

Globethics Repository

The logo for Globethics, featuring the word "Globethics" in white, sans-serif font centered within a solid blue rectangular background.

Helpdesk Research Report: Approaches to civic education in Africa

This page was generated automatically upon download from the Globethics Repository. More information on Globethics see <https://www.globethics.net>. Data and content policy of Globethics Repository see <https://repository.globethics.net/pages/policy>.

Item Type	Preprint
Authors	Freida M' Cormack
Rights	With permission of the license/copyright holder
Download date	2026-07-10 20:28:04
Link to Item	http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12424/226303

Helpdesk Research Report: Approaches to civic education in Africa

Date: 19/12/2011

Query: Please identify examples of best practice civic education programmes in African countries, summarising key features and success factors of the programmes and providing links or contact information where more detailed information can be obtained. Please focus on 1) the nature of civic education frameworks and institutional arrangements and 2) Methods of delivering civic education.

Enquirer: DFID Uganda

Author: Freida M'Cormack, freida@gsdrc.org

Contents

1. Overview
2. Best practice programmes: key features and success factors
3. Frameworks and institutional arrangements
4. Delivery methods
5. References
6. Further information

1. Overview

Civic education (CE), also referred to as citizen or democratic education, can be broadly defined as 'the provision of information and learning experiences to equip and empower citizens to participate in democratic processes. The education can take very different forms, including classroom-based learning, informal training, experiential learning, and mass media campaigns. Civic education can be targeted at children or adults, at the local, national or international level. As such, it is an approach that employs a range of different methods, and is often used in combination with other participatory governance tools (Rietbergen-McCracken, n.d.).

Several civic education programmes implemented in Africa are identified below, aspects of which have been discussed as good practice examples by various researchers and evaluators. They are:

- Kenya's National Civic Education Programme (URAIA)
- Peace-building and citizenship education in Angola (PECE I and II)
- Support to Civic Education Project / UNDP Trust Fund for Civic Education (Angola)
- Street Law Programme ('Democracy for All'), South Africa
- Africa Good Governance Programme on the Radio Waves

From reviews of the programmes listed above, as well as other evaluations, institutional arrangements and programme frameworks must take a number of factors into consideration. Key recommendations include:

- Decide if the programme will be broad-based or narrow/targeted.
- Recognise multiple programme goals and integrate these goals into programme organisation, planning, and implementation.
- Adopt a continuous programme of civic education delivery.
- Devote considerably more effort to impact assessment using appropriately rigorous evaluation methodologies.
- Ensure the coordinating agency is credible and capable.
- Decide on the target group.
- Decide on the main message(s).
- Work towards democratic culture and public sphere.

Evaluations also highlight a number of factors that are critical for success in civic education programmes. Each one highlights three core features of successful programmes:

1. Conduct frequent sessions and expose audience to messages repeatedly.
2. Use participatory training methods whenever possible.
3. Ensure that trainers are authoritative, respected and are able to inspire.

<p>2. Best practice programmes: key features and success factors</p>

This section summarises a number of civic education projects in Africa, which have been independently evaluated and in which some, even if not all, features are championed as positive examples.

Kenya's National Civic Education Programme (URAIA)

<http://www.uraia.or.ke/english/>

The National Civic Education Programmes (NCEP I and II) and their successor programme Uraia Trust, aim to promote citizenship from a rights and responsibility aspect. NCEP I was implemented between August 2000 and September 2002 through a partnership of a group of development partners and civil society organisations (CSOs) in Kenya. The Programme aimed to consolidate a mature political culture in which citizens were more aware of, and fully exercised their rights and responsibilities, as well as participated effectively in broadening democracy.

NCEP I consisted of some 50,000 discrete workshops, lectures, plays, puppet shows, and community meetings conducted by nearly 80 Kenyan NGOs (Finkel and Smith 2011). Finkel and Smith (2011) estimate that 15 percent of all Kenyans of voting age were trained in the programme, making it one of the largest coordinated civic education programmes for adults conducted in developing democracies, with many more being reached through the diffusion of NCEP messages by participants.

