly, the classical democracy was gender blind and not pure and can only be described as the democracy of the patriarchs. Furthermore, there were large numbers immigrants and slaves who were not allowed to take part public offices of the state (Isakhan & Stockwell, 2011). The despotism behind the Athenian democracy is revealed when one ponders the fact that the slaves in Athens established a major part of the whole population, and the state's economy and development rested on their labor. Regardless of this positive contribution to the state, they were not tolerable to take part in the offices as well as the other branches of the state. One can be prompted to argue that the treatment given to the slaves and immigrants disapprove the existence of rights and equality in the Athenian

society. From this angle what is termed democracy in ancient Athens is just the tyranny of the minority because all citizens did not enjoy equal status and the opportunities were unopened to all. Therefore one can sympathize with Held (2006) who argued that numerous features of the classical democracy can reasonably be questioned.

2.4.2 Direct democracy

Generally, direct democracy together with participatory democracy can rationally be assembled as one of two basic types of democracy, in dissimilarity to what is called liberal or representative democracy. The common denominator in this regard is that the citizens are directly involved on an individual basis in decision making in public affairs, rather than acting through intercessors (Held, 2006).

Direct democracy is connected to the Athenian model where: all citizens personally participated in the Assembly; issues were the question of open discussion; if accord proved impossible, a decision was taken by popular vote; the decision was then binding on all the citizens. This kind of uncompromising combined decision-making can by definition only happen in reasonably small communities. However, Best et al (2011) says that such meetings took place at local level in most countries but the degree to which citizens are empowered to take decisions, as well as the room of the issues involved, varied extensively. Direct democracy thus primarily means widespread voting on specific issues.

This shows that regardless of direct democracy being linked to the classical model, it must be noted that contemporary, the kind of direct democracy is different from the classical one. In direct democracy all power is placed in the hands of the individual citizens. When the political decisions are being made, all the members of a polity meet together and individuals do cast a

vote. This sounds like an ideal form of government as each person is treated as an equal, and each person is given an opportunity to directly influence the policy making course.

Many critics argue that this type of democracy is difficult to implement in the modern world. In theory direct democracy is good but in practice the system is difficult to implement. Historically, as has been partially pointed, small political communities in the ancient world tend to use direct democracy. In minor towns or native societies where everyone is well versed with one another and the issues under debate directly affect them, such an arrangement is best. The arrangement is also ideal to implement in small institutions such as schools, colleges and universities. However, once there is an expansion in the size of the constituency and the range of policy areas, direct democracy can become cumbersome and unmanageable. In many countries today, such as America, thousands of laws are implemented and revoked on a day-to-day basis. Thus applying a direct democracy model in such a type of political setting would be quite difficult.

2.4.3 Indirect democracy

This model of democracy is referred to as representative democracy. This political arrangement of governance establishes an intercessory political player between the citizens and the policy outputs of the state. People can select the people who can make decisions on their behalf. It must be noted that through the electoral procedure, one person or a group of individuals are chosen and allocated with the mission of making decisions on behalf of the citizens that they represent. In indirect democracy, the people who are working representing the citizens are evaluated by the public to see the worthiness of their performance. If many citizens are satisfied, then it is probable that the representative individuals will be reinstated. This repetitive procedure generates a bond of accountability between the voters and those that they positioned into power. Indirect democracy is viable especially where there is a large population of the

people or when it is difficult to assemble people to deliberate on the issues affecting the community or organization. This model of democracy can be used in the educational institutions such as schools, colleges and universities.

2.4.4 Protective democracy

The foundation of democracy as a mechanism of shielding human rights and liberties can appropriately be traced to the late 17th and early 18th centuries. John Locke (1631-1704) is viewed as the great proponent of protective democracy. His civil society based on democratic values was fashioned through the instrumentality of social pact to protect the right to life, liberty, property and warrant fulfillment of happiness. Another individual who backed this type of democracy was James Madison (1751-1836), a key designer of constitution of American.

In the same vein, the three advocates of utilitarianism were also the important in the history of protective democracy. These individuals were Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832), James Mill 1773-1836) as well as John Stuart Mill. It needs to be pointed out that the utilitarianism was vehemently supported in favor of protective democracy. The theme of utilitarianism was to defend rights, liberties and opportunities, and these are rudimentary principles of democracy. These ought to be sheltered at any cost and genuine democracy according to them was the unsurpassed form of government which could guarantee these (rights, liberties and opportunities). James Mill and his associates argued that it is only in democracy that all varieties of individual interests could be protected and advanced.

Protective democracy many diverse aspects. In the light of protective democracy, democracy is seen less as a mechanism through which the public could participate in the political life, and more as a method through which the people could protect themselves from the infringements of the government. One can thus be prompted to note that here democracy is seen as a strategy at the reach of individuals which they can use to protect their rights and liberties.

The following are some the fundamental features of protective democracy. Protective democracy believes in popular rule, nevertheless since people indirectly take part in the processes of state, they do it via their representatives. Protective democracy endorses that both the popular sovereignty and representative form of government are valid. It is the principal duty of the state to shield the rights and liberties of people and whether this is appropriately done or not, citizens keep a strong observance over the utilities of state. The authority is answerable to the citizens and in order to establish it, elections are held on systematic basis. Protective democracy states that a very significant technique of defending the rights, liberties and sharing of privileges is the separation of powers among legislature, executive and judiciary. There is prevalence of constitutionalism in protective democracy. In this regard, both the leader and the citizens are to be controlled by the principles laid down in constitution of the country. According to protective democracy the constitution is the basis of power for all people and is the backer of rights and liberties. In order to prevent the defilement of rights and liberties, associations groups and citizens have enough freedom to fight against any violation of rights or intrusion on liberty. Protective democracy believes that there must be competition in all spheres at all levels and this is a manifestation that the individuals are using their liberties and rights and are not bound in chains of autocracy.

2.4.5 Deliberative democracy

Deliberative democracy is also referred to by some scholars as discursive democracy. It is the idea that the public decisions ought to be made by an open discussion among the free and equal citizens. Many scholars argue deliberative democracy strive to impart government decision making with reasoned discussion and collective judgement among the citizens (Chambers, 2003; Cunningham, 2002; Guttman and Thompson, 2004). In disparity to other models of democracy, that uses voting as the vital instrument for recognising and amassing preferences,

deliberative democracy put emphasis on public deliberation as the spring of legitimate law or decision making (Young, 2000).

Deliberative democratic proponents have urged that democracy ought to be involving the exchange of reasons. Those who participate in the democratic procedure have to aim at an outcome that reflects not the balance of competing forces and political skills, but the force of the better argument (Cohen 1989 in Kahane et al, 2010). In this regard it has been emphasized that the citizens must manifest reciprocity in their dealings, putting forward arguments that can be anticipated to push the democratic course in the direction of consensus (Gutmann and Thompson 1996).

Deliberative democrats have also commended that involvement in the democratic procedure ought to be civic inclined rather than privatistic. This means that, all the participants must not enter into the democratic arena with an entirely formed notion of the positions they will eventually follow. Kahane et al (2010) argues that the participants should let themselves to be wavered by the arguments of other participants and attempt to look at the political agenda from a point that encompasses the interests of all people. Deliberative democracy encourages and advocates for an active idea of citizenship, whereby the democratic politics is not the only domain of elites. It must be pointed out that the advocates of deliberative democracy disagree on certain issues, for example they disagree about the explicit reasons that make participation important. Some declare that participation in the democratic course by ordinary citizens is a fundamental good.

Gutmann and Thompson (1996) have legendarily argued that the outcomes of deliberation should be unswerving with standard liberal obligations to liberty and opportunity. As pointed previously, these two scholars maintain that deliberating citizens must pursue, in their dealings with one another, a standard of reciprocity, whereby they desist from raising controversial

arguments drawn from their precise conceptions of the good. Hence Gutmann and Thompson (1996) counsels that, instead, the citizens ought to make use of the means of public reason.

A close scrutiny of this view has made many scholars to find fault with this way of loading the deliberative deck in errand of liberal consequences. Even though not necessarily unorthodoxing from liberal principles, many have questioned whether variants of deliberative democracy such as Gutmann and Thompson's are actually deliberative at all, as the outcomes appear to be produced by the restraints on deliberation as much as by deliberation itself Kahane et al (2010).

As a result of criticism of the explanation of deliberative democracy, many forms of deliberative democracy erupted. The stress of this research is the discussion of one of the deliberative model propounded by a German philosopher Jürgen Habermas. Although his model shares the latter's anxiety with reason giving, it embraces a much more extensive conception of permissible reasons. The constrictions that it puts on deliberation are procedural rather than substantive. Habermas sees deliberative democracy as part of a larger project to do with the duty of communication, and with the ongoing incapacitating of obstacles to communication, as a prime driver of human historical development (Habermas, 1989).

Habermas' deliberative democracy theory employs the whole public domain of a state, emboldens energetic citizenship, and does not disregard any citizen from political discussion. The private sphere also plays a part in the creation of public opinion, meaning that communication forums outside the public sphere can be useful in the dissemination of political power. Habermas utilises a liberal context for his deliberative democracy theory, having the rule of law and constitutionalism as key principles. However, unlike other philosophers such as Rawls, he basis constitutionalism and law on communicative reason. There are two concepts that form the foundation of Habermas's work on deliberation: first, there is the *public sphere*, which hosts political deliberation; and second, there is the *Ideal Speech Community* that states

the circumstances under which a political community can reach compromise (Habermas, 1989).

Deliberative democracy is essential in all the institutions such as schools because it gives room for the exchange of genuine reasons rather than simply as the skirmish of opposing interests. In schools all the stakeholder involved can make use of this model of democracy to ensure that they make intelligent decisions in whatever they do. Both the teachers and the learners must be given room to use deliberative democratic principles so as to build a good working environment. Deliberative democracy also enlightens all people in educational institutions in regard to the desperate need of teaching critical thinking so that people can have reasons for their actions and be able to justify those actions with solid reasons.

2.4.6 Developmental democracy

J. S. Mill is a chief supporter of developmental democracy. He did not focus his attention mostly on the power and purpose of democracy to guard rights and liberties, but also on its power to improve or develop the faculties of man. According to him democracy was a very powerful apparatus of moral self-development and highest and harmonious development of individual capacities. Thus one can note that central to this model of democracy are the two elements of development. There is moral self-development on one hand and the development of individual capacities on the other hand.

It needs to be noted that by individual capacities Mill refers to the argumentative power of people, intellect as well as reasoning to understand the discrepancy between right and wrong, and above all the capability to partake in the procedures of government. Hence Mill was also grateful to de Tocqueville's *Democracy in America*. It was the stance of Tocqueville that the increasing involvement of state was certain to curtail the freedom of individuals and that it would be detrimental for the progress.

