

CITIZENSHIP, EDUCATION, RELIGION AND RELIGIOUS IDENTITY IN PUBLIC SCHOOLING IN SOUTH AFRICA

M Naidoo (Unisa)

Abstract

Religion education grounded in universal human rights and civil toleration raises tensions between liberal assumptions of citizenship and religious perspectives. In the public school environment, nurturing learners to become responsible, effective citizens grounded in their worldview and identity may conflict with their developing religious identity and can pose a problem in realizing the vision of a democratic South Africa. This article unveils how the new focus of citizenship education within the Policy on Religion and Education in South Africa interacts with the competing, conflicting claims of religious identity and considers the complex interrelationship of the above concepts and the implication for learners in public schools.

Key Words: Religion Education, Citizenship Education, Religious Identity, Democracy, Values Education

INTRODUCTION

Citizenship education seeks to inculcate specific forms of behaviour and ways of thinking. It is axiomatic that "democracy is more than a form of government; it is primarily a mode of associated living" (Dewey 2002:101). The rights of citizenship interface with religion on the political-legal side and the symbolic-affective side (Chidester 2002:14). Religion education grounded in universal human rights and civil toleration highlights tensions between liberal assumptions of citizenship and religious perspectives. This raises an important question: What if the way in which children are taught in school to live and exercise their citizenship is not congruent with the way parents would have their children learn to live? What if the central tenets of

citizenship education are contrary to the religious beliefs of parents?

It is important to note that the idea of human rights may present competing, conflicting claims in relation to religious obligation, or stand in necessary counterpoint to religious loyalties (Gustafson & Juviler 1999). In the public school environment, we encounter different value systems in each religion and are taught to accommodate them as a meeting place of different values, beliefs and cultures. But each learner also bears within himself or herself a religious identity. In schools, nurturing learners to become responsible, effective citizens grounded in their worldview and identity may conflict with their developing religious identity; this could pose a problem in realizing the democratic vision. Given that the education policy supports education as a formative enterprise (Chidester 2006:69), it is important to establish how learners mediate their religious identity in the context of a co-operative democracy. Against this background, the purpose of this paper is to consider how citizenship education within the new Policy on Religion and Education in South Africa (DoE 2003) interacts with personal religious identity. To this end, this paper will first describe the new South African educational context, emphasizing the new focus on citizenship education via Values Education in reaching the democratic vision. Secondly, the paper will challenge the liberal assumptions of citizenship education insofar as they compete and conflict with the claims of religious identity. The final section will consider the complex interrelationship of the above concepts and their implication for learners in public schools in contributing to the "will to live together" in our new society.

1. THE SOUTH AFRICAN CONTEXT

South Africa, now legally and politically a constitutional democracy, is faced with the major challenge of building up new economic, social and cultural structures in this multicultural land. More than this, we are faced with the task of *realizing* the democratic vision (Dreyer 2006). This realization seems to be particularly difficult in South Africa because apartheid annihilated the fundamental human values that are important preconditions for democratic order. A respect for free speech and tolerance of the views of others has been the casualties of the struggle against apartheid (Prozesky 1995; Saayman 1993). The still recent transition to democracy and the radical break with the past mean that South Africans do not yet have a settled conception of citizenship to draw on (Enslin 2003:73). Mattes (2002) challenges the common view that in divided societies like South Africa people identify more readily with one of its ethnic, racial or religious components than with the society as a whole.

Religious education is often viewed as helping to nurture democratic values, political literacy and nation building among the youth. Berkowitz (1998) notes that education for democracy is of particular interest in countries which are newly democratic or are attempting to strengthen their democratic nature. In South Africa the change to a secular state has led to a democratic educational philosophy which guarantees freedom of religion and prohibits any discrimination on religious grounds.

1.1 The Religion and Education Policy

South Africa's Policy for Religion and Education (DoE 2003) was linked to a broad range of initiatives celebrating linguistic, cultural and religious diversity. Religion education in the curriculum was linked to a broader range of educational projects within the schools, the public sphere and the international arena taking up the challenge of internalizing and actualizing the promise of the national motto, "unity in diversity" (Chidester 2008). In this formula for national unity, the heritage of the past and the diversity of the present could be mobilized in the service of a national future (Chidester 2006). The policy is set against the larger context of building a new nation out of the legacy of dehumanization suffered by the majority of South Africans under apartheid. Thus it recognizes religious resources and strategies for redemption, by creating an intersection between personal subjectivity and the social collectivity intended to restore human dignity. The religion-friendliness of the policy acknowledges the positive role that religion can play in modern, democratic societies. While departing from the overtly religious agenda of the apartheid regime, this new policy affirms respect for the religious heritage of South Africa in all its diversity, but makes a principled distinction between religious education, instruction or nurture, which is best served by families and religious communities, and religion education, which is best served by learning about religion, religions and religious diversity. Multi-religious education (Simuchimba 2005:107) in public schools is promoted, using a phenomenological approach, with the emphasis on teaching students *about* religion rather than promoting specific religions.