Both NCEP I and II implemented civic education via CSOs rather than via government education programmes. NCEP II was originally designed in part to address what donors and CSOs believed would be a new national constitution that was to be adopted in 2005 (MCI 2009). The failure of the effort to create a new constitution meant NCEP II had to focus more generally on citizen education not tied specifically to the constitution.

NCEP II requested proposals from Kenyan CSOs to be implementing partners and then chose 43 to partner in the programme and grouped them into four consortia: Constitution and Reform Education Consortium (CRECO) – a national network of CSOs; Consortium for Empowerment and Development of Marginalised Communities (CEDMAC) – coordinating the work of CSOs representing marginalised and minority communities; Ecumenical Civic Education Programme (ECEP) – a mechanism for coordinating the NCEP work of the two major church networks; and National Muslim Civic Education Consortium (NAMCEC) comprising four Islamic CSOs (MCI 2011). The programme funded proposals that included traditional CE workshops, as well as more innovative interventions involving theatre and other community activities.

By the end of August 2007, NCEP II-Uraia involved approximately 79,000 discrete workshops, poetry or drama events, informal meetings, cultural gatherings, and other public events, as well as extensive programming on democracy, governance, and rights-related topics through television, radio, and other mass media outlets. Documents indicate that some 10 million individuals were exposed in some form to face-to-face civic education activities. Presumably many more were reached via the mass media component, which represented a new and innovative feature of NCEP II-Uraia compared with its predecessor.

Finkel and Smith (2011) note civic education affected the knowledge, values, and participatory inclinations of individuals directly exposed to the programme. These individuals became opinion leaders, communicating these new orientations to others within their social networks. A 2009 MCI evaluation of NCEP II for USAID found that individuals who were exposed to NCEP-II Uraia face-to-face activities were significantly more knowledgeable about politics, specifically in regards to the Constituency Development Fund, more participatory at the local level, more aware of how to defend their rights, and more informed about constitutional issues and the desirability of public involvement in the constitutional review process, than were similarly 'matched' individuals who did not participate in NCEP-II Uraia activities.

The review also examined the impact of NCEP II-Uraia mass media, which represented a new and innovative component of the programme and found mixed results. On the one hand, they found that there was extensive exposure to Uraia messages in the mass media. Yet the media component by itself produced relatively few meaningful impacts.

The effects of NCEP II-Uraia civic education were influenced strongly by **the extent to which an individual was exposed to civic education activities; the kinds of instructional methods used; the quality of the facilitators, and the degree to which individuals engaged in discussions about democracy issues after their direct exposure** to civic education.

Specifically (MSI 2009):

- Those who participated in three or more face-to-face activities exhibited consistent and stronger effects on a set of core democratic orientations, while those who participated in only one or two activities often showed no differences compared to the control group.
- Exposure to multiple participatory teaching methodologies led to significantly greater impact than exposure to lecture-based and other passive education techniques.
- When facilitators of NCEP II-Uraia activities were perceived to be of higher quality, significantly stronger impacts were observed than when facilitators were perceived to be of lower quality.
- There was significant post-activity discussion of NCEP II-Uraia civic education with individuals in both the treatment and control group's social networks, and these post-activity discussions led to extensive 'secondary effects' of NCEP II-Uraia activities.