In a developmental democracy individuals' participation is commonly found and it is done through the voting mechanism which is held repeatedly. There is a subsidiarity of power as all the powers are stretched up to the lowest level and this permits citizens to participate in the several affairs. More so, legislature and bureaucracy are distinct from each other and the second has no control over the lawmakers. However, as experts the bureaucrats delight in certain amount of freedom. There are legitimate and lawful provisions which regulates both the ruler and the ruled as well as all the divisions of state management and judiciary. Special provisions are accessible for the promotion of right and liberty and in this regard the various social as well as economic rights are given primacy.

In a nutshell, developmental democracy is an engagement to guarantee collective as well as individualistic private, public, procedural, substantive, distributive and retributive justices and rights of its society, all together and at the same time. Developmental democracy is a non-stop systemization, adaptation, and use of all liberal and human-centred values from any source but primarily for home lasting benefits. Thus, developmental democracy is a nationalist pledge rebuffing internal and external uninvited pressures against its basic pillars. It esteems all international norms and prescriptions to the benefits of both the national and global communities. It charitably provides all venues of liberal democratic values to the extent that they never insincerely obscure and supersede the distinct democratic demands of the gigantic majority.

2.4.7 Cosmopolitan democracy

Democracy envisages dynamism and as a form of government it is tremendously desirable, however it must be appropriate for changed circumstances. This attitude has led to reformulate democracy at dissimilar epochs. This can be observed as basis of cosmopolitan model of

democracy. Many thinkers believe that democracy is narrowed to the geographical area of a nation state but cosmopolitan model contemplates of democracy at global level (Held, 2006).

Cosmopolitan model of democracy is a compromise between meaning, implication and requirements of nation states on one hand and the globalization of politics, economy and culture on the other hand. In this age of increasing inter-states dependence, a revision of the attitude towards democracy seems to be obligatory. Hence, cosmopolitan model of democracy is not an entirely new idea, it is a concept regarded in the background of new state of affairs in international situation.

The cosmopolitan model of democracy is grounded on many reasonable assumptions. It accepts that in the contemporary world situation the nation-states are directly and indirectly reliant on upon each other. This suggests that the activities, policies and schemes of one state will always influence those of other states. The democratic states and societies ought to jointly form an assembly which cannot not be under the control of any of the superpowers. According to the cosmopolitans this assembly may be termed a world government. Furthermore cosmopolitan democracy assumes active collaboration among all states in respect to the management of issues across the border of nation-states. Another belief of cosmopolitan democracy is that all the quarrelsome transnational issues ought to be settled by referendum. Moreover, this model denotes that the nation-states enjoy right to equal autonomy. A close look on this model of democracy shows that the United Nations Organization must have a key role for the success of cosmopolitan model of democracy.

Cosmopolitan democracy is very important in educational institutions such as the schools because it is liberal and it embraces all people from various places, tribes, countries and cultures. The principles of this model, if taken seriously in schools, may link many schools in the global world. Furthermore it will improve the quality of education since most of the

decisions will be made from a global vantage point, rather than a local limited view. Thus one can argue that the issue of distance education and video conferencing, among many modern ways of learning, are a brain child of cosmopolitan model of democracy.

2.5 Principles of democracy

Most people from all around the world have acknowledged and identified the chief principles, which must exist so as to have a purely democratic government. These principles habitually become a portion of the constitution or bill of rights in a democratic society. It must be noted that though no two democratic states are precisely alike, people in democracies support many of the same fundamental principles and desire the same benefits from their government. This section of the study highlights briefly some of the fundamental principles of democracy.

2.5.1 Citizen participation

One of the supreme basic indications of a democracy is the participation of citizens in the government. It needs to be noted that participation is the key role of citizens in democracy. In this regard participation is not only their right, but it is their core duty. Citizen participation may take many forms that are directly or indirectly and these include standing for election, voting in elections, becoming informed, discussing issues, joining community or civic meetings, being members of private charitable organizations, paying taxes as well as even objecting. In this regard participation constructs a better democracy.

2.5.2 Equality

Democratic civilisations accentuate the principle that all the people are equal and the same. Equality in this regard means that all the individuals are prized equally, have the same

opportunities, and may not be categorised against because of their race, religion, ethnic group, gender or sexual alignment. In a democracy, individual people and groups continue to uphold their right to have diverse cultures, personalities, languages and beliefs.

2.5.3 Political tolerance

Democratic societies ought to be politically tolerant in their nature. This reveals that while the majority of the people rule in a democratic government, the rights of the minority must be protected to the fullest. People who are out of power must be permitted to organize and speak out. Usually these minorities are from time to time referred to as the opposition because they might have ideas which are unlike to that of the majority. According to this principle individual citizens must also learn to be tolerant of each other in regard to their political ideas. A democratic culture is frequently made of people from dissimilar cultures, racial, religious and ethnic groups who have different viewpoints in contrast to the majority of the population. Thus one in this regard a democratic society is enriched by multiplicity. If the majority repudiate rights to and destroy their opposition, at that moment they also terminate democracy. One objective of democracy is to make the best likely decision for the entire society. To accomplish this, respect for all people and their view points is desperately needed. Decisions are more probable to be accepted, even by those who clash with them, if all the citizens have been permitted to discuss, debate and question them.

2.5.4 Accountability

In a democratic society, elected and appointed representatives have to be accountable to the people whom they represent. The elected people are responsible for their actions while executing the duties assigned to them. The elected officials ought to make decisions and execute their duties agreeing to the will and wishes of the people, not for themselves.

2.5.5 Transparency

For any democratic government to be accountable there is need for the people to be aware of what is transpiring in the country and this is referred to as transparency in the government. A transparent government holds open gatherings and lets the citizens to attend. In a democracy, the media and the people get information easily about what choices are being made, by whom and why.

2.5.6 Regular, free and fair elections

One way citizens of the country express their will is by choosing officials to represent them in a democratic government. Democracy swears that these chosen officials are elected and peacefully removed from their office in a free and fair way. In this regard one can be impelled to note that intimidation, corruption and threats to the citizens during or before an election are in contradiction of the principles of democracy. Thus in a democracy, elections are held habitually after every stated years. Participation in elections should not be based on a citizen's wealth, but on the fact that a citizen is an active participant in the country. For free and fair elections to happen, obstacles should not exist which make it problematic for people to vote.

2.5.7 Economic freedom

In a democratic society, people must have economic freedom. This shows that the government permits some private ownership of property and businesses, and that the people are allowable to select their own work and labour unions. The role the government ought to play in the economy is open to debate, but it is normally accepted that free markets have to be real in a democratic society and the state should not absolutely control the economy. However, some

scholars argue that the state should play a robust role in countries where great inequality of wealth survives due to past discrimination or other unfair practices.

2.5.8 Control of the abuse of power

Democratic societies attempt to obviate any chosen official or group of individuals from abusing their power. It needs to be pointed that one of the most famous abuses of power is corruption. Corruption happens when the government officials use public coffers for their own benefit or exercise power in an illegitimate style. Innumerable means have been used in many countries to shield against these abuses. Habitually the government is organized to limit the powers of the branches of government, that is, to have independent courts and organisations with power to act in contrast to any illegal action by a nominated official or branch of government; to permit for citizen involvement and elections; and to check for police mishandling of power.

2.5.9 Bill of rights

Many democratic countries also decide on to have a bill of rights to guard people against abuse of power. A bill of rights is a list of rights and freedoms assured to all people in the country they live in. When a bill of rights becomes portion of a country's constitution, the courts have the muscle to enforce these rights. A bill of rights restricts the power of government and may also execute obligations on individuals and organizations.

2.5.10 Accepting the results of elections

In any democratic society, in the event of democratic elections there are winners and losers. Frequently the losers in an election believe so powerfully that their party or candidate is the

best one, to an extent that they decline to consent to the results of an election. This is really in antipathy to the democratic principles. The imports of not accepting the outcome of an election may be a government that is unsuccessful and cannot make decisions. It may even result in severe violence which is also against democracy.

2.5.11 Human rights

All democracies endeavour to reverence and shelter the human rights of the citizens. Human rights in this regard mean those values that reveal respect for human life and human self-worth. It needs to be highlighted that democracy accentuates the value of every human being at any background. Examples of human rights comprise of freedoms of expression, association, assembly, the right to equality as well as the right to education.

2.5.12 Multi-party system

One of the chief principles of genuine democracy is that there must be a multiparty system in a country. In order to have a multi-party system, more than one political party ought to take part in elections and play a role in the government. A multi-party system permits for opposition to the party which victories the election. This is good because it helps in that it provide the government with diverse viewpoints on issues affecting the country. Furthermore, a multiparty system provides voters with a choice of candidates or parties as well as policies to vote for. Traditionally, when a nation only has one party, the effect has been a dictatorship, which democracy strive to crumble.

2.5.13 Rule of law

In a democratic state no one is above the law and this includes all people even a king or an elected President or officials in government. This is well known as the rule of law. It means that every person must obey the law and be held liable if they violate it. Democracy also maintains that the law be equally, fairly and unswervingly enforced.

2.6 Summary

This chapter took the reader through the in-depth analysis of the concept democracy. The chapter opened with highlighting the various definitions of democracy unpacking some of the difficulties that are encountered in attempting to give a single definition of the concept. An attempt was made to highlight chief definitions of democracy from both minimal and procedural view points as well as from various independent scholars. The concept of democracy was traced from the ancient times going through the lapse of time to modernity. The chapter also stresses on the models of democracy and finally ended by examining some of the recognised principles of democracy in the world.

CHAPTER THREE

DEMOCRACY, EDUCATION AND DEVELOPMENT

3.1 Introduction

This chapter seeks to analyse the multifaceted relationship between democracy and development, an interrogation that has engrossed academics and policymakers similarly for some decades. As the chapter is going to unfold, it must be highlighted that the symbiosis between democracy and development is practically unassailable. The reality that democracy serves as a launch pad for development as well as good governance is evident in many world countries. Despite some intellectual controversies among scholars in regard to this issue, evidences found from critical study prompts the author to submit to the fact that there is an undeniable intimate relationship among democracy, education and development. Development is here to be understood to mean the entire collection of economic, social and cultural advancement to which people aspire. This work upholds undeniable relationship between democracy and development; and it focuses on development-democracy debate, link between democracy and development as well as the relationship between democracy and education as a narrowed part of development. The chapter concludes by a summary.