In order to participate in a unified non-racial, non-sexist and democratic South Africa, as well as in an increasingly globalized world, learners need some level of educational

engagement with religion, religions and religious diversity (DoE 2003). Religion Education, based on educational goals and objectives, but also promising social benefits of greater understanding and toleration and a reduction in prejudice, was introduced into the curriculum as an integral part of the subject field Life Orientation (LO) and Religion Studies (RS). LO is a compulsory subject for all learners and is made up of four learning areas that deal with values. Religion education is located in one of these learning areas called "social development", and is designed to advance knowledge about the many religions in South Africa and the world, and also to cultivate an informed respect for diversity (DoE 2003). The main aim of RS is religious literacy and citizenship education; it should develop the capacity for "mutual recognition, respect for diversity, reduced prejudice and increased civil toleration that are necessary for citizens to live together in a democratic society" (DoE 2003). RS is a specialized, examinable option in Grades 10–12, the last three years of school education. Teachers are expected to teach content and to facilitate different belief systems and values in the subjects of RS and LO (NCS Religion Studies 2006; NCS Life Orientation 2003). These educational expectations are part of social development and citizenship education (Kymlicka 1999; Jackson 2004; Callan 1997).

1.2 Values Education in public schools

Within the Department of Education, the Religion and Education policy was integrated into the broader aims of the Values in Education initiative by developing new approaches to anti-racist and anti-sexist education and by identifying a range of basic values, such as equity, mutual respect, tolerance, accountability and social honour that should be instilled in all educational practice, as set out in the Manifesto (DoE 2001). One outcome in these learning areas is active participation in the promotion of a democratic,

equitable and just society. Another is that learners will be helped to exercise their rights and responsibilities. It is envisaged that all teaching and learning activities should be rooted in the Manifesto's values, which also strongly direct the interpretation of the subjects Religion Studies and Life Orientation in developing an understanding of religious diversity. These values include the concept of identity and identity formation and "respect for religious and social distinctions" (Morrison 2000:124–125).

Values can be defined as the beliefs held by individuals to which they attach special priority or worth and by which they tend to order their lives; they constitute norms or principles embedded in a person, a cultural group, a religion or belief system (Hill 1991:4). Values are *the* hermeneutical key unlocking any religion (Du Toit 1998). As part of the Department of Education's major cultural project, the Values in Education Initiative, attention to religion was framed by reflection on values. In teaching religion studies, religious content is taken as the point of departure in which universal values are identified and used to imply a mutual value system (McLaughlin 1995:26–27).

In implementing these values across the curriculum, teachers have to be sensitized to the different values embedded in each belief system and cultural orientation (Rhodes & Roux 2004). Furthermore, teachers have to be equipped to facilitate these values (Green 2004).

However, the question is whether teachers have the necessary training and skills to facilitate the various identified value and belief systems (Ferguson & Roux 2003). Unfortunately, prejudice towards diversity in society and school still prevails (Pratap Kumar 2006) and can be counterproductive to the implicit value system of the education process. It was found that teachers moralize religious content to establish good behaviour, and that

teachers teach from a mono-religious perspective, although in a multi-religious school environment (Roux & Steenkamp 1995). Having developed a curriculum in line with the new national policy, little progress has been made in teacher training to achieve the educational outcomes (Harley & Wedekind 2004). Teachers in training, especially those who come from homogeneous environments, are not necessarily literate in religious diversity and often display signs of fear or discomfort when placed in a religiously diverse environment (Roux & Du Preez 2006, Roux, Du Preez & Ferguson 2009). In addition to this challenge, learners' lack of knowledge about their own value system is also a matter of concern; it was alarming that learners showed a lack of skill in reflecting their own behaviour and values when studying the content (Roux 2004). While the new curriculum's infusion of the concept of democratic citizenship and respect for cultural and religious diversity is positive, it is clear that the conditions and context for effective implementation of both the new curriculum and values in education are not in place in most schools (Sayed 2002; Vally 2005)

Other challenges in implementing values education include implementing the model of managing values, which is the value-neutral or the value-clarification approach. The concept is not based on existing values and norms that the students have to internalize, but rather on the values that young people have already internalized. The aim is to guide students' exploration of those attitudes and internalized norms that interfere with the unity of thought, emotion and decision making. Learners' questions about life and meaning are dealt with by teachers in an objective and neutral manner. According to Kirschenbaum (1977), one of the criticisms against the value-neutral approach is that it is unsuitable as an approach to identifying values in the curriculum, because a study of values can only be an attempt to explain how a person develops his or her own

values (Ziebertz 2008:146). If values are not taught directly, they will still be embedded in the teacher's taken-for-granted worldviews and will be part of the hidden curriculum (Halstead 1996:4). Values lie beneath the surface of everything that teachers do, even when they are unacknowledged (McLaughlin 1995:20–23). Consequently, one has to consider the criticism of implied neutrality with regard to the religious convictions or religious identities of both the teacher and the learner (Hermans 2001; Sterkens 2001). Other criticisms include the ideological character of multi-religious education (Ziebertz 2003:123), focusing on the instrumental character while dismissing the experience of the learner, and the perception that the preoccupation with religion will have no consequences on the individual's view of life.