Peace-building and citizenship education in Angola (PECE I and II)

<http://www.dw.angonet.org/node/177>

In 2003, Development Workshop, an international NGO, launched a civic education programme in Angola with its local civil society partners (PECE I), to encourage dialogue and tolerance among war-affected communities. The programme followed on from extensive peace-building efforts by the same civil society groups. In February 2007 DW launched PECE II and focused on preparing the population for the 2008 elections. The programme consisted of: electoral training, education, adult literacy, conflict resolution, and organised participative planning at the local community level. Community theatre, cartoons and a community newspaper were also used to convey messages, such as the right to vote and the need to live and work together peacefully. The programme was built around teams of provincial activists, trained in civic education, conflict management, community mobilisation and principles of democracy. The teams comprised Provincial Nuclei (each province has a nucleus staff of three: a provincial coordinator, a vice-coordinator and a finance officer), CSOs, Churches, Church based organisations, national and local representatives of the Government, and Ministries of Education, Family, and Youth & Sports representatives. Also, many Peace Activists, volunteers, teachers, promoters, traditional leaders worked together to support local initiatives.

By 2008, activities undertaken included (Orre and Larssen 2008a):

- Training 120 representatives of provincial coordination committees, including provincial Nuclei.
- Training of 216 peace activists on Civic and Electoral education, gender equity and women's rights, who subsequently replicated their knowledge back in the community.
- Development and dissemination of civic and electoral education materials.
- The creation and expansion of 60 resource-centres/mini-libraries in six target provinces.
- Equipping each province with computers connected to the internet.

- Media outreach (mostly radio shows), as a means of easily passing on information and raising awareness.
- Promoting electoral education awareness and educating communities about democracy and free and fair elections in order to prevent any community violence.
- Educating youth and children in schools and supporting the Ministry in the further inclusion of Civic Education in the school curriculum.
- Organising and facilitating Open Space Sessions to communities with the least access to information, done with the support of the projects provincial promoters. These Open Space Sessions contained information about Elections, Elections Code of Conduct, Human Rights, Gender Issues, Democracy, Civic Education, Conflict Resolution, Conflict Prevention, the importance of the Parliament and awareness raising for HIV/AIDS. The programme used debate, speeches, cartoons, brochures, leaflets, drama, music, song, storytelling and poetry to disseminate the information and encourage a more open discourse in the communities.

Orre and Larssen (2008a) evaluated the DW programme for NORAD. Their overall assessment of the programme is that it provided highly relevant outputs to people who have received its communications. The coordinating NGO, DW, was widely regarded as a credible knowledge-based organisation and also appeared to be in a strong position to play a coordinating role. For many years it was the only NGO in the country and has been vital to building the capacity of Angolan civil society partners since 1991.

However, the programme had some limitations, most significantly in its numerical outreach: only 1 percent of the voting population directly participated in the programme. The evaluation also noted that while some messages were communicated very efficiently, other, more subtle civic education messages linked to political development were harder to deliver through the preferred communication method – *palestras* (lectures). They recommended that future programmes should seek to vary and experiment with innovative methods of participative meetings. Also, the programme did not sufficiently deal with the question of who its primary target group was.

Other areas of improvement highlighted in the evaluation included:

- **Motivating the promoters:** Providing promoters with authority and motivation must be seen as key to a successful campaign of any programme of civic and electoral education which is based on direct communication with people in communities and villages. However, the review identified some issues of concern regarding the remuneration of the promoters, such as tardy arrival of funds and/or unclear arrangements regarding remuneration/subsidy and the covering of transport costs. Also, several promoters also expressed that a proper credential or an identification card would be more appropriate while working in communities.
- **Mini-Libraries:** The project should have considered the context and the likely usefulness of the mini-libraries before taking the decision to include this feature in the project. In the programme's 2008 annual report it was noted that only a few of the provinces actually reported on the functioning and use of the libraries and the few reports indicate a quite limited impact. The administration and maintenance costs of running well-functioning public mini-libraries are very high compared to simple distribution of written materials.