3.2 Democracy Development Debate

For a stretched time, democracy and development were viewed as concepts that were foreign to each other in the eyes of analysts and academics. In the 1960s and 1970s, there were few specialists who attempted to launch a link between the two concepts. It was during that same period when numerous developing countries attained a significant growth rate regardless of being governed by authoritarian regimes. From the 1970s onwards, a number of questions began to be inquired principally after people had started to become conscious that development

was a more compound phenomenon than had been thought, and one that should perhaps take lengthier to bring about than had been forecast (Ghali et al 2002). Hence it was realized that the concept of development could not be reduced merely to its economic and financial dimension, to which it had hitherto been narrowed and also that the social, cultural, political and environmental scopes of development were also important to note.

The crisis of the 1980s well-known as the *development's lost decade* in many regions of the world, provoked transformed inquisitorial on the issue that seemed all the more critical because authoritarian States were transparently incompetent of coming up with a solution to their problems. With the end of the bipolarization of the world, the collapse of centralized State systems, the failure of most totalitarian governments and the rise of new organizations produced by civil society, the democracy-development contention finally became a dominant subject of up-to-date debate (Ghali et al 2002).

Most people in the world now believes that there is a close affiliation between democracy and development. However controversy spawn when people try to answer questions such as: What is the nature of those links? How do democracy and development hang together? Should some of them be strengthened, and if so which? How can the emergence of a democratic form of development (without which democracy would remain a throwaway) be encouraged? Would development lead to democracy or democracy produce development? These philosophical questions have divided many scholars in the world.

Modernizationist scholar, Seymour Lipset and his followers argue that economic growth or development leads to democracy, so that the principle according to them is development first, democracy later (Lipset, 1959). According to this line of argument there is no democracy that can happen where there is no development. In antipathy to the modernization theory, Mesquita and Brown find that in the case of China, the effect of economic development would not lead

to democracy for the reason that authoritarian regimes and autocracies around the world show people that they can delight in the benefits of economic development one hand and avoid political liberalization on the other hand (Mesquita and Downs, 2005). Their discovery is a contradiction to the argument of modernizationists that democracy is the indispensable outcome of development.

However, there are some scholars who support that democracy must be first and then development later. These scholars include individuals such as Joseph Siegle, Michael Weinstein, and Morton Halperin, and their firm belief is that democracies unswervingly outperform non-democracies on most pointers of economic and social well-being, so that upholding democracy should be prior to escalating economic development in developing countries (Siegle, Weinstein, and Halperin 2004, 2005).

Some scholars such as Adam Przeworski and Fernando Limongi are unsure on which side to lean between the *development first, then democracy* or *democracy first development later*. These scholars argue that even though politics certainly influences economic performance, the influence of regime type is not important on states' economic growth; and people do not know whether democracy improves or limits economic development (Przeworski and Limongi, 1993; Przeworski, Alvarez, Cheibub, and Limongi, 2000).

3.3 Democracy and Development

A controversy is evident among scholars in regard to whether democracies solely lead to development or not. In this regard the scholars are divided into two groups with some on one hand argues that democracy lead total human development while others believes that autocratic regimes does the same. According to some, only an authoritarian government is in a position to introduce liberalization measures that lead to comprehensive human development. In this regard it is argued that, an authoritarian government may be needed at the commencement of

liberalization reforms because electorates often turn down economic reform even when it is actually known that ultimately they would benefit a majority of voters. Fernandez and Rodrik (1991) demonstrate that uncertainty about the impact of reform at the level of the individual could lead a rational electorate to vote contrary to reform that is for human flourishing or development. In other words, this means that policies that would be common *ex post* are habitually not implemented in a democratic regime. Devotees of this view, as noted by Edwards (1991) every so often refer to the experience of countries which only introduced democracy after economic development was successfully executed and these countries include Chile, South Korea and Taiwan.

Other scholars support that democracy fosters economic growth. Firstly, it is only governments with some legitimacy that will be able to implement and withstand policies that may lead to comprehensive human development. Secondly, a lot of the institutional features of a democracy, like an autonomous legal system, are also required for a successful liberalization of humanity. North (1993) posits that well stated and enforced property rights (a necessary condition for economic growth or development) are only safe when political and civil rights are secure (that is democracy), otherwise arbitrary appropriation is always a threat. Thirdly, democratization leads to development and removes all obstacles due to its system of checks and balances. Rodrik (2000) says that democratic institutions (political parties, elected representatives, free speech, and the like) can be seen as the final institutions of conflict management, as they allow for differences among social groups to be fixed in a foreseeable, inclusive and participatory manner. As liberalization may lead to distributional conflicts, this view suggests that democracies should be better competent to liberalize their economies than non-democracies.

From the above analysis, it is clear that democracy is not simply good in itself but rather it is also valuable in enhancing the process of development in the world. Of course, if one take an aptly extensive concept of development to incorporate overall welfare of the population at large, comprising some basic civil and political freedoms, a democracy which warrants these freedoms is, virtually by definition, more encouraging to development on these counts than a non-democratic regime. One may, however, opt to look at freedoms as possibly instrumental to development, as is usually the case in the large empirical literature that aims at discovering a statistical association between some measure of democracy and some measure of a narrower concept of development. Thus, that does not include those freedoms as an intrinsic part of the nature of development itself.

Undoubtedly, there is a strong relationship between democracy and development in general. Campos (1994) generally sees a positive relationship between democracy and development. Lipset in 1959 first advanced that democracy is tightly related to economic development. His observation has spawned the largest body of research on any topic in comparative politics. Lipset's argument has been endorsed and queried, revised and stretched, buried and revived. Regardless of such intellectual murky waters, many scholars are for the link between democracy and development. It is the intention of this research to critically examine the relationship between democracy and development. As it will be unfolded, democracy brings economic development, social solidarity, enhancement of human rights and human flourishing in all spheres of their lives.

Many scholars are for the argument that there is a link between democracy or good governance and poverty reduction or economic development as well as social flourishing (Rao, 2004). Amartya Sen argues that in democracy there is an instrumental, intrinsic as well as a constructive value. This intrinsic or inherent value lies in the citizens' capability to exercise

choice and the extension of individual freedoms that it represents. The instrumental value of democracy is in the fact that in democracy the rulers have to be attentive to what the people want even if they are criticised and the rulers seek support of the people during elections. Democracy can also aid a proper conceptualisation and grasp of needs through the partaking processes of discussion leading to better decisions being made for the flourishing of the human race. One can be prompted to argue that by providing a peaceful mediation among the competing parties, democracy promotes peace and stability, that is, development. In this regard Rao (2004) says that democracies rarely go to war against each other and this absence of war is critical for development and poverty reduction.

There is empirical evidence, especially for the countries in transition, on the part of democracy in nurturing liberalization or human flourishing in all spheres of life. Utilising data for 26 countries, De Melo et al. (1996) noted a correlation of 0.8 between their index of economic liberalization and the Freedom House index of political freedom. These researchers used panel data to guesstimate the elements of economic liberalization or development in transition countries. Political freedom or democracy appears with a positive and highly substantial coefficient in their equation. Likewise, using panel data from twenty-five post-communist countries of Central Eastern Europe and the past Soviet Union in the period 1992 to 1997, Dethier et al. (1999) conclude that democracy has enabled economic flourishing. These outcomes submit that political liberalization boosts economic liberalization. Hence, the effect of political liberalization or democracy on economic performance is indirect, via its influence on economic liberalization. Fidrmuc (2000) reports that democracy has a U-shaped result on economic performance, at least during the initial part of the transition. Thus one can argue that either no democracy or full democracy leads to better economic performance than moderate democracy. Dawson (1998) also found that for a sample of 92 countries the level of economic freedom in 1990 was significantly related to political and civil freedom at the commencement

of the estimation period, that is, 1975. One can therefore agree with the fact that democracy leads to development of human race in numerous spheres of life.

Talking about what democracy does to humanity, Elster (1994) argues that to be dependable and effective, pre-commitment requires democracy in any political economic sphere. It is worthy note that the promises of a ruler are much more credible if there is a well-established system for propelling the ruler out of office for the failure to keep those promises. For any development to occur effectively in the world, power must be divided. This is a fundamental theme of much of the modern work on constitutional political economy. In the same way, North and Weingast (1989) have mentioned the historical case of the Glorious Revolution in England in 1688, which by consolidating political institutions that constrained the king heightened his commitment to securing private property rights and thus fostered economic growth. Thus there is no doubt in this regard that democracy is a chief ingredient for development in the world.

In *Democracy, Governance, and Economic Performance: Theory and Evidence*, Feng (2003) discovers that democracy has a positive bearing on economic and social development, nonetheless mostly through indirect channels. These channels, as according to the author, include policy certainty, political constancy, the formation and application of rules that safeguard property rights, the advancement of education, the capacity to promote private capital, and the lessening of inequality. A democratic regime therefore, is seen as crucial in bringing about these indirect benefits because it is a system that provides for systematic government change while obstructing unconstitutional change.

Furthermore, in their book *The Democracy Advantage: How Democracies Promote Prosperity and Peace*, Joseph Halperin et al. (2005) unfolds the developmental benefit of participatory and accountable systems of governance (democracy) over time, as compared to authoritarian regimes. The authors reveals their findings arguing that the better performance of democracies

can be accredited to their relatively greater inclination for establishing institutions of mutual power, information frankness, and flexibility. These authors found that low-income democracies outdo autocracies across a wide array of development indicators. From their work, it has been revealed for example, that democracies have experience more unwavering and steady growth patterns than autocracies over time. In the same vein, low-income democracies have superior levels of social welfare across several measures of development advancement.

In their paper entitled *the impact of democracy on economic growth in sub-Saharan Africa, 1982-2012*, Masaki and Walle (2014) pointed out that democracy led to economic growth in most of the African countries where democracy is used as a system of government. These two authors wrote upon evidence that up to 43 countries in sub-Saharan Africa for the period of 1982- 2012 had strong association between democracy and economic growth (Masaki & Walle, 2014)

Thus it is clear from the above that, even in the African continent where democracy is argued to be imperfect an immature, there is a glimpse of how democracy leads to development of the nations and people in all spheres of life. This also means that by embracing democracy human beings become well in terms of their social and economic status, hence escaping the plight of poverty. Thus the argument that the link between democracy and development is generally positive holds much water as one analyse the global trends in regard to the effects of democracy.