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP IN EDUCATION

Citizenship education has recently been introduced as a separate subject in the curriculum in many countries around the world, and various claims have been advanced in support of this move. Giddens tells us that "citizenship education can improve the lives and school experience of young people" (2000:14). Hargreaves suggests that it will provide the cement to hold a pluralist society together (1994:37). There is also a widespread assumption that citizenship education will provide an important and widely accepted way of delivering moral education and values education more generally (Crick 1998; Halstead & Taylor 2000:170)

According to Beck (1998:102–106), *citizenship* is an essentially contested concept. In its minimal sense it refers to the political and legal status of individual members of a state. This concept may be expanded by introducing the notion of the "active citizen", a term which implies that the citizen is actively involved in "shaping the way his or her

community functions" (Miller 2000:28). McGhie discusses maximal citizenship as: a collaborative, participative process that promotes active engagement; an inclusive process that promotes a sense of belonging; a process founded on human rights, one that values diversity, is "aspirational" and actively seeks the wellbeing of all members of the community (1999:33). South Africa's developing conception of citizenship draws mainly on two ingredients: the anti-apartheid struggle and the new Constitution, which has forged a highly participatory notion of maximal democratic citizenship (Mattes 2002). This sense of citizenship presupposes a framework of liberal values and takes for granted that citizenship education is democratic education (Callan 1997; Gutmann 1987; Tamir 1995).

Like citizenship, *citizenship education* can be conceived as an education which is designed to produce informed and politically literate citizens (Beck 1998:108). The broader conception is of an education which aims to produce not only informed but also committed citizens, who are morally and socially responsible. It therefore includes the development of values, skills and aptitudes as well as knowledge of the concepts involved. In this view, schools have a responsibility to transmit the public values of society and to encourage pupils to develop a commitment to these (McLaughlin 1995:27–30). In South Africa, Values Education is central to the above model of active citizenship, within a framework of public values.

From a liberal perspective, private values are more substantial views of human good that go beyond the public framework (McLaughlin 1995:26–27). They may be more or less reasonable or controversial, but what distinguishes them from public values is that there are no conclusive objective grounds that everyone will accept as appropriate for selecting one set of private values over another. The liberal state will therefore tolerate the wide range of differing

private values and adopt a neutral stance between them, as long as they operate within the framework of justice and respect difference and diversity of this kind, which makes a state pluralist (Jackson 2004). This concept of "enlightened neutrality" holds up an ideology of mutual interdependence as it expels religion from the public to the private domain (Ziebertz 2008). All too often liberalism is misguidedly thought of as a neutral alternative to religious perspectives rather than a specific ideological vision (Pike 2008:115). Religious parents and groups might well argue that the state is failing to pay due respect to their rights by imposing the current citizenship curriculum, when being a good citizen can be "perfectly compatible with unswerving belief in the correctness of one's own way of life" (Galston 1989:99).

2.1 Religious believers and liberal values

Those who have a legitimate interest in what children learn in school often have divergent expectations and needs; yet education for democratic citizenship is mandatory for all. While liberal values permeate the curriculum of public schools, it is important to recognize that by no means all citizens share these values (Sachs 2005). Challenges come from competing secular value systems like postmodernism (Hutcheon 2003) and radical feminism (Graham 1994), as well as from Islamic (Halstead 2004) and Christian worldviews (Pike 2005). Many Christians whose views are informed by the scriptures (Phil. 3:20, Eph. 2:1–11) may well consider themselves to be citizens of Christ's kingdom before they are citizens of a temporal political entity, while Muslims often consider themselves to be primarily members of the *Umma* (worldwide community of Islam) and have concerns about the secular and liberal nature of the state of education in South Africa (Dreyer 2006). Many religious believers find they cannot give pluralism their unequivocal support because endorsing a range of lifestyles, rather than

prescribing more narrowly how one should live, is no more neutral than the teaching in churches that declares some ways of living to be sinful and other ways to be pleasing to God. Pluralism is considered by liberals to be the most rational response to diversity but this can discriminate against those who sincerely believe that some ways of living are morally acceptable and others are not (Pike 2008). The tension between the liberal assumptions of citizenship education and such religious perspectives should not be underestimated.

Core liberal values – generally considered to be liberty, equality and rationality – underpin citizenship (Pike 2008). For most secular citizens, individual liberty entails the freedom to pursue their own interests and desires, when for many committed religious believers this is not considered to be freedom at all. In fact, the pursuit of one's own desires can be regarded as evidence of a lack of freedom from such desires. For many Christians, for instance, genuine freedom can only be found in following God's way as communicated in scripture and lived out in the life of a community. Equality also tends to be viewed in different ways by "believers" and "non-believers", and many religious parents "do not want parity of treatment with other groups, but the freedom to bring up their children in line with their own religious commitments" (Halstead 1995:264). In a secular liberal democracy, decisions tend to be made on the basis of rational justification. While this seems entirely reasonable to most secular people, the exclusive reliance upon this approach may well be contested by those for whom many decisions should not be made on the basis of reason only. This contrast between secular liberalism and religious faith needs to be appreciated by educators, because privileging autonomous rationality may exclude any theonomous alternative (Pike 2005:115). Seeing reason and revelation as incompatible has been challenged by authors such as

Sampson (2000), but we are, perhaps, more aware now than ever before that reason alone can be inadequate, given the nature of our lives and the way in which we actually live.