Support to Civic Education Project / UNDP Trust Fund for Civic Education (Angola)

<http://www.ao.undp.org/Civic-Education-Project.htm>

The 'Support to Civic Education Project' was launched on 10 November 2006. It is a grant disbursement initiative facilitated by UNDP Angola, with funding received to date from NORAD, SIDA, UNDP and USAID. The project aims to empower civic stakeholders expanding democratic participation, particularly among women and other under-represented segments of society, through civic education, access to information about civic and human rights, and awareness-raising activities. It also aims at enhancing the technical and managerial capacity of CSOs, as well as at overcoming the lack of resources for implementing democratic participation activities among key stakeholders. The project consists of disbursing grants of up to US\$200 000 for civic education projects to Angolan CSOs, and to closely monitor the implementation process with the overall goal of building CSO capacity by means of an 'on-the-project' learning process (UNDP 2008).

A Project Support Unit (PSU) was established under the day-to-day management of an international senior civic education expert, supported by a programme officer, a financial/administration assistant and a driver, all Angolan. The PSU is responsible for managing project inputs, output delivery and project reporting. The call for proposals to the fund was published in the *Jornal de Angola* (the main newspaper) in January 2007, and stayed open for six months. The submitted proposals were evaluated by a Technical Advisory Committee, chaired by UNDP. The selection criteria applied had been decided by all stakeholders, including donors, the Ministry of Territorial Administration and the national electoral commission. The services of 22 national CSOs were subsequently contracted (Ore and Larssen 2008b).

Ore and Larssen (2008b) conducted a mid-term review of the project. They noted that the PSU placed much emphasis on the virtues of participative learning. While the approach is highly commendable in the Angolan setting, UNDP also found this cumbersome; although the principles of participative learning are universally welcomed, the civic education 'promoters' sometimes fail to practice acquired techniques. The most practiced technique was speeches (*palestras*) before a crowd and then opening up for a round of questions which seldom led to real debate or in-depth exchanges of views and concerns.

Most civic education sessions observed were linked to electoral procedures or peace and reconciliation issues, but the report emphasises the need to investigate ways of enhancing the relevance of messages conveyed – for the individual as well as for society.

Street Law Programme ('Democracy for All'), South Africa

<http://www.streetlaw.org.za/legaleduintro.html>

Launched in 1986, the Street Law Programme was designed to introduce the law and human rights to people of all levels of education, providing a practical understanding of the law, the legal system and the constitution to all learners. It aimed to address the political and social marginalisation of certain groups (when it was launched, of black and coloured students country-wide, more recently of youths in KwaZulu Natal and Eastern Cape). It provided general civic knowledge and issue-based or rights education, primarily to high school students by university

students (Brilliant 2000; USAID 2002). In most instances the students received course credit as compensation for their efforts. These student trainers then provided civic education instruction to pupils in grades 11 and 12 in high schools across the country. The programme was designed to operate on a weekly basis at minimum (Finkel and Ernst 2005).

In 1996, Street Law operated out of 20 universities, with a presence in each of South Africa's provinces. By 2002, it had trained a total of 240,000 students using 15,750 trainers. Trainers include volunteer students; professional educators; primary, secondary, and high school teachers; and community activists. Democracy education as an explicit component had reached 4,175 high school pupils and another 1,500 participants in prisons, communities, unions, and various professions. Students were taught about issues related to democracy, human rights, elections, conflict resolution, and how citizens can participate responsibly in democratic politics (Brilliant, 2000).

The Street Law model has a number of notable characteristics. First, it is based on a highly interactive manual which uses many different learning methods, e.g., role-plays, games/exercises (simulations), and small discussion groups. Other methods include lectures, training of intermediaries, community organising, materials distribution, and mass media. Second, the manuals are explicitly designed to be responsive to local conditions. The parent organisation, Street Law USA, encourages this process and treats the national organisations as partners rather than subsidiaries. Thus there is a high degree of local control over what material is presented and how, while ensuring that the fundamentals are preserved.