In their assessment of eighty four studies in the period between 1983 and 2005, Doucouliagos & Ulubasoglu (2008) concluded carefully that embracing all these studies led them to notice that democracy's net impact on the economy does not seem to be detrimental as some say. The studies on the relationship between democracy and human flourishing shows that democracy as a system of government gives room for freedom and respects or encourage dignity of work among the people in the nation. Such conditions are very important to ensure that the people

work freely and their work is valued lead them to self-improve themselves be it socially, economically, culturally or politically. This therefore is in harmony with the fact that democracy leads to development.

Furthermore, in principle, the exercise of political rights sets democracies different from other political regimes, such as autocracies, in that voters can force or pressure their representatives to respond to their needs, leading to improved standard of living of the people. In this vein, it has been argued by Boix and Stokes (2003) that such pressure helps voters coerce the confiscatory temptations of the rulers and thereby protecting property rights, ensures political accountability, reduces corruption and advances the providing of public goods vital to development.

Thus the argument is that democracy is development enhancing. However, deficiencies such as malnourishment, illiteracy and disparities in ethnic and gender relationships have proven to be strong, even within the nearly two thirds of the world's countries classified as electoral democracies. It is upon this premise that one can critically argue that, the persistence of deprivations is a cue that there is still a great deal to be focused about the affiliation between democracy and development.

3.4 Democracy and Education

Education is significant to the social, economic, technological and political development of any country. It buttresses the social well-being of a country's inhabitants. It is evident that education is an indispensable tool of measuring human and societal development in relative to the diverse aspects of a country's well-being. There is also a connexion between education and democracy. Theorists of democracy and education such as Dewey (1916); Glaeser, Ponzetto and Shleifer (2006); Pinar (2003) and Carr (2000) agree that in numerous countries, education and democracy are highly interwoven especially given the fact that education train people to

interrelate with others and raises the benefits of civic participation, comprising voting and organizing.

Many of these scholars are of the view that democracy enhances quality education in a country leading to developed or improved societies and people. Democracy is important in solving or minimizing societal violence and disruptions. The question is, what kind of individual person and what sort of state and society should the effective school aim to produce? If the aim is to produce non-violent citizens and a peaceful society, then a crucial goal of education must be to nurture democracy because it provides the best atmosphere for the non-violent resolutions of disputes and conflicts. Democracy greatly drops the possibility of violence in schools and societies leading to peaceful societies that respects human rights and freedoms. Thus democracy is very important in schools as it has great impact to the societies. The intention of this section is to try and interrogate on the nature of the relationship between democracy and education in the world.

Furthermore, Kelly (1995) argues that one of the major errands that education ought to perform in a society is the correct preparation of young citizens for the roles and duties they must be ready to take on when they reach their maturity. According to this author, this should be seen as the aim of education. Kelly continued and argued that democratic education have a duty to foster the nurturing of the virtues, knowledge and skills that are necessary for economic, social, civic moral and political involvement in the society. Such an education system must prepare people to take part in determinedly replicating their society and have a conscious social reproduction duty as the supreme not only of democratic education but also of a democratic society.

There are essential practical values underlying democracy which education must foster and encourage. These values that are desperately needed include values such as tolerance of

multiplicity and reciprocal respect between individuals and groups, a respect for evidence in establishing opinions, an inclination to be open to the probability of changing one's mind in the light of such evidence and treating all people as having equivalent social and political rights as human beings. It is in the same vein that Hepburn (1984) in his analysis of five researches he carried in America concluded that, that democratic experiences in the school and the classroom does contribute much to the participatory awareness, skills and attitudes vital to life in democratic societies.

Furthermore, democracy is very important in schools because it leads to improved people's attitudes and leads to human flourishing socially, psychologically and rationally. In Britain John and Osborn (1992) carried a research in terms of the development of civic attitudes by comparing a traditional-authoritarian secondary school with a democratic one. The research suggested that there was a strong correlation between democratic school and the attitude of learners unlike to the findings on the traditional-authoritarian one. Moreover, students at the democratic school were more fervent supporters of race and gender equality though they were also more disbelieving about whether the government actually functioned democratically. The findings also envisaged that the democratic school was also more likely to inspire freedom of expression in the classroom leading to better graduates. This prompts one to note that democracy is critically important in the education system.

In his work entitled *Democracy and Education*, Dewey (1916) sets out an argument as to how education should operate to enable democratic social relations and the growth as well as the development of the individual human being. Dewey says democracy is a necessary method of living together to guard the individual and preserve social equity. This thought is premised on the social-interactionist concept of knowledge. For Dewey (1916:4), "men live in a community in virtue of the things they have in common and communication is the way in

which they come to possess things in common.” Thus in this regard, democracy is largely depicted as a matter of communication. He also claims that democracy is more than a system of government, but primarily a mode of connected living of co-joint communicated experience. Dewey sees a connection between democracy and education and argued that democracy is seen in education through communication for a common good. Thus one can note that democracy is interwoven with education.

It needs to be pointed that an attempt to determine the association between education and democracy is important as it may have far-reaching implications for the delivery of teaching and learning that consequently impacts how students relate to and do, democracy within the classroom, within the school and generally at the societal level. Education for democracy comprises the enlargement of civic virtue and the behavioural personalities of the good citizen. Civic virtue involves the relegation of personal interests to the common good of the whole community to which a person belongs. If learners would develop civic virtue, they practice the behavioural habits leading them to be the good citizens. Examples of such democratic dispositions include temperance, fortitude, commitment to justice, charity, optimism about the future, honesty, civility in dealings with others, tolerance as well as respect and recognition of the equality of humanity. These personalities ensures that the learners in a school will be graduates who are rational and who make informed decisions leading to the development of the country holistically. Thus one can argue that there is a strong relationship among education, democracy and development.

3.4 Summary

This chapter has unfolded an undeniable intimate relationship among democracy, education and development. From the evidence given it has been seen that democracy can lead to the total development of the human race in all spheres. A symbiosis has been unfolded also on

democracy and education. Democracy has been noted as a vital impetus for education to produce graduates who are useful in the society leading to development. This suggests that schools ought to integrate democracy in the curriculum for genuine graduates to be produced who are going to be architects of development and human flourishing in the society.

CHAPTER FOUR

MODELS OF DEMOCRACY AND ZIMBABWEAN EDUCATION SYSTEM

4.1 Introduction

Policy makers and politicians habitually view education as a vital tool for the production of good citizens. In this regard democracy is seen as a proper ideology that assists in shaping people to be good citizens in the society. It is clear that there is an unbreakable connection between politics and education. In fact education endorses the political system or ideology in a country. Dewey says democracy and education goes hand in glove and that only democratic education can make a democratic society. In this logic, school ought to be a miniature society. Thus Gutek (2001) got it correct when he argued that children can acquire the basic principles of democratic life at school. As previously highlighted, democracy is very crucial in the education system at various levels. In this chapter the focus of the research is on the critical analysis of the various models of democracy and their relevance in the education system of Zimbabwe. After the relevance of democracy is unpacked, the research will then propose a model of democracy for the education system in Zimbabwe.

4.2 Relevance of the models of democracy in the Zimbabwean education system

Possessing a democratic attitude is one of the unsurpassed means of living happily and peacefully in this postmodern society. Democracy, as revealed previously, is the chief of the most accepted ways of governing system in our modern societies. In this regard, democracy in education and the establishment of a democratic environment at schools are so substantial for the society, students, teachers as well as administrators. Teaching endorsing democratic behaviours and attitudes as well as democratic management applications at the schools are so imperative because these democratic gainings will mould good students' future life leading to

better societies. Therefore, one of the most vital tasks of the schools should be facilitating students to realize the values of democracy. All the educational activities done at schools are also awfully essential for establishing democratic culture at schools. It must be pointed out that the behaviours of the administrators, teachers, families, students and education programmes are important in the disseminating democratic principles among the learners. Emphasis in this section is to focus on some of the models of democracy discussed in chapter two and their relevance to the Zimbabwean education system.

4.2.1 Relevance of classical democracy to Zimbabwean education system

Classical democracy that characterise the ancient Greek state of Athens is very relevant to the Zimbabwean education system in manifold ways. In this model, the chief political standards are equality among all people or citizens, liberty and reverence for law and justice. There is a highly veneration of justice and law. It needs one's attention to note that what is called rule of law is a system which is copied from this model of democracy. This principle is vital in Zimbabwean education system. It needs to be highlighted that the schools or any other educational institution ought to maintain equality among all the people. The teachers needs to be treated equally and so are the learners to be treated. There must be no favouritism in the educational institutions. The gifted learners and the special needs learners needs to be equally treated by being given equal opportunities to develop their skills and potentialities. Justice must be the notable feature in institutions of learning. This must apply even to the deviants, justice must be given precedence. The members who violet the rules must not be arbitrarily mistreated. Thus the schools in Zimbabwe can benefit a lot by embracing the principles of classical democracy.

The classical democracy ensures all the citizens the chance to participate in the decision making procedures. Mass meetings can be done occasionally to evaluate the state of affairs and make

policies as well as decisions. The procedure of elections is made in such a style that everyone get an opportunity of participation in the offices available. Thus in Zimbabwean education system, educational institutions can embrace the principles of classical model of democracy and benefit a lot from it. All the learners and the teachers in the schools must be given opportunities to participate fully in the running of the institutions. Decisions on how to conduct school activities such as the prize giving days, games competitions, consultation and other activities, can be done after the decisions of all the parties in the school. The pupils can decide on the state of affairs in regard to their learning situations, for example airing out their exasperations through legal means and stating how they can be helped. This is partially done in the Zimbabwean schools as manifested by the existence of the students' representative board, which has an upper hand on channelling the decisions or ideas of the learners to the administration or responsible authorities of the educational institutions. This reveals the importance of classical democracy to the Zimbabwean education system.

4.2.2 Relevance of direct democracy to Zimbabwean education system

The fundamental feature of direct democracy is that the citizens are directly involved on an individual basis in decision making in public affairs, rather than acting through intercessors (Held, 2006). All the people can personally participate on issues on question of open discussion and if accord prove impossible, a decision is then taken by a popular vote and this decision is then binding on all the people. This is critical in the Zimbabwean education system as it helps all participants in working towards a common good. The learners ought to be fully involved in the issues affecting them. In this regard, the student who are at the institutions where they are provided with the meals, they can suggest the types of the food they favour rather than the authorities to decide for them. The pupils can evaluate the way the teachers work or deliver their lesson through completing the evaluation questionnaires individually. This is important

in that it helps the teachers to note their weaknesses and correct as well as noting their strength and consolidate. In doing this, there would be harmony in schools and other educational institutions as the parties will be doing what satisfies each other. More so, some of the deviant behaviours among the learners will be reduced keeping in mind that deviance is partly a result of resistance to the failure of the other part. Thus one can be prompted to note that some indisciplines in the educational institutions are a result of persistence of the teachers in manifesting their weaknesses to the learners during the teaching and learning processes. Thus direct democracy as a model is much relevant to the Zimbabwean education system is followed as per its prescriptions.