2.2 The issue of moral education

In the history of public schools, educators who formerly linked moral education to traditional religion have severed those ties in favour of secular perspectives and of late have shifted focus to educating in citizenship (Ziebertz 2003). In each case concern surfaces about whose values, morals and perspectives dominate. The educational task of preparing learners for citizenship (Halstead 2006:207) involves encouraging learners to develop a substantial commitment to public values and to civic virtues which allow the public values to flourish. Secondly, it encourages learners to explore, discuss and critically reflect on the diversity of values in the private domain and to make autonomous choices in this area. Thirdly, it encourages them to develop tolerant and respectful attitudes towards those beliefs, values and commitments different from their own.

In the active citizenship model, as in South Africa, multi-religious education does overlap with moral education in consensus morality of human solidarity and personal autonomy (Steyn 1999:139). Indeed, Crick argues that any teaching on citizenship not based on moral values and reasoning would be mechanical and boring, or even dangerous (1998:19). And in a survey of teachers' attitudes of citizenship education in South Africa, respondents clearly maintained that the moral dimensions of citizenship mattered far more than the legal or political dimensions; the good citizen was described as being conscious of the interests of others and the wider society and acting accordingly (Schoeman 2006).

However, the *Manifesto on Values, Education and Democracy* (DoE 2001) is more successful in articulating values for democratic citizenship than values in general (Enslin 2003:81). A preoccupation with the values of the public democratic sphere leads to neglect of the personal and private (Enslin 2003). This "active" citizenship model faces the dilemma that the more substantial the framework of public values, the more people there will be who do not share those values and therefore feel excluded; but the thinner the values framework, the less adequate it will be as a means of moral education (Halstead 2006:207). This model presupposes a liberal framework of values, which is clearly necessary for an understanding of citizenship in a liberal democracy, but is not necessary for an understanding of morality (Haydon 2000). It becomes an issue that in the liberal framework religion is relegated to a matter of individual choice, whereas for many people it is the basis of their moral understanding.

2. THE CHALLENGE OF RELIGIOUS IDENTITIES IN EDUCATION

Effective citizenship implies civic responsibilities, not the least of which is the recognition that the individual is part of a larger social fabric. Yet everyone is also a member of a smaller community which is defined by certain basic values that may exhibit real and potential value differences on some of the larger fundamental social issues (Cohen 1982). British educator Robert Jackson feels that with increasing inter-communal, inter-religious tension, religion is no longer a private matter but has become a public concern, and that society benefits "if pupils in our society are conversant with its language" (Jackson 2004:139). Educational philosopher Callan (1997:3), recognizing the import of these specific values, argues that "there is a need to go beyond the tribalism of ethnicity and religion, as significant as these may

be in the lives of many, rather focusing on a commitment to the political good." While this position is appealing, it does not negate the fact that core values will always be understood and interpreted according to the particular worldview and religious identity embraced by the individual.

Religious identity refers to a religion's self-interpretation as recognized by a supportive audience. Thus we speak of a person's religious identity or a religious community's identity because of their recognition and appropriation of a religious concern (Ziebertz 2008). It reflects a dynamic process in which religious "data" in the form of texts, rituals, symbols, values, and the like are evaluated and related to the concerns of everyday life (Ziebertz 2003). Religious identity is made up of ideological, ritual and institutional identity (Van der Ven 2003:480). It is "fluid and complex: its meaning contested by different interpretations and definitions, ever subject to changing conditions and multiple understandings" (Tanner 1997:25). Individuals or communities deem certain beliefs and practices significant to the extent that they label themselves a religious individual or community.

In our society of plural perspectives, identities, whether religious or secular, that ground moral convictions attain particular importance and significance. For instance, religiocentrism is a type of ethnocentrism that exhibits a slanted perception due to the influence of doctrines or a particular way of thinking and the general ideology of the educator, be it religious, non-religious or anti-religious, as well as the ideology of the learner and his or her family and social context (De Velasco 2007). On many occasions religiocentrism derived from a religious identity is not perceived in a fully conscious way, but nevertheless provides a filter of reality that can detract from what is being taught or studied. However much a model of citizenship seeks to avoid narrow forms of nationalism or

ethnocentrism, it cannot avoid other more subtle forms of inequality or cultural domination. It necessarily involves a rejection of the view, which some citizens may hold, that religious attachments are more important than political ones as a source of identity, or that the Islamic *Umma* is more important than the nation state (Halstead 2005). Such a religious identity may not recognize the essential frame of equality among the different religions. Religious identity is marked by its centrality, priority, obligation and resistance to change within the overarching set of an identity system (Ziebertz 1993). What is more, its longevity over time gives religious identity a perennial credibility, surpassing the contingencies that appertain to biographical, political or other immanent notions of identity (Van der Ven 2003:480). This strongly felt credibility may lend itself to emotional or ideological support for better or worse.