Finkel and Ernst (2005) show that exposure to civic education had substantial effects on political knowledge among black and coloured South African high school students. While the exposure to civic education per se had weaker effects on democratic values and skills, they show that what matters are specific factors related to the quality of instruction and the use of active pedagogical methods employed by civics instructors. Variables related to the students' teacher and classroom environment also had effects on a variety of other democratic orientations such as institutional trust, political tolerance, and civic duty.

They found that when students are taught by instructors with high levels of competence, likeability, and interest, more significant gains are registered on democratic values and skills. Similarly students whose civics classes were taught with active, participatory instructional methods showed significant gains on virtually all of the democratic orientations that were examined.

Africa Good Governance Programme on the Radio Waves

<http://www.comminit.com/?q=democracy-governance/content/africa-good-governance-programme-radio-waves>

<http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/WBI/WBIPROGRAMS/CMUDLP/0,,contentMDK:20638494~menuPK:461794~pagePK:64156158~piPK:64152884~theSitePK:461754,00.html>

The Africa Good Governance Programme on the Radio Waves is a project of the World Bank Institute (WBI), launched in 2006, to support local government capacity building and community empowerment via radio. The distance learning programme was transmitted via digital satellite

radio technology to municipalities in Ghana, Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda. Using digital radio technology, the programme aimed to reach out to remote rural areas and help foster social inclusion and decentralisation. The programme comprised of four elements: 1) Governing Municipalities without Corruption; 2) Civic Participation, a programme that introduced listeners to concepts, definitions, and tools regarding civic participation and governance.; 3) Municipal Finance/Participatory Budgeting; and 4) Africa Municipal News Magazine.

Rietbergen-McCracken (n.d.: 4) considers the programme to be '[a] good example of how media can be used in civic education... The programme introduced listeners to the concepts, definitions, and tools of civic participation and governance, and presented a step-by-step methodology for participatory budgeting'.

3. Frameworks and institutional arrangements

Numerous civic education programme frameworks exist, and identifying the appropriate one will depend on the democracy problem being addressed, which will then determine the choice of target audience (Brilliant 2000). The most widespread application of civic education is in **formal school education** – in-classroom training focused on general principles. It tends to have a dual emphasis, both educational reform and the promotion of democratic values and behaviours. Numerous other types of civic education, however, are delivered through informal education and information-sharing activities. These include (Sabatini *et al*, in Brilliant 2000; Rietbergen-McCracken, n.d.):

- **General civic knowledge:** out of school training intended to transfer basic knowledge, skills, and values.
- **Issue-based or rights knowledge:** training/education on specific political issues or rights questions.
- **Voter education:** Education on the 'whys and hows' of voting, generally with an emphasis on the importance of participation and respect for democratic process.
- **Civil Society creation/mobilisation:** education on the skills and knowledge needed to generate citizen participation through civil society organisations (e.g. community organisations, NGOs, education institutions, faith-based groups); contains a strong element of support for civil society.
- **Community/Group Problem Solving:** education concerning the skills and knowledge needed to address particular issues or problems, often focused on gaining government attention.
- Civic education has also been used in the **public sector** to improve the democratic functioning of local government or political parties.

The evaluations discussed in section 2 above and others provide numerous recommendations for frameworks and institutional arrangements. These include:

1. **Decide if the programme will be broad-based or narrow/targeted.** Broad-based civic education programmes aim to build a stronger foundation for democracy. In general, they emphasise knowledge and values' change, and the horizon is long-term. In terms of