Best et al (2011:5) says direct democracy today primarily means popular voting on specific issues, necessarily without much collective deliberation, especially if this takes place by electronic means. In direct democracy all power is placed in the hands of the individual citizens. When the decisions are being made, all the members meet together and individuals do cast a vote. This is ideal as each person is treated as an equal, and each person is given an opportunity to directly influence the policy making course. This is ideal to implement in small institutions such as schools, colleges and universities in Zimbabwe. The views of those in the learning institutions must be exalted and a chance must be given all participants to vote for any decisions done at the school. In the selection of the prefects at schools and the student representative body at tertiary learning institutions, there is need to involve all the participants. This will help in the smooth flow of the activities in the institutions as the elected members will be recognised by everyone, hence bringing harmony and peace at educational institutions. Thus direct democracy is vital and relevant to the education system in Zimbabwe.

4.2.3 Relevance of indirect democracy to Zimbabwean education system

This model of democracy is referred to as representative democracy. In indirect democracy, the people who are working representing the others are evaluated by the represented to see the worthiness of their performance. If many are satisfied, then it is probable that the representative individuals will be reinstated. This repetitive procedure generates a bond of accountability between the voters and those that they positioned into power. Indirect democracy is viable especially where there is a large population of the people or when it is difficult to assemble people to deliberate on the issues affecting the community or organization. This model of democracy is relevant in the Zimbabwean educational institutions such as schools, colleges and universities.

The educational institutions can make use of indirect democracy in various instances. In the drafting of the curriculum, there can be some representatives from all stakeholders to deliberate on the curriculum to be made. In the school situation, the learners can have their representatives who liaise with the school administration or the teachers on their plight. Such problems may be increased deviance on the pupils, the teaching irregularities, hygiene queries, improper association and other cause for concern. In sports and other inter school competitions the school can have a group of the students to represent the school. The learners can also form the board of representatives who act as a check and balance on the despotism of other parties in the educational institution. In primary schools in most Zimbabwean primary schools, there are individuals who represent the various departments. For example the health director is responsible for the health of all members in the institution, while the sports director deals with the concerns regarding to sports.

Furthermore, in indirect democracy the basic principle is also accountability and evaluation of those who are elected to represent others. Thus there is need in Zimbabwean schools for those

elected in certain departments to be accountable for everything that goes wrong in their department. Those who run the school finance need to be answerable in case there is some financial irregularities at the institution. This makes the members of the institution to work with caution leading to effective schools in the country. Those who put certain individuals in position must closely monitor the performance of those in position to see if they are competent. In case of an evidence of incompetent, there is need to change the person with an efficient member. The fact that there are some audit sessions done in institutions of learning in Zimbabwe shows that the principles of indirect democracy are regarded in Zimbabwe. It is also in line with indirect democracy where some teachers in school may find resource persons to teach on their behalf certain concepts. This implies that representative democracy is relevant in the Zimbabwean education system.

4.2.4 Relevance of protective democracy to Zimbabwean education system

In this model of democracy the objective is shielding human rights and liberties. In this regard there is need to defend rights, liberties and opportunities. These ought to be sheltered at any cost and guaranteed in the learning institutions. In the light of protective democracy, democracy is seen less as a mechanism through which the public participate in the political life, and more as a method through which the people could protect themselves from the infringements of the government. Protective democracy believes in popular rule, nevertheless since people indirectly take part in the processes of state, they do it via their representatives. Protective democracy endorses that both the popular sovereignty and representative form of government are valid. It is the principal duty of the state to shield the rights and liberties of people and whether this is appropriately done or not, citizens keep a strong observance over the utilities of state. The authority is answerable to the citizens and in order to establish it, elections are held on systematic basis.

Protective democracy is relevant to the Zimbabwean education system. In the schools it must be the duty of the schools to have democratic principles which protect the liberties and rights of every member at the institutions. The learners ought to be shielded from the infringement of their rights by other learners or teachers or the administration of the institution. It must be noted that many learner face challenges from other pupils, for example they may be bullied, isolated or discriminated. The teachers can also label the learners or sexually harass them especially if they are female ones. The teachers and the administration needs to be shielded from intimidation by external supervisors, the community or the political parties. In this regard the members in the educational institution must know their rights and liberties, and be free to exercise them in the boundaries of legality. The learners at the schools can be encouraged to form the clubs that make the learners aware of their rights and liberties, examples of such groups include the Girls Guides, AIDS Club and many others that can be formed in the learning institutions. Moreover, in schools there ought to be regular, systematic, free and fair elections especially in choosing representatives for certain positions. In this vital to ensure quality in the institutions of learning in Zimbabwe. Thus one can note that it is agreeable that protective democracy is relevant in the Zimbabwean education system.

Furthermore, there is prevalence of constitutionalism in protective democracy. In this regard, both the leader and the led are to be controlled by the principles laid down in constitution. According to protective democracy the constitution is the basis of power for all people and is the backer of rights and liberties. In order to prevent the defilement of rights and liberties, associations groups and citizens have enough freedom to fight against any violation of rights or intrusion on liberty. Protective democracy believes that there must be competition in all spheres at all levels and this is a manifestation that the individuals are using their liberties and rights and are not bound in chains of autocracy.

In this regard there must be a constitution for every educational institution that specify the wanted behavior as well as the penalty for violation of such constitution. This constitution must bind all the people at the institution including those on authority. It must not be a burden to the learners only but giving a free range to those on power to do what they deem necessary. It must be highlighted that those in power such as the teachers need to be exemplary in respecting the constitution and this will help the learners to follow the same course. In case of violation of the rights and the constitution, the members affected may vent out their exasperations by peaceful means such as demonstration and striking. The learners and teachers may strike in case that there is a serious issue affecting them in peacefully executing their duties. Such issues may be shortages of clean water and the incompetency or despotism of the administration. Thus one can note that protective democracy is relevant in the educational institutions in Zimbabwe.

4.2.5 Relevance of deliberative democracy to Zimbabwean education system

In deliberative democracy the public decisions ought to be made by an open discussion among the free and equal citizens. Decision making ought to be characterised by a reasoned discussion and collective judgement among the citizens (Cunningham, 2002). Deliberative democratic proponents have urged that democracy ought to be involving the exchange of reasons. Those who participate in the democratic procedure have to aim at an outcome that reflects not the balance of competing forces and political skills, but the force of the better argument (Cohen 1989 in Kahane et al, 2010). Deliberative democrats have also commended that involvement in the democratic procedure ought to be civic inclined rather than privatistic. This means that, all the participants must not enter into the democratic arena with an entirely formed notion of the positions they will eventually follow. Kahane et al (2010) argues that the participants should let themselves to be wavered by the arguments of other participants and attempt to look at the political agenda from a point that encompasses the interests of all people.

Deliberative democracy is essential in all the educational institutions such as schools because it gives room for the exchange of genuine reasons rather than simply as the skirmish of opposing interests. In schools all the stakeholders involved can make use of this model of democracy to ensure that they make intelligent decisions in whatever they do. Both the teachers and the learners must be given room to use deliberative democratic principles so as to build a good working environment. For example the teachers and the learners can discuss on the causes of deviance in schools or the reasons for a high failure rate at the institution. The learners can identify what they think are the causes of such issues while the teachers state also what they think are the causes of the issues at hand. The discussion among the parties involved must be fruitful leading to consensus. There must be logical reasoning and the suggestions given by each individual must be sustained by genuine reasons and others must evaluate as well as critically analysing. These discussions must bring good solutions to the problems at hand.

Deliberative democracy also enlightens all people in educational institutions in regard to the desperate need of teaching critical thinking so that people can have reasons for their actions and be able to justify those actions with solid reasons. In teaching of the subjects the teachers must not indoctrinate the learners but rather engage the learners so that they critically argue for the answers they give. In case that there is some unacceptable behaviour manifested at the educational institutions, there must not be a quick radical judgemental conclusion. Rather there is need to engage in a deliberation with the culprit to dig out the reasons behind such behaviour. For example a child may manifest strange behaviour at school because he or she is facing some challenges at home such as abuse. Thus through deliberation with such a child, the problem will be noted and a reasonable remedy be offered leading to better education in Zimbabwe. Therefore deliberative democracy is relevant in the Zimbabwean education system

4.2.6 Relevance of cosmopolitan democracy to Zimbabwean education system

The cosmopolitan model of democracy accepts that in the contemporary world situation the societies are directly and indirectly reliant on upon each other. This suggests that the activities, policies and schemes of one society will always influence those of other societies. Furthermore cosmopolitan democracy assumes active collaboration among all states in respect to the management of issues across the border of nation-states. Another belief of cosmopolitan democracy is that all the quarrelsome transnational issues ought to be settled by referendum. Moreover, this model denotes that the nation-states enjoy right to equal autonomy.

Cosmopolitan democracy is very important in Zimbabwean educational institutions such as the schools because it is liberal and it embraces all people from various places, tribes, countries and cultures. The principles of this model, if taken seriously in schools, may link many schools in the global world. Furthermore it will improve the quality of education since most of the decisions will be made from a global vantage point, rather than a local limited view. Thus one can argue that the issue of distance education and video conferencing, among many modern ways of learning, are a brain child of cosmopolitan model of democracy.

In Zimbabwe, the schools or educational institutions rely on each other in learning and in other programs. For example the satellite schools usually depend on the main established schools for guidance on how the schools are run, examinations as well as on the resources to use. It must also be pointed that the external assessors from other schools in other schools, is an indicator that cosmopolitan democracy is relevant in the Zimbabwean education system. The grouping of the educational institutions into provinces, districts and clusters is in essence an attempt to ensure interdependence and reliance among the educational institutions in Zimbabwe. The teaching methodologies such as group work, pair work, debates and discussions as well as field trips intends to foster sharing of knowledge and interdependence in the educational institutions.

In this regard it is also important to mention the School Development Programs done in schools that brings interdependence among the teachers on the knowledge of certain concepts that affects their profession. One can note that cosmopolitan model of democracy is applicable in the Zimbabwean education system.

4.3 Proposed model of democracy for education system in Zimbabwe

From my personal analysis of the numerous models of democracy that are applicable in the Zimbabwean education system, I propose that educational practitioners and other responsible authorities give preference to Habermas' deliberative democracy as guiding democratic model in the running of the educational institutions. This is due to the fact that this model of democracy has numerous advantages at the educational institutions and a deep analysis reveals that all other models can be deduced from deliberative democracy, that is to say their chief principles. Thus in this section, the focus is on highlighting the reasons why deliberative democracy is essential in the Zimbabwean education system.