One of the problems of religious identities in a multi-religious world is the exclusiveness of religious claims, the view that "my religion" is in some way more unique, superior, normative and absolute (Knitter 1985). Although religious identity is more than this, its holder cannot escape the question of the "other," of other religions in a religiously plural world (Hermans 2001). In education, this religious identity of the learner can be a powerful resource or, conversely, can be a source of active intolerance or prejudice (De Velasco 2007). It is important to note that there is an inescapable link between a person's religious identity and his or her attitude towards adherents of other religions or religious diversity (Ziebertz 1993), since core values will always be understood and interpreted within the particular religious identity embraced (Du Toit 1998). For example, Christian opponents to the education policy warned that removing Christian instruction and Christian worship from public schools would deprive children of divine protection (Chidester 2006:78), and that asking them to

learn about other religions, especially about South Africa's indigenous religious heritage, would expose them to demoniac possession (Horn 2003:62). Other Christian opponents opposed religion education by alleging that it established a uniform multi-religious religion or, alternatively, that it established a uniform anti-religious philosophy of secular humanism (Chidester 2006:73) and thereby undermined the decentralized role of local schools in determining their own particular and distinctive religious ethos. As we can see from the above, while religious communities offer identity to people, in many cases this identity is exclusive. As a consequence, the reconciliation potential of religions is not self-evident and they can become part of the problem (Van der Borgh 2008).

The tension between religious diversity and national unity is inflected differently all over the world, especially in negotiating the meaning and rights and responsibilities of citizenship (Chidester 2006:78). In locating the relationship between religion education, individuals, citizens and the state, Bruce Lincoln has identified a crucial problem: how is any first person singular transformed into a first person plural? (Lincoln 1987:74). How do we account for the intersection between personal subjectivity and social collectivity? The study of religion is constantly confronted with the challenge of making sense of the discourses and forces through which any first person plural is constructed (Chidester 2002). This leads one to consider the question of how people of different faiths and with different religious identities can live justly and harmoniously together in a multi-religious democratic society which is increasingly growing into a "global village" (Ziebertz 1993:89).

3. IMPLICATIONS FOR PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The aim of education for active citizenship is expanded to help learners to take a general perspective as equal citizens, but if this general perspective is expanded to include social, cultural, religious and moral elements, it carries the danger of undermining the social, religious, cultural life of minorities and undervaluing difference (Hall 2000). If religion education is to be worthwhile for all learners, it cannot be based on the assumptions which undermine the beliefs, values and commitments and identity of some. Religious education can contribute to citizenship by "providing opportunities for pupils to see how individuals, group and political choices, policies and actions, e.g. human rights, are inextricably linked with and influenced by religious and moral beliefs, practices and values" (Pike 2008:116). In the school context, it will necessitate an exploration into religious identity and how the attitudes and values acquired from religious socialization influence learners' understanding of religious diversity, and whether these attitudes are in harmony with the values of democracy.

Religious socialization plays a very important role regarding the religion to which a person belongs or does not belong, his or her religious practices and attitudes towards people of other beliefs or faiths. The identity of the person develops initially through the primary socialization of the child, who takes on board the social world mediated to him by his significant others and internalizes their roles and attitudes. It is by identifying with significant others that the child becomes capable of identifying himself, of acquiring a subjectively coherent and plausible identity (Berger & Luckmann 1967:151–152).

As children's social world expands, however, and their contact with others broadens, they enter a secondary socialization, marked by a broader social interaction and

their attempt to synthesize diverse influences into a consistent picture (Erickson 1968). Sometimes adolescents may not be up to this task, especially if they find themselves at the centre of a tug of loyalties. This secondary socialization also highlights the discrepancy that can occur between identity as self-realization and identity as social definition, and between how individuals themselves experience their unique identity and how others reflect back that image (Halstead 1995). A Jehovah's Witness child may have a strong self-identity at home as a member of the true faith, but may pick up very different messages about the peculiarity of her identity at school, which could create a ghetto, a subculture or a separatist movement. Hall explains how in such circumstances the strength of group identity may be understood in terms of a defence against threat or ill-treatment (2000). Religious identity for some groups is not a form which can be tacked on as an extra component to their citizenship, but is something which they believe permeates the whole of life. Hence the desire for separate schools, which has been described as a form of "voluntary apartheid" (Halstead 1995), and which religious believers see as the only way to provide their children with a sound education in a secure and stable environment where the beliefs and values of the school are broadly in line with those of the home. What we find here is that religion sets a public standard by which people can measure their lives, and the standard lacks significance if it is open to individual interpretation, challenge and relegated to the private domain.