- programme content, this category would include formal civic education and general civic knowledge. It might also include issue-based or rights education (USAID 2002; Brilliant 2000).
2. **Targeted civic education seeks to address specific aspects of democracy and democratic behaviour.** It also tends to emphasise motivation and mobilisation. MCI (2009) argues that there is likely to be advantage in **narrowing the content** of programmes to focus on specific topics and themes that are likely to resonate with the public. They also recommend less emphasis on ‘cross-cutting’ issues, such as HIV/AIDS, gender and the environment, because these are very difficult orientations to change in the context of typical civic education programmes. USAID (2002) similarly argues that if funds are limited, programmes should focus on smaller, concentrated initiatives instead of national programmes where participants meet only one or two times. While this is less relevant for programmes that focus on preparing citizens for a one-time event, such as those that provide technical information about the mechanics of voting in the lead up to a particular election, for programmes that have changing long-term behaviours and attitudes as their goal, the need to focus is critical.
 3. **Recognise multiple programme goals and integrate these goals into programme organisation, planning, and implementation.** For instance, if capacity building is to be a goal, it should be systematically included in programme design. By laying out more directly what, aside from changing the awareness, values and engagement of ordinary individuals through exposure to civic education, is intended to be achieved, efforts will have a much greater chance of success.
 4. **Adopt a continuous programme of civic education delivery.** Future projects should be structured so as to deliver civic education in on a continuous basis, and especially less tied to the timetable of elections.
 5. **Devote more effort to impact assessment, using appropriately rigorous evaluation methodologies.** Future impact evaluations should include a pre-test to measure participants’ baseline orientations before civic education begins, and future programmes must keep better records of programme participants and programme activities to facilitate the evaluation process.
 6. **Ensure the coordinating agency is credible and capable.** Orre and Larssen (2008a) point out that in Angola, one of the critical success factors was the good standing of the coordinating NGO both with national civil society groups and the international community.
 7. **Decide on the target group.** Civic education programmes may be targeted to geographic regions, to gender, to ethnic categories, and to social/economic groups. They may also be broad-based (e.g. sessions are open to all inhabitants of a certain region) or limited (e.g. only poor women are invited to attend). The selection of the target audience is dependent on the programme content and is closely related to the objectives of the programme. (Brilliant 2000) Setting-up a country-wide civic education programme implies difficult choices about who should benefit from the training and which groups to focus on. Orre and Larssen (2008a) suggest a **rights-based approach**, targeting those most needy of civic education (e.g. by gender or geographical region) or the most vulnerable (most poor, handicapped, etc.); and **strategic intervention** – focusing on groups deemed more likely to contribute and create pressure toward a democratic public sphere (urban youth, school teachers, etc).

8. **Decide on the main message(s).** The Angola study found that more attention could be given to the *content* and the *message* conveyed. Specifically, the information must be correct, and it must be relevant (Orre and Larssen 2008a).
9. **Work towards democratic culture and public sphere.** While it is easy to understand the focus on elections, civic education programmes should also contribute to ensuring that the public space is open for frank and civic debate on all aspects of society, politics and government and that pressure is made on the government to guarantee this openness throughout the country.

4. Delivery methods

Some of the tools most commonly used in civic education activities include seminars, training-of trainers, peer-to-peer learning, workshops, focus group discussions, drama, simulations, role plays, radio and television programmes, information technologies (e.g. blogs, internet forums) and other informal teaching and information-sharing methods. Regardless of the tools used, consistently across all evaluations and reviews there are three essentials in terms of successfully delivering civic education programmes (Carter, email communication; Finkle and Smith 2011; USAID 2002):

1. **Frequent sessions and repeated exposure:** participants will gain little benefit from attending one or two sessions; once a threshold of three sessions has been reached, the impacts will be significantly greater.
2. **Participatory training methods:** the use of interactive methods such as role-plays, problem-solving activities, and mock political or judicial activities is key to effective learning.
3. **Respected/authoritative trainers who are able to inspire:** teachers who fail to engage their students have little success in transmitting information about democratic knowledge, values, or ways to participate effectively in the democratic political process.