In living and engaging deliberative democracy in educational institutions, the learners or students develop civic virtues such as honesty, toleration, and respect. Pamental (1998) says that these virtues mentioned are endorsed through civic skills such as seeking out alternative perspectives, favouring the status of the common good as well as achieving fair consensus. These capacities stand to prepare future citizens for dexterously dealing with the ostensibly irreconcilable variances of an increasingly diverse nation.

In deliberative communication each member in an institution of learning takes a stand by listening, pondering, looking for arguments, and evaluating, while simultaneously there is a combined effort to find the values and norms upon which everyone can agree (England, 2006). It is important to note that such communication, however, is not merely a just talk for the sake of talking. When done properly in the parameters of deliberative democracy, it must be centred

on real content only and ought to be directed toward legitimate action. In this regard, to be active and informed partakers, all members in the Zimbabwean education system need to learn how to evaluate different ways of living at their institution. This therefore involves critically reflecting on one's own way of living and learning to give good and intelligent reasons to support it, while at the same time being open to learning other better ways from peers. This helps to conserve peace at educational institutions. In this sense learners at schools need to learn to actively listen to others and appreciate the arguments or point of view of their peers. It is therefore reasonable for one to argue that appreciating someone else's perspective constructs empathy and an awareness of social issues effecting people dissimilar from one's self. Hence leading to moving away from self-centred individualism toward joint appreciation of diversity, conflict resolution and a common good as opposed to purchased good. Such tenets of deliberative democracy can make education system in Zimbabwe to be the centres of best quality education in the region and centres of moulding useful citizens.

Often many people simplistically comprehend democracy to be a routine activity of voting or merely a simple rule by the majority. In contrast, deliberative democracy goes beyond that as it welcomes the altercation of multiple viewpoints as well as storytelling of personal experiences, and tirelessly works toward consensus building as well as informed action plans in a way that simply voting cannot produce. All these can be the recognisable fruits in the Zimbabwean education system in deliberative democracy is taken as the chief model in the system.

Furthermore, deliberative democracy ought to be used as a chief model of democracy in the Zimbabwean education system because it supports social justice in its fullness. Social justice strives for fair treatment as well as recognition of all individuals and is particularly sensitive to the position of those who are regarded as vulnerable at the educational institutions such as the

learners, special learners, girls and women. It must be noted that social justice integrates deliberative democracy's stress on the perspectives of diverse individuals who need to be included in public decisions for the common good. Social justice as a principle in deliberative democracy, works its way to confront and curb aspects of inequality within schools. The struggles of individuals who are poor, the minority or disabled at the learning centres are dealt with reasonably if deliberative democracy is embraced in Zimbabwean education because everyone will be striving for a common good. Deliberative democracy in schools ensures that disagreement is not viewed as conflict but rather an opportunity for reasoning exchanging progressive ideas. One can thus be prompted to argue that deliberative democracy is good in Zimbabwean education system because it is a preventative measure against violence and gross deviance in schools.

Moreover, teaching under the auspices of deliberative democracy ensures that the students are empowered in the learning institutions in Zimbabwe. Through this model of democracy the students learn that the conversation they make are open to and respectful of the largest number of perspectives. In addition, learners in the schools becomes empowered to take control of the challenges they face in a rational manner. The learners become aware of their role as boundary keepers in the societies. Deliberative democracy, as noted by Robertson (2008), helps people to learn the boundaries of what is acceptable and permitted in school conversations so that they can insure that their classroom conversations do not veer into inappropriate areas. Deliberative democracy makes learners capable to air out their plight in a rational way and this will solve many instances whereby the female or male learners are abused secretly but regrettably being unable to expose that. This is because they lacked the skill of deliberating issues which can only be imparted by deliberative democracy. Thus one can note that Zimbabwean schools will solve many problems if they embrace deliberative democracy as a basic democratic model in the system.

Deliberative democracy is worth embraced in the Zimbabwean education system because it imparts evaluation skills to every member in the system leading to better policies and decisions being made, leading to quality education. Deliberative democratic evaluation is characterized by three principles, namely, deliberation, inclusion, and dialogue (Marie, 2010). Deliberation is defined as reasoning reflectively about significant issues, including detecting preferences and values of all participants. When this is embraced, there will be minimum or no chaos in the education system since any decision to be made is an outcome of a consideration of all views of participants such as teachers, learners, participants and others. There will be no dictatorial tendencies in the system where things are just a command from above to the surprise of the so called inferior members. If this had been embraced in the Zimbabwean education system, there would have been no rallying cry in the face of the implementation of the so called National Pledge. Inclusion is defined as containing all relevant interests, stakeholders as well as other citizens with specific concerns. Deliberative democratic evaluation is also dialogical, engaging stakeholders and evaluators in dialogues during the process of evaluation. It is through this dialogue that all stakeholder interests, opinions and ideas are portrayed more accurately as well as completely. This make the education system in Zimbabwe better and valuable.

Dialogues among members of the institution are valuable for such important activities as planning, making judgments, and evaluating the progress of the institutions. Key to this process is a commitment by all to put aside narrow self-interest and then address issues through respectful, reciprocal as conversation-enabling deliberation (Marie, 2010). In this manner, legitimate knowledge is widened to integrate views of less powerful stakeholder groups such as learners. In deliberative democratic evaluation there is particular emphasis on finding that all members of the institution are represented in conversations and decisions. Thus before any major decision is done, this work may be done in committees, focus groups, institutional public

forums and even in surveys. One can note that this is significant in the education system in Zimbabwe as it avert many ill decisions that can be done egocentrically by few individuals neglecting the other stakeholders leading to diminishing quality in education as well as inequalities and commotion.

4.4 Summary

This chapter gave an in-depth analysis of the relevance of the various selected models of democracy to the Zimbabwean education system. It has been unpacked that the seven models discussed in this chapter are to a greater magnitude applicable in the educational settings in Zimbabwe. The models analysed has revealed that democracy is profitable to all the stakeholders in the education system of Zimbabwe. Quality education has also been noted as the fruits of embracing democracy in the learning settings n Zimbabwe. The focus of the chapter closed stressing on the preferred model of democracy to the education system in Zimbabwe and deliberative democracy was the researcher's proposed model to the Zimbabwean education system. This is due to the fact that this model of democracy has numerous highlighted advantages at the educational institutions and a deep analysis reveals that all other models can be deduced from deliberative democracy, that is to say their chief principles.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter provides a detailed summary of an entire research and it trailed the order of the research chapters, that is, from chapter one to chapter four. This chapter also highlights the conclusions gotten grounding on the research findings and it gives the recommendations derived from the study. Thus this chapter covers these subtopics: summary of the chapters, detailed conclusions from the study, recommendations from the research and the suggestions for further study.

5.2 Summary of chapters

The essence of the study was to unfold the models of democracy that can be suitably applied to Zimbabwe school education system. The prime objectives of the research were to have an in-depth analysis of the concept of democracy, critically analyze the relationship among democracy, education and development; as well as finding out the relevance of different models of democracy for school education system in Zimbabwe. Chapter one was an introductory chapter focusing on the background to the study, thesis statement, research objectives, delimitations, limitations, assumptions, definition of key terms, methodology and it ended with a chapter outline.

Chapter two dealt with an in-depth analysis on the concept democracy dealing with its definition, history, theories types and principles. Many relevant sources were consulted in regard to the concept of democracy for relevant findings to be found. A trace of the concept of democracy was taken from the ancient times where some instances of democracy were ubiquitous in the ancient states. Chapter three was a critical analysis of the relationship among

democracy, education and development in the world. A comprehensive body of literature revealed that really there is a cordial relationship between the three concepts aforementioned. Chapter four did unpack the relevance of different models of democracy for education system in Zimbabwe and gave a proposed model of democracy in schools. This chapter revealed that there are six models of democracy that are applicable to the education system in Zimbabwe. These are classical democracy, direct democracy, indirect democracy, protective democracy, deliberative democracy and cosmopolitan democracy. It has been highlighted in this chapter that deliberative democracy surpasses all the other models, hence it was given preference as the proposed model of democracy in the school education system of Zimbabwe.

5.3 Findings and conclusions from research

It was noted by the researcher that democracy is a complex subject that cannot have a single static definition. Thus consistence has been found with Akindiyo's argument that it is a complex concept which is certainly not amenable to a single definition by the scholars (Akindiyo, 2015). It has been found that unique experiences of different societies makes it difficult to have a single static universal definition of the concept democracy. There it has been concluded that indeed, attempts at a complete and stagnant definition of democracy are not only beleaguered by problems, they are also anti-democratic, determined to control and enclose something that, by its very nature, must act in response to the varying and compound needs of people over time. It is democracy's dynamism, its sensitivity to the will of the people that must be central to any definition of democracy. Thus Jacques Derrida (2006) was correct when he rejoiced on the multiplicitous nature of democracy in his considerate that democracy's 'emancipatory promise' is always to come.

Thus the concept of democracy in this research, has been acknowledged from various standpoints. It has been noted from the study that democracy is a system of governance that

solicits to maximise three essentials, that is, accountability, representation and participation. The study found that the definitions of democracy can fall into the following groups: economic, social, communitarian or political definitions. The first of these three categories tend to define democracy in terms of the outcomes, for example the equalization of wealth, income, status or maintenance of a feeling of belonging in a community. On the other hand, in the political category democracy is defined by its procedures and institutions rather than its outcomes.

Following the concept of democracy from the primitive times worldwide to the contemporary period, this research concluded that democracy is a way of group decision making characterised by equality among the participants at an essential stage of collective decision making. From this conclusion there are some key aspects to be taken note of. These are collective decision making and equality in participation. The researcher noted that these are indispensable ingredients in the concept of democracy. It is upon this premises that hung all the human rights and the fundamental freedoms.

Furthermore, the study found out that there is an undeniable intimate relationship among democracy, education and development. Development has been noted as comprising of education, economic advancement, and basic civil and political liberties. Regardless of the hot debate that has seen the intellectual world being divided into democracy-development endorsers, democracy-development rejecters as well as the unsure scholars, this study noted that democracy tremendously leads to human development in manifold areas of their lives such as in economic life, political life, social life as well as the cultural life. Campos (1994) generally sees a positive relationship between democracy and development. Feng (2003) also discovered that democracy has a positive bearing on economic and social development. Therefore this research concluded that institutions that are undemocratic cannot bring human development in

all spheres of their life. This suggests that educational institutions can be centres of development if they are solely democratic.