Given that in South Africa the formation of religious identity is primarily the responsibility of families and religious communities and not the public school, it is important to understand how religious identity, shaped by religious socialization, influences learners' attitudes in supporting citizenship education in schools. Although there is no

empirical evidence to support the assumption of a lack of values among today's youth (Reigel & Ziebertz 2007:58), we are left with the question of what those values and value orientations are, and what role religion plays in them. This is especially important to establish because South Africa's new public pedagogy has also been criticized for creating an artificial uniformity in which difference, disagreement and debate are buried under scripted narratives and framed imagery for creating consensus (Teeger & Vinitzky-Seroussi 2007). This in turn may force the curriculum for Religion Studies to stress the underlying similarity of all religions in forming personal identity, transmitting moral values, and facilitating mutual recognition in a shared society (Smith 1988). In the process, creative and critical thinking about the multiplicity of religious identities and the negotiation of religious differences might be subsumed in the artificial manufacture of consensus. The model of co-operation between religion and state is welcomed together with the educational aim of "religious literacy" and the cultivation of the capacities for mutual recognition and tolerance in accordance with constitutional values. However, as Dreyer states the multi-tradition approach is challenged as an appropriate model for achieving the capacities for mutual recognition and tolerance due to the relative neglect of the religious identities of teachers and learners (Dreyer 2006:57).

More research is needed on the politicizing of religious environments and traditions within education. Individual rights and practices of religions as well as traditional cultural practices are increasingly being discussed (Gearson 2002) in order to promote dialogue and discourse between world opinions, religions and cultures. In addition, research of this nature will provide nuanced insights into the complex role religion plays in promoting particular value systems and could show how religion in education can be levered to

change discriminatory and harmful value systems. Public schools need to create space in religion education for ways that recognize, affirm, and explore, creatively and critically, possible invented, emergent and contested identities. Understanding why these identities and worldviews differ so radically in some of society's most controversial issues might be more fruitful than glossing over or dismissing those differences. Simplifying differences runs the risk of smoothing over complexities, while probing deeper into the worldviews and identities out of which moral values arise may yield greater insights. The real test of religious pluralism and the affirmation of diversity in South Africa lie in the effective balancing of national unity on one hand and religious and personal laws on the other.

Conclusion

The new South Africa has sought to mobilize all the many religious constituencies within its borders in the service of the one national interest. At its heart, the policy on religion and education has taken a commendable approach, drawing on the official idea of citizenship. But as this paper has highlighted, there is a disjuncture between the policy as text and the reality as lived (Harley & Wedekind 2004). Reverence for anthems, flags, mottoes, sports insignia and national symbols is less likely to promote the critical citizenship and deliberative capacities which constitutional patriotism requires (Enslin 2006:82). Instead the challenge for religion education will be to include religious plurality in public discourse and educational practice rather than contributing to religion being pushed back to the private by treating it as a purely informational subject.

Whether schools will succeed in the ambitious task of creating transformed citizens will also depend on among other things, how the powerful resource of religion in South Africa is accessed. South Africa is a very religious country

and religion does have a meaningful influence on the values espoused in society. Religious communities have an unusually large responsibility for protecting and promoting democracy (Van Wyk 1997:95), and need to support education by considering the implications of religious socialization in a pluralistic society (Dreyer 2006). The gap that threatens between religious education in public schools and religious socialization by parents and religious community can thus be narrowed and contribute to the "will to live together" in our pluralistic society.

Bibliography

- Beck, J. 1998. *Morality and Citizenship in Education*. London: Cassel.
- Berger, PL. & Luckmann, T. 1967. *The Social Construction of Reality*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Callan, E. 1997. *Creating Citizens: Political Education and Liberal Democracy*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Chidester, D. 2002. *Global Citizenship, Cultural Citizenship and World Religions in Religion Education*. Cape Town: Human Science Research Council Publishers.
- Chidester, D. 2006. Religion Education and the Transformational State in South Africa. *Social Analysis*. Vol. 50 (3), 61-83.
- Chidester, D. 2008. Unity in Diversity: Religion Education and Public Pedagogy in South Africa. *Numen: International*

- Review for the History of Religions*. Vol. 55 (2/3), 272–299.
- Cohen, A. (ed.) 1982. *Belonging: Identity and British Rural Cultures*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Crick, B. 1998. *Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools*. London: QCA.
- De Velasco, FD. 2007. Religion, identity and education for peace. *British Journal of Religious Education*. Vol. 29 (1), 77–87.
- Dewey, J. 2000 *Democracy and education*. New York: Macmillian.
- DoE (Department of Education). 2001. *Manifesto on Values, Education and Democracy*. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- DoE (Department of Education). 2003. *National Curriculum Statement grades 10-12, Life Orientation*. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- DoE (Department of Education). 2003. *National Policy on Religion and Education*. Pretoria: Government Printers.
- DoE (Department of Education). 2006. *National Curriculum Statement – Religion Studies*. Pretoria: Government

Printer.

Dreyer, JS. 2006. The National Policy on Religion and Education in South Africa:

Reflections from a Public Practical theology. *Practical Theology in South Africa*. Vol. 22 (2), 40-60.