The most important finding of the USAID (2002) study, which applies equally to adult and school-based programmes, is that **course design and quality of instruction are critical to the success of civic education programmes**. In addition, the study found that the most effective civic education programmes:

- **Are aware of, and try to design around, obstacles to frequent participation:** Even when programmes are explicitly designed to meet frequently and have the funding to do so, there are often obstacles to regular participation. To the extent possible, groups conducting civic education should assess possible barriers to participation and try to address them before implementing a programme.
- **Build opportunities for participation directly into the programme:** One of the surest paths to greater local political participation over the longer term is to tap into or build opportunities for political participation directly into the civic education programme, whether through non-governmental organisations (NGOs) or meetings with local government officials. This involves more than simply using participatory methods. It also involves building opportunities for direct political engagement into the programme.

- **Focus on themes that are immediately relevant to people's daily lives:** In designing civic education projects, programme managers should work to identify an audience's primary concerns, and then show how democracy and governance issues relate to those concerns.
- **Focus on hot topics:** As participants will engage more fully if they feel strongly about the topics discussed, it is useful to define and discuss a number of controversial issues where there is likely to be a range of opinions among participants.
- **Invest in the training of trainers:** Given the importance of course design and teaching method, the training of trainers is a good investment. It is crucial that trainers feel comfortable with a broad range of teaching methods, and have the flexibility to adapt both method and course content to the immediate concerns of programme participants.
- **Target voluntary associations:** Group membership may be a useful screening device for recruiting participants into civic education programmes, since people who already have extensive social networks appear to benefit more from civic education than people who do not tend to join social, economic, or political groups.
- **Pay attention to gender issues:** Women generally face greater obstacles to participation than men in terms of resources and cultural barriers, particularly in the developing world. Programmes that address these deeper barriers to participation may be required over and above civic education to reduce the gap between men and women.
- **Avoid inflating expectations:** In light of the fact that civic education appears to reduce participants' trust in institutions, programme leaders should be aware that there is a risk of setting standards too high and of creating unrealistic expectations about what democracy can and should deliver. To this end, programmes may want to focus on specific short-term goals, in addition to broader issues of political or constitutional reform.
- **Bring parents, teachers, and school administrators into school-based programmes:** School environment and family beliefs and practices are powerful influences on the democratic orientations of children and young adults. Unless civic education programmes take account of these forces, they are likely to overwhelm any new messages that are taught.

The evaluations make further recommendations for best practice (MCI 2009; Orre and Larssen 2008a, 2008b; USAID 2002; Brilliant 2000):

- **Make special efforts to reach the less powerful:** civic education activities need to be carefully designed to match the needs and conditions facing such groups.
- **Model democracy:** civic education programmes need to be run in a democratic manner, to demonstrate the values being taught, such as participation, tolerance and respect.
- **Address the supply side too:** as civic education is generally concerned with increasing the demand for good governance, consideration also needs to be given to strengthening the skills, knowledge and awareness of the supply side actors to respond to this demand. Thus, civic education is most effective if accompanied by capacity building efforts directed at civil servants, the police, parliamentarians, etc.
- The **choice of methodology** needs to be sensitive to the characteristics of the target audience. For instance a review of the DW Angola project found that mini-libraries were not particularly effective in a context lacking 'a culture of reading' (Larsson 2008a).

- Projects should focus explicitly on **making more aggressive use of the new information technologies**, and in particular the internet and mobile communications. The objectives should be to use the internet and mobile communications technology to promote both the visibility of civic education messages, and the networking and capacity of the CSO sector.
- However, **consider the mass media component carefully**. While the inclusion of mass media programming is often considered a major innovation, some evaluations (e.g. MCI 2009) have shown that the long-term impacts of individuals' exposure to CE media is relatively limited, few lasting media partnerships develop as a result of the programme, and the national media's own agenda does not appear to be influenced by the programme. While the media can play a supporting role in promoting civic competence and rights awareness, by itself it is unlikely to affect major change. A **more targeted, frequent, and intensive media campaign**, however, may overcome some of these limitations.
- Programmes should emphasise and **exploit the potential 'secondary effects' of post-activity discussions of programme participants with individuals within and outside of their immediate social networks**. This indicates the need to expand participant recruitment beyond the immediate social networks of groups engaged in the civic education process. The more that such individuals are sought out and included in future activities, the more likely it is that programmes will extend their reach and their impact.

