

**STUDENTS AS NEW KINGPINS IN DECOLONISING CURRICULUM AND GOVERNANCE IN SOUTH AFRICAN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING**

**Mavhungu Elias Musitha**

Specialises in tourism development, public policy and traditional authorities

**Mavhungu Abel Mafukata**

Specialises in higher education, African culture and entrepreneurship

---

**ABSTRACT**

*Colonial apartheid is blamed for the economic, social and political problems that beset Africa today. Everywhere there is demand to reverse it so that Africa can be put on the path to economic development. University education was perceived a catalyst to achieve this goal. But the state and universities have failed in their mandate to decolonize education curriculum. This is an anti-positivist study. It is based on secondary data from literature study. The study has found that students have a role in curriculum and governance structures of institutions of higher learning to decolonize universities. The study has argued that students should be involved meaningfully to make contribution to decolonize universities. The study had found that participation of students in governance structures is crucial for holding the universities accountable to reverse the advancement of Eurocentric paradigms and knowledge and promote original African writing and pan-African perspectives. This study recommends radical change on the requirements of composition of senates and councils to accommodate students. Lastly this study recommends that universities should be forced to submit their audit reports annually the senate and councils and also public media for public scrutiny.*

*Keywords: Decolonisation; Curriculum; Governance; Institutions of higher learning; Students; Participation; New kingpins*

**INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND**

The establishment of universities in the past was viewed as existing outside those they existed to serve particularly students. Students were not seen as important component of the life of universities until in this modern times where it was realized that they are microcosms of society, and their nature, role and functions cannot be adequately understood outside of their problematic intersection with state, markets and civil society (Discussion Paper 2015:7). Students were not involved in decision-making in university governance as this was the preserve of administrators instead of acknowledging that the life of universities required the

interdependence of administrators, faculty members, students and support staff (Zuo and Ratsoy 1999:2). The provisioning of university education in South Africa was dominated by white, male, western, capitalist, heterosexual, and European worldviews (Shay 2016). The South Africa university black education goes back to 1916 with the establishment of South African Native College which was later transformed into university of Fort Hare in the Eastern Cape. This university was attached to Rhodes University until the passing of the Extension of University Education Act which Fort Hare from its affiliation with Rhodes University (Gwala cited Cobbert and Cohen 1988, 164). But the apartheid government was eager to separate the people of South Africa according to ethnic groupings which led to the establishment of homelands and subsequent to that, universities followed as they classified into three categories namely autonomous such as Zululand for Zulus and Swazis, Turfloop, to serve Vendas, Sothos and Shangaans, homelands such as Fort Hare, Venda, Bophuthatswana and urban universities such as Durban Westville for Indians, Western Cape for Coloureds, (Gwala cited Cobbert and Cohen 1988, 166). However the establishment of the bush or homeland universities was to pave the way for entrenched artificial independent states and these universities were opened in TBVC states namely Venda; Bophuthatswana; and Transkei in the 1970s (Reddy 2004,10). The Principals or Rectors of councils of the said universities were male Afrikaners to entrench the authoritarian rule on these universities (Gwala cited Cobbert and Cohen 1988, 167-169). The establishment of those universities did not consider the participation of the beneficiaries of the education let alone students who are the key component since decision-making in university governance was the custodian of administrators (Zuo and Ratsoy 1999:2). The variety and complexity of responsibilities of universities require interdependence among administrators, faculty members, students, and members of the support staff (Zuo and Ratsoy 1999:2). In the modern times there is a demand for the student voice to play a critical role on the design, facilitation and improvement of learning (Mitra 2004). They must also participate in curriculum development and governance so that they can take responsibility on the education matters that affect them (Ngussa and Makewa 2014: 23; Osborn 2009). Their participation promotes what Tamrat (2016) refers as 'shared governance' suggesting that there should be multiplicity of stakeholders who participate in any in the running or management of organisations inclusive of students. Swain (2012) contends that students have become decision-makers on what they should be taught, how they should be taught and in strategic decision on how the university should be run. The Budapest Declaration: Governance and Student Participation (2011) pointed that students

were co-responsible for higher education management and not consumers of higher education (Nyborg 2011). It further posits that they should meaningfully participate in decision-making and governance of higher education equally with professors to improve its quality. Bergan (N.D) posits that student participation in higher education governance is a common feature in Europe. De Boer and Stensaker (2007) postulated that Germany introduced the tripartite model of governance in which students were represented on equal basis with professoriate and non-professorial academics. According to Bergan (2004); Persson (2004) students are crucial for the running of universities.