Du Toit, CW. 1998. Sharing Values: The Place and Function of Values in Multireligious Education, in CW du Toit & JS Kruger (eds) *Multi-religious education in South Africa: Problems and Prospects in a Pluralistic Society*. Pretoria: Unisa.

Enslin, P.2003. Citizenship education in post-apartheid South Africa. *Cambridge Journal of Education* 33(1) 73-83.

Erickson, E. 1968. *Identity: Youth and Crisis*. New York.

Ferguson, R & C D. Roux. 2003. Teacher's participation in facilitating beliefs and values in Life Orientation programmes. *South African Journal for Education*. Vol. 23(4), 273-275.

Gearson, L. 2002. *Human Rights and Religion*. Brighton: Sussex Academic Press.

Citizenship, Education and Religious Identity 51

Glaston, W.1989. "Civic education and the liberal state" in Rosenblum, NL. (ed) *Liberalism and the Moral Life*, Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press.

Giddens, A. 2000. "Citizenship in the global era," in Pearce, N. and Hallharten, J (eds)

Tomorrow's Citizens: critical debates in citizenship and education. London: Institute for Public Policy Research.

Graham, G. 1994. Liberal vs radical feminism revisited. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 11 (2), 155-170.

Green, L. 2004. Nurturing democratic virtues: educator's practices. *South African Journal of Education*. Vol. 24 (4), 254-259.

Gustafson, C and Juliver, P (eds.) 1999. *Religion and Human Rights: Conflicting Claims*. Armonk, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe.

Gutmann, A. 1987. *Democratic Education*. Princeton, NJ.: Princeton University Press.

Hall, S. 2000. Multicultural citizens, monocultural citizenship? Pearce, N. & Hallgarten, J. (eds) *Tomorrows*

Citizens: critical debates in citizenship and education.

London: Institute for Public Policy Research.

Halstead, JM. 1995. "Voluntary apartheid? Problems of schooling for religious and other minorities in democratic societies. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*. Vol. 29 (2), 257-272.

Halstead, JM. 1996. "Values and values education in schools," in JM. Halstead and MJ. Taylor (eds) *Values in Education and Education in Values*, London: Falmer Press.

Halstead, JM. 2004. An Islamic concept of education. *Comparative Education*. Vol. 40 (4), 517-527.

Halstead, JM. 2005. Religious Education, in L Jones (ed.). *Encyclopedia of Religion* (2nd ed.), 731-736. New York: Thomson-Gale.

Halstead JM. and Taylor, MJ. 2000. "Learning and Teaching about values: a review of recent research" *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 30 (2), 169-202.

Harley K. & Wedekind, V. 2004. Political Change, curriculum change and social formation 1990- 2002.

Chrisholm, L (ed) *Changing class, education and social change in post-apartheid South Africa*. Pretoria: HSRC Press.

Hargreaves, DH. 1994. *The Mosaic of Learning: schools and teachers for the next century*, London: Demos.

Haydon, G. 2000. "The moral agenda of Citizenship Education," in Gardner, R. (ed) *Citizenship and Education*. London: Kogan Page.

Hermans, CAM. 2001. The Other in Dialogue: Interreligious Communication from a Sociological Cultural Perspective, in HG Zebertz, H Haring & D Browning (eds). *The Human Image of God*, 285-309. Leiden: Brill.

Hill, BV. 1991. *Values in education in Australian schools*. Melbourne: ACER.

Horn, IM. 2003. "African Traditional Religion, Western Religious Shifts and Contemporary Education." *Journal for Christian Scholarship* 39 (3-4), 51-66.

Hutcheon, L. 2003. *The politics of postmodernism*. London: Routledge.

Jackson, R. 2003. *International Perspectives on Citizenship, Education and Religious Diversity*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Jackson, R. 2004. *Rethinking Religious Education and Plurality: Issues in Diversity and Pedagogy*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Knitter, P.F. 1985. *No Other Name? A Critical Survey of Christian Attitudes toward the World Religions*. London: SCM.

Kirschenbaum, H. 1977. *Advanced Values Clarification*. La Jolla, CA.: University Associates

Kymlicka, W. 1999, Education for Citizenship. In JM Halstead & TH McLaughlin (eds) *Education in Morality*. London: Routledge.

Lincoln, B. 1987. *Discourse and the Construction of Society: Comparative Studies of Myth, Ritual and Classification*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Mattes, R. 2002. South Africa: democracy without the people? *Journal of Democracy* 13(1), 22-35.

McLaughlin, TH. 1995. "Public Values, private values and

educational responsibility," in E.

Pybus and TH. McLaughlin (eds) *Values, Education and Responsibility*, St Andrews: University of St Andrews Centre for Philosophy and Public Affairs.

McGhie, M. 1999. Education for citizenship in schools. Gordon Cook Foundation, *Conference Report: Education for Citizenship*. Aberdeen, Gordon Cook Foundation.