Furthermore, this study founded that democracy and education are connected for there is a mutual relationship between the two. Consistence is found with Pinar (2003) and Carr (2000) who agree that in numerous countries, education and democracy are highly interwoven especially given the fact that education train people to interrelate with others and raises the benefits of civic participation, comprising voting and organizing. Thus the gist of the matter is that democracy has many benefits it offers to the educational institutions as mini societies. Democracy enhances quality education in a country leading to developed or improved societies and people. It has been founded to be an important instrument in solving or minimizing societal violence and disruptions, for example in educational institutions deviance and indiscipline can be reduced due to embracing democracy as a guiding principle.

In the same vein, it is concluded that democratic education have a duty to foster the nurturing of the virtues, knowledge and skills that are necessary for economic, social, civic moral and political involvement in the society. Such an education system must prepare people to take part in determinedly replicating their society and have a conscious social reproduction duty as the supreme of a democratic society. There are also essential practical values underlying democracy which education foster and encourage. These values include values such as tolerance of multiplicity and reciprocal respect between individuals and groups, a respect for evidence in establishing opinions, an inclination to be open to the probability of changing one's mind in the light of such evidence and treating all people as having equivalent social and political rights as human beings.

Furthermore, democracy was discovered to be very important in schools because it leads to improved people's attitudes and leads to human flourishing socially, psychologically and rationally. Consistent with this, John and Osborn (1992) research suggested that there is a strong correlation between democratic schools and the attitude of learners unlike in the traditional-authoritarian schools. Thus one can argue that students at democratic schools are more fervent supporters of race and gender equality as well as human rights. The findings also envisaged that the democratic schools are more likely to inspire freedom of expression in the classroom leading to better graduates. This prompts one to note that democracy is critically important in the education system.

In addition, democracy is vital in education because it comprises the enlargement of civic virtue and the behavioural personalities of the good citizen. From the study, civic virtue involves the relegation of personal interests to the common good of the whole community to which a person belongs. If learners would develop civic virtue, they practice the behavioural habits leading them to be the good citizens. Examples of such democratic dispositions include temperance, fortitude, commitment to justice, charity, optimism about the future, honesty, civility in dealings with others, tolerance as well as respect and recognition of the equality of humanity. These personalities ensures that the learners in a school will be graduates who are rational and who make informed decisions leading to the development of the country holistically. Thus the study concluded that there is a strong relationship among education, democracy and development.

Furthermore, this research found many models of democracy that help education in a multiplicity of ways and there are six models that were found to be perfectly suitable in the education system in Zimbabwe. These models differ in the extent to which they are applicable in the Zimbabwean education system. In classical democracy applicability to the Zimbabwean

education system was depicted in many ways. From the principles of classical democracy it was learnt and concluded that the schools or any other educational institution in Zimbabwe ought to maintain equality among all the people. The teachers needs to be treated equally and so are the learners to be treated. There must be no favouritism in the educational institutions. The gifted learners and the special needs learners needs to be equally treated by being given equal opportunities to develop their skills and potentialities. Justice must be the notable feature in institutions of learning. This must apply even to the deviants, justice must be given precedence. The members who violet the rules must not be arbitrarily mistreated. Moreover, the mass participation of all citizens in classical democracy made the researcher to note that participation of all the members in the education institutions is vital. The study thus concluded that all the learners and the teachers in the schools must be given opportunities to participate fully in the running of the institutions. Decisions on how to conduct school activities such as the prize giving days, games competitions, consultation and other activities, can be done after the decisions of all the parties in the school. The pupils can decide on the state of affairs in regard to their learning situations, for example airing out their exasperations through legal means and stating how they can be helped.

In direct democracy, it was found that all the people can personally participate on issues on question of open discussion and if accord prove impossible, a decision is then taken by a popular vote and this decision is then binding on all the people. It was then concluded that in the Zimbabwean education system embracing direct democracy helps all participants in working towards a common good. The learners ought to be fully involved in the issues affecting them. In this regard, the student who are at the institutions where they are provided with the meals, they can suggest the types of the food they favour rather than the authorities to decide for them. The pupils can evaluate the way the teachers work or deliver their lesson through completing the evaluation questionnaires individually. This is important in that it helps the

teachers to note their weaknesses and correct as well as noting their strength and consolidate. In doing this, there would be harmony in schools and other educational institutions as the parties will be doing what satisfies each other. More so, some of the deviant behaviours among the learners will be reduced keeping in mind that deviance is partly a result of resistance to the failure of the other part.

This study found and concluded that the educational institutions can make use of indirect democracy in various instances. In the drafting of the curriculum, there can be some representatives from all stakeholders to deliberate on the curriculum to be made. In the school situation, the learners can have their representatives who liaise with the school administration or the teachers on their plight. Such problems may be increased deviance on the pupils, the teaching irregularities, hygiene queries, improper association and other cause for concern. In sports and other inter school competitions the school can have a group of the students to represent the school. The learners can also form the board of representatives who act as a check and balance on the despotism of other parties in the educational institution. In this regard consistence has been found in primary schools in most Zimbabwean primary schools, as there are individuals who represent the various departments. For example the health director is responsible for the health of all members in the institution, while the sports director deals with the concerns regarding to sports. Therefore indirect democracy is concluded to be suitable in the Zimbabwean education system.

Protective democracy was found to be relevant to the Zimbabwean education system. It was hence concluded that in the schools it must be the duty of the schools to have democratic principles which protect the liberties and rights of every member at the institutions. The learners ought to be shielded from the infringement of their rights by other learners or teachers or the administration of the institution. It must be noted that many learner face challenges from other

pupils, for example they may be bullied, isolated or discriminated. The teachers can also label the learners or sexually harass them especially if they are female ones. The teachers and the administration needs to be shielded from intimidation by external supervisors, the community or the political parties. In this regard the members in the educational institution must know their rights and liberties, and be free to exercise them in the boundaries of legality. The learners at the schools can be encouraged to form the clubs that make the learners aware of their rights and liberties, examples of such groups include the Girls Guides, AIDS Club and many others that can be formed in the learning institutions. Moreover, in schools there ought to be regular, systematic, free and fair elections especially in choosing representatives for certain positions. In this vital to ensure quality in the institutions of learning in Zimbabwe. Thus conclusion is that it is agreeable that protective democracy is relevant in the Zimbabwean education system.

This research found also that cosmopolitan democracy is very important in Zimbabwean educational institutions such as the schools because it is liberal and it embraces all people from various places, tribes, countries and cultures. It was noted and concluded that the principles of this model links schools in the global world. Furthermore it improves the quality of education since most of the decisions will be made from a global vantage point, rather than a local limited view. Thus the issue of distance education and video conferencing, among many modern ways of learning, were concluded to be a brain child of cosmopolitan model of democracy. It was also found that in Zimbabwe, the schools or educational institutions rely on each other in learning and in other programs. For example the satellite schools usually depend on the main established schools for guidance on how the schools are run, examinations as well as on the resources to use. It was pointed that the external assessors from other schools in other schools, is an indicator that cosmopolitan democracy is relevant in the Zimbabwean education system. The grouping of the educational institutions into provinces, districts and clusters is in essence an attempt to ensure interdependence and reliance among the educational institutions in

Zimbabwe. The teaching methodologies such as group work, pair work, debates and discussions as well as field trips intends to foster sharing of knowledge and interdependence in the educational institutions. In this regard it is also important to mention the School Development Programs done in schools that brings interdependence among the teachers on the knowledge of certain concepts that affects their profession. It was therefore concluded that cosmopolitan model of democracy is applicable in the Zimbabwean education system.

Deliberative democracy was found to be the chief of all the models and because of its greater extent in the applicability to Zimbabwean education system, it was concluded that deliberative democracy is a proposed model for the education system in Zimbabwe. It was seen to be essential in all the educational institutions such as schools because it gives room for the exchange of genuine reasons rather than simply as the skirmish of opposing interests. In schools all the stakeholders involved can make use of this model of democracy to ensure that they make intelligent decisions in whatever they do. Both the teachers and the learners must be given room to use deliberative democratic principles so as to build a good working environment. For example the teachers and the learners can discuss on the causes of deviance in schools or the reasons for a high failure rate at the institution. The learners can identify what they think are the causes of such issues while the teachers state also what they think are the causes of the issues at hand. The discussion among the parties involved must be fruitful leading to consensus. There must be logical reasoning and the suggestions given by each individual must be sustained by genuine reasons and others must evaluate as well as critically analysing. These discussions must bring good solutions to the problems at hand.

Furthermore, it was found that deliberative democracy enlightens all people in educational institutions in regard to the desperate need of teaching critical thinking so that people can have reasons for their actions and be able to justify those actions with solid reasons. In teaching of

the subjects the teachers must not indoctrinate the learners but rather engage the learners so that they critically argue for the answers they give. In case that there is some unacceptable behaviour manifested at the educational institutions, there must not be a quick radical judgemental conclusion. Rather there is need to engage in a deliberation with the culprit to dig out the reasons behind such behaviour. For example a child may manifest strange behaviour at school because he or she is facing some challenges at home such as abuse. Thus through deliberation with such a child, the problem will be noted and a reasonable remedy be offered leading to better education in Zimbabwe. Therefore deliberative democracy was concluded to be relevant in Zimbabwean education system.

This research was a profound one as it tried to find out the various models of democracy that are applicable in the Zimbabwean education system. It concluded that one cannot take one model and stick to it so as to solely use it in the education system in Zimbabwe, rather an integrated approach is needed such all the principles of various models are seen in the system. This was found to bring out improved standards in the education system in the country.