This literature reveals that student involvement in university and college governance began in the late 1960s and the early 1970s in the U.S. and Canada. In Canada, Duff and Berdahl (1966) conducted a national study of university governance and encouraged institutions to make the decision-making process more open and transparent and to allow for greater participation by faculty members and students. Students do not only want to participate in unspecified governance but want to be involved in the shaping of the content, curriculum and design of their courses (Bols and Freeman 2011). Zuo and Ratsoy (1999) in their study have found that academics and senior university officials contended that administrators, as educators, have a responsibility to facilitate student participation in university decision making since student involvement not only ensures representation of student interests, but also provides opportunities to learn how the university works, and enables students to develop leadership skills. This study therefore investigates why students are not involved in both curriculum and governance and recommends strategies of involving students in curriculum and governance structures.

## **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

### **Research approach**

A qualitative research approach was chosen for this study to provide insights into the various perspectives of student involvement in the university curriculum and governance structures. Borg and Gall (1993: 26) describe qualitative research as having the potential to produce valid description of an interesting phenomenon and discover relevant variables.

### **Research design**

From a methodological point of view research design is defined as a blueprint or detailed plan for how a research study is to be conducted, using (operationalizing} variables so that

they can be measured, selecting a sample of interests to study, collecting data to be used as a base for testing hypotheses and analyzing the results (Thyer 1993: 94). This study adopted literature study.

### **Instrumentation**

This study has utilized secondary data collected from books, articles, newspaper articles, historical material and university websites.

### **STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN GOVERNANCE GLOBAL PERSPECTIVE**

Swain (2012) posited that Budapest Declaration: Governance and Student Participation (2011) pointed that students were co-responsible for higher education management and not consumers of higher education. Participation of students in university governance is not new. It has been there for over time. Bergan (N.D) posits that the Bologna Process described the participation of students in higher education governance as being in the heart of Bologna Process and being the key feature of higher education. The Oslo conference was aimed at higher education governance. The participation of students in governance has been going on for a generation in European countries. They have been represented on the governing bodies of universities and it is a general feature of those universities. Popovic (2011) opined that student participation in higher education governance” was an official Bologna Seminar organized by the Ministry of Education and Science of Armenia, the European Students’ Union and the Council of Europe, which had taken place on 8-9 December 2011, in Aghveran, Armenia. Popovic (2011) posited that from the time of Prague communiqué in 2001, “students were regarded as full members of the academic community”.

However Popovic (2011) postulated that students had formed part of the members of the academic community much longer, from the medieval period when the foundation of the universities was formed. He further posited that the year 2003 saw the Council of Europe in cooperation with the Norwegian Ministry of Education organised a Bologna seminar in Oslo on student participation. The participation of students in governance cannot be automatic but should be promoted by academic staff through their attitudes and the resources they use to facilitate the information and participation processes (Plansa et al.2011:14). Students’ participation would not take place if professors could not equip students as part of empowerment (Plansa et al. 2011: 14)

## **GOVERNANCE AND UNIVERSITIES IN SOUTH AFRICA**

During apartheid students were sometimes allowed to have Students Representatives Councils (SRCs) but which could be abolished at will by the authorities and those suspected of being involved in politics would be expelled and could not appeal anywhere against their expulsion (Gwala in Cobbett and Cohen 1988:169). The administration of universities was under the total control of the office of the Rector, Council and Senate. The Councils which were the highest decision-making bodies were under the control of Afrikaners and those who were appointed by the state. This study contends that certainly students were not considered recipients of whatever was transmitted to them without much say and it could be concluded that universities were run on a top-down management thus making ‘shared governance’ far-fetched. New dispensation passed Higher Education Act 101 of 1997 that promulgated co-operative governance in higher education institutions to promote corporate governance. Moreku (2014:241) contends that this participation was not effective due to lack of SRC participation in key governance structures. This paper contends that meaningful participation can only happen if students are equipped with knowledge and skills with the help of academics.

## **POST-APARTHEID PERIOD 1994**

The collapse of apartheid in 1994 and the rise of the African National Congress (ANC) to power in 1994 aroused expectations that apartheid pillars would go too. In this case the most strong pillar was that of education particularly university education. There was expectation that it would be transformed and changed with its curriculum and governance shaped to suit the democratic undertones that came with democratic government. However that was not the case. According to Shay (2016) in South Africa the provisioning of university education as does primary and secondary is still dominated by white, male, western, capitalist, heterosexual, and European worldviews. To make it worse those universities and colleges of education were under the authorities of male Afrikaner rectors /principals (Ngcokovane (1989, 188). Ramoupi (2014) opined that South Africa lost an opportunity in 1994 during Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) to hold institutions of higher learning accountable for their actions during apartheid. Ramoupi (2014) posits that TRC was established to get all those who were involved in apartheid atrocities account for their actions and why they did what they did in order to lay the new foundation for democratic dispensation of establishing non-racial society. The State had failed to compel universities to

democratize when the opportunity was there. Contrary to Ramoupi who blamed the state Maserumule (2015) opined that the problem lied squarely with academic professors who were afraid to see apartheid go. According to Maserumule most of the academics were themselves the products of colonial apartheid education (2015). Suggestively Maserumule implied that because those academics and professors attended those universities they were still controlled and influenced by those policies they too were modelled around.