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

Morrison, D. 2000. Cultural Values, Human Rights and Religion in the Curriculum, in Cairns J, Gardner R & Lawton D (eds) *Values and the Curriculum*, 123-133. London Woburn Press.

Prozesky, M. 1995. Introduction. In Prozesky, M and De Gruchy, J (eds) *Living Faiths in South Africa*. Cape Town: David Philip.

Pike, MA. 2005. Citizenship and Faith Schools: What Should Children in Christian Schools Understand and

Appreciate about a Liberal and Secular Society? *Journal of Education and Christian Belief*. Vol 9 (1), 35–46.

Pike, MA. 2008. Faith in citizenship? On teaching children to believe in liberal democracy.

British Journal of Religious Education. Vol. 30 (2) 113-122.

Pratap Kumar, P. 2006. Religious Pluralism and Religion Education in South Africa. *Method*

and Theory in the Study of Religion, 18, 273-293.

Rhodes, B. & Roux, C. 2004. Identifying values and beliefs in an outcomes-based

curriculum. *South African Journal of Education*. Vol. 24. Issue 1, 25-30.

Roux, C. 2004. Identifying Values and Beliefs in an Outcomes-Based Curriculum. *South African Journal of Education*. Vol. 22 (1), 25–30.

Roux, C. & Du Preez, P. 2006. Clarifying Students' Perceptions of Different Belief Systems and Values: Prerequisite for Effective Educational Praxis. *South African Journal for Higher Education*. Vol. 30 (2), 514-531.

Roux, C. & Du Preez, P. & Ferguson, R. 2009. Understanding Religious Education through Human Rights Values. Meijer, WAJ. (ed) *Religious Diversity and Education in Europe*. 67-84. Munster: Waxmann.

Roux, C. & Steenkamp, D. 1995. A curriculum proposal for the school subject Religious Studies. *Scriptura*. 53 (2) 73-95.

Riegel, U. and Ziebertz, HG. 2007. Religious Education and Values. *Journal of Empirical Theology*, 20, 52-76.

Saayman, WA. 1993. Religious Freedom in Apartheid South Africa, in Kilian, J (ed) *Religious Freedom in South Africa*, 37–47. Pretoria: Unisa.

Sayed, Y. 2002. Democratising Education in a Decentralised System: South African Policy and Practice. *Compare*, Vol.32 (1) 35–46.

Sampson, PJ. 2000. *6 modern myths about Christianity and western civilization*. Downers Grove, IL.: Intervarsity Press.

Searle, J. 1995. *The Construction of Social Reality*. New

York: Free Press.

Schoeman, S. 2006. A blueprint for democratic citizenship education in South Africa publicschoools: African teacher's perception of good citizenship. *South African Journal of Education*, Vol.26 (1), 129-142.

Skeie, G. 1995. Pluralism and plurality: a challenge for religious education. *British Journal of Religious Education*. Vol.17 (2), 84-91.

Smith, JZ. 1988. "Narrative into Problems: The College Introductory Course and the Study of Religion." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 56(4): 727-739.

Sterkens 2001. *Interreligious Learning. The Problem of Interreligious Dialogue in Primary Education* (Empirical Studies in Theology 8). Leiden:Brill.

Steyn, CH.1999. "The Role of Multi-Religious Education in the Transformation of South

African Society" in Walsh, TG. and Kaufmann, F (eds) in *Religion and Social*

Transformation in Southern Africa. St Paul: Paragon House, 131-142.

Tanner, K. 1997. *Theories of culture*. Minneapolis, Minn: Fortress.

Taylor, C. 1989. *Sources of self: the making of the modern identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Teeger, C. & Vinitzky-Seroussi, V. 2007. Controlling for Consensus: Commemorating Apartheid in South Africa. *Symbolic Interaction*. Vol. 30(1), 57-78.

Vally, S. 2005. Citizenship and children's education rights in South Africa. *Journal of Education* Vol. 33, 31-47.

Van der Borght, E. (ed) 2008. *Christian Identity*. Leiden: Brill.

Van der Ven, JA. 2003. Religious Identity in Comparative Research, in LJ Francis, M Robbins and J Astley (eds.), *Empirical Theology in Texts and Tables: Qualitative, Quantative and Comparative Perspectives*. 41-70.

Van Wyk, AG. 1997. Role of Religious institutions and religion regarding values in the new South Africa: A

practical theological perspective. *Practical Theology in South Africa* 12 (1), 89-104.

Van der Borght, E. (ed.). 2008. *Christian Identity*. Leiden: Brill.

Van der Ven, JA. 2003. Religious Identity in Comparative Research, in Francis, LJ. & Robbins, M. & Astley, J. (eds) *Empirical Theology in Texts and Tables: Qualitative, Quantative and Comparative Perspectives*. 41-70 Leiden:

Brill. Ziebertz, HG.1993. Religious Pluralism and Religious Education. *Journal of Empirical Theology*. 6 (2), 82-99.

Ziebertz, HG. 2008. *Religious Education in a Plural Western Society: Problems and Challenges*. London: Transaction Publishers.