5. References

Brilliant, F., 2000, 'Civic Education Assessment--Stage II. Civic Education Programming Since 1990--A Case Study Analysis', A report for the U.S. Agency for International Development, Washington, DC

<http://www.civiced.org/pdfs/research/CivicEdDecember2001FrancaB.pdf>

Finkel, S.E. and Ernst, H.R., 2005, 'Civic Education in Post-Apartheid South Africa: Alternative Paths to the Development of Political Knowledge and Democratic Values', *Political Psychology*, Vol. 26, No. 3, pp333-364

<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3792601>

Finkel, S.E. and Smith, E., 2011, 'Civic Education, Political Discussion, and the Social Transmission of Democratic Knowledge and Values in a New Democracy: Kenya 2002', *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol 55, Issue 2, pp417-435

<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1540-5907.2010.00493.x/full>

MSI International, 2009, 'The Second Kenya National Civic Education Programme II (URAIA): Goals, findings and recommendations from participant and civil society impact assessments', USAID, Washington, DC (email attachment)

Orre, A. and Larssen, C., 2008a, 'Making Elections is like Preparing 'Funge: If you don't do it Right it goes Puiti-Puiti'', Review of Norwegian Support to Development Workshop's Programme

for Civic and Electoral Education among State and Civil Society Actors, Chr. Michelsen Institute (CMI Report R 2008: 11), Bergen

<http://www.cmi.no/publications/file/3150-making-elections-is-like-preparing-funge.pdf>

Orre, A. and Larssen, C., 2008b, 'How can the elections help us quell hunger?', FINAL REPORT A mid-term review of Norwegian support to UNDP's trust fund for civic education

<http://mirror.undp.org/angola/LinkRtf/CE-ER2008.pdf>

Rietbergen-McCracken, J., n.d., 'Civic Education', Civicus / PG Exchange Toolkit, Johannesburg

http://pgexchange.org/images/toolkits/PGX_B_Civic%20Education.pdf

UNDP Angola, 2008, 'Support to Civic Education' 2007 Annual Report, (UNDP Project no. 00052948), UNDP Angola, Luanda

<http://mirror.undp.org/angola/LinkRtf/Civic-Education-AR2007.pdf>

USAID, 2002, 'Approaches to Civic Education: Lessons Learned', Technical Publication Series, Office of Democracy and Governance, Bureau for Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance, U.S. Agency for International Development, Washington, DC

http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/democracy_and_governance/publications/pdfs/pnacp331.pdf

6. Additional information

Selected websites visited

ACE Electoral Knowledge Network

<http://aceproject.org/ace-en/topics/ve/vea/vea05>

EISA Voter and civic education

<http://www.eisa.org.za/WEP/comeducation.htm>

IDEA's Civic Education Research Database

<http://civiced.idea.int/>

Centre for Civic Education, CIVITAS International Programmes

http://www.civiced.org/index.php?page=civitas_africa

Civic Education Resource Inventory

<http://ceri.civnet.org/>

CIVNET/CIVITAS

www.civnet.org

Global Human Rights Education Network

<http://www.hrea.org/>

National Democratic Institute

<http://www.ndi.org/>

World Movement for Democracy: Civic Education for Democracy

<http://www.wmd.org/resources/whats-being-done/civic-education-democracy>

Experts consulted

Sheryl Stumbras, USAID, sstumbras@usaid.gov

Harry Blair, Yale University harry.blair@yale.edu

Lynn Carter, Management Systems International, LCarter@msi-inc.com

About Helpdesk research reports: Helpdesk reports are based on 2 days of desk-based research. They are designed to provide a brief overview of the key issues, and a summary of some of the best literature available. Experts are contacted during the course of the research, and those able to provide input within the short time-frame are acknowledged