5.4 Recommendations

The research envisioned to identify the models of democracy that can be suitably applied to Zimbabwe school education system. Grounding on the findings of the study, the following recommendations are worth mentioning:

- Various models of democracy ought to be embraced in the Zimbabwean education system to ensure quality education in the country as well as useful graduates
- The government need to draft a policy that will integrate democratic education into the curricula of the contemporary education system

- There is need to have ubiquitous workshops with all the stakeholders in the education system on the importance of democracy in schools
- Learners must be allowed to have their freedom freely expressed in the schools without threats from the responsible authorities
- There is need by the government and other organizations to enlighten learners in the schools so that they are empowered in regard to democracy
- Any change in the education system ought to be a brain child of all the stakeholders and not a reform from above
- There is need to jealously guard the freedoms, rights and opportunities of teachers, pupils and other stakeholders from infringement by the government
- Deliberation ought to characterize the education institutions in the country and every learning must be characterized by critical thinking and rationality by all
- Any decision in the schools must be rendered valid after having voted for it and the majority endorsed it

5.5 Suggestion for further study

The researcher suggests that the following areas be studied by other or future researchers:

- The extent to which democracy is implemented in Zimbabwean schools or an evaluation of democracy in Zimbabwean schools
- Challenges faced by teachers and learners in embracing democracy in educational institutions

- Comparison of the implementation of democracy between urban and rural Zimbabwean schools
- The influence of political atmosphere in the country on democracy in educational settings

REFERENCES

- Ake, C. (1996). Rethinking African Democracy. In L. Diamond and M. F. Plattner (eds) *The Global Resurgence of Democracy*. (pp. 63–75). Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Bailkey, N. (1967). Early Mesopotamian Constitutional Development. *The American Historical Review*, 72(4), 1211–1236.
- Best, E., Augustyn, M. and Lambermont, F. (2011). *Direct and Participatory Democracy at Grassroots Level: Levers for forging EU citizenship and identity?* European Union.
- Blackwell, C. W. (2003). *Athenian Democracy: an overview*. Blackwell.
- Boix, C. and Stokes, S. (2003). Endogenous Democratization. *World Politics* 55: 517–49.
- Bryce, J. (1921). *Modern Democracies* (Vol. I). London: Macmillan.
- Carr, W. (2000). Democracy and the Curriculum. *The Curriculum Journal*, 7:73-77.
- Chambers, S. (2003). Deliberative Democratic Theory. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 6: 307-326.
- Cicero, M. T. (1998). *The Republic and The Laws* (N. Rudd, trans.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cunningham, F. (2002). *Theories of Democracy: A Critical Introduction*. NY: Routledge.
- Dawson, J.W. (1998). Institutions, investment, and growth: new cross-country and panel data evidence. *Economic Inquiry* 36, 603–619.
- De Melo, M., Denier, C., Gelb, A. (1996). From plan to market: patterns of transition. *World Bank Economic Review* 10, 397–424.

De Tocqueville, A. (1864 [1835]). *Democracy in America* (H. Reeve, trans., 4 edn, Vol. 1). Cambridge: Sever and Francis.

Deng, F. M. (2004). Human Rights in the African Context. In K. Wiredu (ed.), *Companion to African Philosophy* (pp. 499–508). Malden: Blackwell.

Derrida, J. (2006) *Spectres of Marx: The State of the Debt, the Work of Mourning, and the New International* (P. Kamuf, trans.). New York: Routledge.

Dethier, J. J., Ghanem, H., Zoli, E. (1999). Does democracy facilitate economic transition? An empirical study of Central and Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. *Journal for Institutional Innovation, Development and Transition* 3, 15– 30.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and Education*. The Macmillan Company.

Doucouliagos, H., and M. Ulubasoglu (2008). Democracy and Economic Growth: A Meta-Analysis. *American Journal of Political Science*, 52(1): 61–83.

Edwards, S. (1991). *Stabilization and liberalization policies in Central and Eastern Europe: lessons from Latin America*. NBER Working Paper 3816. National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, MA.

Elster, J. (1994). The Impact of Constitutions on Economic Performance. *Proceedings of the World Bank Annual Conference on Development Economics*, 1994.

Englund, T. (2006). Deliberative Communication: A Pragmatist Proposal. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 38(5): 503-520.

Feng, Y. (2003) *Democracy, Governance, and Economic Performance: Theory and Evidence*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Fernandez, R. and Rodrik, D. (1991). Resistance to reform: status quo bias in the presence of individual-specific uncertainty. *American Economic Review* 81, 1146– 1155.

Fidrmuc, J. (2000). *Liberalization, democracy and economic performance during transition*. ZEI Working Paper B52000. ZEI, Bonn.

Finley, M. I. (1973). *Democracy Ancient and Modern*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Ghali, B. et al (2002). *The interaction between democracy and development*. UNESCO.

Glaeser, E., Ponzetto, G., & Shleifer, A. (2006). Why Does Democracy Need Education? *Journal of Economic Growth*, 12:77-99.

Glassman, R. M. (1986). *Democracy and Despotism in Primitive Societies: A Neo-Weberian Approach to Political Theory. Volume 1: Primitive Democracy*. Millwood: Associated Faculty.

Goedicke, H. (1975). *The Report of Wenamun*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Goody, J. (2006). *The Theft of History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gutmann, A. and D. Thompson (1996). *Democracy and disagreement*. Cambridge: Harvard.

Gutmann, A. and Thompson, D. (2004). *Why Deliberative Democracy?* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Habermas, J. (1987). *The Theory of Communicative Action* (T. McCarthy, trans.). Boston: Beacon.

Habermas, Jürgen (1989). *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

- Halperin, M., Siegel, J. & Weistein, M. (2005). *The democracy advantage: How democracies promote prosperity and peace?* New York: Routledge Publishers.
- Hattersley, A. F. (1930). *A Short History of Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Held, D. (2006). *Models of Democracy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hepburn, M. (1984). Democratic schooling - five perspectives from research. *International Journal of Political Education* Volume 6.
- Hobbes, T. (2002 [1651]). *Leviathan*. Project Gutneberg.
- Isakhan, B. and Stockwell, S. (2011). *A secret history of democracy*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jackson, P. (2011). *What is education?* University of Chicago Press.
- John, P. and Osbom, A. (1992). The influence of school ethos on pupils' citizenship attitudes. *Educational Review* 44 (2).
- Josephus, F. (1700). *Against Apion* (W. Whiston, trans.). Project Gutenberg.
- Kahane, D., Weinstock, D., Dominique, L. and Williams, M. (2010). *Deliberative Democracy in Practice*. Toronto: UBC Press.
- Keane, J. (2009). *The Life and Death of Democracy*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Kelly, A. V. (1995). *Education and Democracy: Principles and Practices*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Laclau, E. and Mouffe, C. (1985). *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. London: Verso.

Leick, G. (2001). *Mesopotamia: The Invention of the City*. London: Penguin.

Lincoln, A. (1863, 19 November). *Gettysburg Address*. Vol. IX.

Lipset, S. (1959). Some Social Requisites of Democracy: Economic Development and Political Legitimacy. *American Political Science Review* 53: 69-105.

Mangu, A. (2014). The African Union and the promotion of democracy and good political governance under the African peer review mechanism: 10 years on. *Africa Review* 6(1):59-72.

Marie, S. (2010). Deliberative Democracy in Teacher Education. *Journal of Public Deliberation*: Vol. 6: Iss. 1, Article 5.

Martin, M. and Snell, D. C. (2005). Democracy and Freedom. In D. C. Snell (ed.), *A Companion to the Ancient Near East* (pp. 397–407). Malden: Blackwell.

Masaki, T. and Walle, N. (2014). *The impact of democracy on economic growth in sub-Saharan Africa, 1982-2012. WIDER Working Paper*. World Institute for Development Economics Research.

Mesquita, D., Bruce, B. and Downs, G. (2005). Development and Democracy. *Foreign Affairs* 84(5): 77-86.

Moran, W. L. (ed.). (1992). *The Amarna Letters*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Muhlberger, S. and Paine, P. (1993). Democracy's Place in World History. *Journal of World History*, 4(1), 23–47.

Mullen, E. T. (1980). *The Assembly of the Gods: The Divine Council in Canaanite and Early Hebrew Literature*. Chicago: Scholars.

North, D. and Weingast, B. (1989). Constitutions and Commitment: Evolution of Institutions Governing Public Choice. *Journal of Economic History*, December 1989.

North, D.C. (1993). *The Paradox of the West*. Economics Working Paper Archive. Washington University-St. Louis, Missouri.

Oppenheim, A. L. (1969). Mesopotamia: Land of Many Cities. In I. M. Lapidus (ed.), *Middle Eastern Cities: A Symposium on Ancient Islamic and Contemporary Middle Eastern Urbanism*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Pamental, M. (1998). *What Is It Like to Be a Deliberative Democrat?* Paper presented at the Philosophy of Education Society.

Pinar, W. (2003). Understanding Curriculum Policy. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 5: 37-43.

Przeworski, A. and Limongi, F. (1993). Political Regimes and Economic Growth. *The Journal of Economic Perspective* 7(1): 51-69.

Przeworski, A., Michael, E. Alvarez, Cheibub, A. and Limongi, F. (2000). *Democracy and Development: Political Institutions and Well-being in the World 1950-1990*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Rao, S. (2004). *Poverty, democracy and development: issues for consideration by the Commonwealth Expert*. Group on Democracy and Development. Commonwealth Secretariat.

Rawls, J. (2001). *Justice as Fairness: A Restatement*. Cambridge: Belknap Press.

Rist, G. (2014). *The history of development: From Western origins to global faith*. ZED Books Ltd.

Robertson, E. (2008). Teacher Education in a Democratic Society: Learning and Teaching the Practices of Democratic Participation. In *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education*, edited by Marilyn Cochran-Smith, Sharn Feiman-Nemser, D. John McIntyre, and Keely E. Demers, 27-44. New York: Routledge.

Robinson, E. W. (1997). *The First Democracies*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Robinson, P. T. (1986). New Conflicts. In A. A. Mazrui and T. K. Levine (eds), *The Africans: A Reader* (pp. 133–155). New York: Praeger.

Rodrik, D. (2000). Where did all the growth go to? External shocks, social conflict, and growth collapses. *Journal of Economic Growth* 4, 385–412.

Schemeil, Y. (2000). Democracy before Democracy? *International Political Science Review*, 21(2), 99–120.

Schumpeter, J. (1947). *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy*. New York: Harper and Brothers.

Sen, A. (2003). Democracy and Its Global Roots: Why Democratisation Is Not the Same as Westernisation. *The New Republic*, 229(14), 28–35.

Siegle, T., Michael, M. & Halperin, M. (2004). "Why democracies excel." *Foreign Affairs* 83(5): 57-71.

Teffo, J. (2002). Monarchy and Democracy: Towards a Cultural Renaissance. *Journal on African Philosophy*, 1(1), 1–17.

Teffo, J. (2004). Democracy, Kingship, and Consensus: A South African Perspective. In K. Wiredu (ed.) *A Companion to African Philosophy* (pp. 443–449). Malden: Blackwell.

The Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action, Part I, paragraph 5, in Ghali et al (2002) *the interaction between democracy and development*. UNESCO.

Wolf, C. U. (1947). Traces of Primitive Democracy in Ancient Israel. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, 6(2), 98–108.

World Summit Outcome (2005). Paragraph 135.

Young, I. (2000). *Inclusion and Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.