Maserumule (2015) posits that they could not be expected to decolonize those universities since they too had become colonisers. However, Mafukata (2016) is of the view that failure to decolonisation of universities is not only attributed to State and academics but also on those academics who were imported from outside the country to occupy senior university positions against South Africa nationals. Suggestively they fear decolonization because it will open the doors for South African nationals who will compete with them. Therefore, Ramoupi (2014) is correct by suggesting that the state should have held the universities accountable for their actions and laying the foundation for decolonization of universities in line with the democratic dispensation. An example is the one suggested by Vice-Chancellor Professor Max Price of the University of Cape Town (UCT) who blamed the State for not taking concrete steps to decolonize UCT which during apartheid government rejected Professor Mafeje a renowned scholar to teach at UCT. Ramoupi (2014:273) argued that democratic government should have impressed on universities particularly UCT to decolonize thus becoming inclusive of all sectors of the population of South Africa. Therefore in the light of the arguments by Ramoupi (2014) and Maserumeule (2015) it is clear that both the State and academics have failed to decolonize universities. The failure of the two role-players is problematic because they have the authority to initiate and influence the process of decolonization and the question is who should play their role? Shay (2016) provides a suggestion that students should be involved in the management and administration of the institutions of higher learning to promote inclusiveness because they are the beneficiaries of higher education. Participation of students would lay the ground for turning universities into centers of learning rather than maintaining the curriculum that produces centers of servitude as planned by colonial and apartheid policies (Conrad 1989: 2).

## **THEORETICAL UNDERPINNING OF THIS STUDY**

Jagersma (2010,1) in his study found that students' voice have always been excluded from curriculum development and that it was time the voice was included. This paper argues that university students should participate in the process of decolonization of universities since both the state and academics have failed to decolonize them. The failure of the state and academia leaves the space open for students to initiate since they are the beneficiaries of the education. But what is decolonization? It is important to have a definition of decolonization since it is at the center of this study. Heleta (2016) argues that it is the movement that is aimed at radically transforming formerly colonial and apartheid controlled education which was aimed at keeping Africans at positions of serving colonial masters. Fanon (1961) posits that decolonisation is when the oppressed liberate themselves and making education facilities such as universities open to all the former colonized African children. Ramoupi's argument that in South Africa after the fall of apartheid, curriculum and content remained colonial and apartheid driven whilst there is a cosmetics switch of leadership at principal level from whites to Blacks (2014, 271). Lumumba of Congo in his inaugural address as Prime Minister in 1961 pledged that Africa should write its own history which would be read in Africa (New Africa 2002, 23).

In decolonizing university education, this paper will be underpinned by the participatory theory as opined by (Arnstein 1969) and it contends that decolonisation cannot happen outside the participation by stakeholders that includes the students who should have a say in defining the new curriculum, senates and councils (governance bodies). This paper therefore, investigates possibilities of students' participation in curriculum development and governance structures of the universities. It will also investigate possible barriers to students' participation and finally providing some recommendations about their participation in curriculum development, and senate and councils the administrative structures of the universities. Swain (2012) contends that students have become participants in decision-making on what they should be taught, how they should be taught and in strategic decision on how the university should be run. Budapest Declaration: Governance and Student Participation (2011) pointed that students were co-responsible for higher education management and not consumers of higher education. It further posits that they should meaningfully participate in decision-making and governance of higher education equally with professors to improve its quality. Bergan (N.D) posits that student participation in higher

education governance is a common feature in Europe. However, Bergan (N.D) contends that students have the responsibility of participating in electing those students must represent them in governing bodies. Students themselves as evidenced by a UCT student Athabile Nonxubain Evans (2016) contended that: “*we cannot be decolonised by white people who colonised us*”.

Clearly this suggests that students the universities were mainly white dominated in curriculum development and governance and that it was time that they too, participate in the running the affairs of those universities. Indeed as Zuo and Ratsoy (1999:2) alluded to, students yearn for the days when universities would adopt the concept of ‘shared governance’ where they would be represented equally with professors in the day to day running of the administration of the universities. This is the only way that would guarantee peace and stability because they would be able to know what is happening. They would be able to take decisions that affect their university life. However, Arnstein (1969) warned against using student to rubber stamp the decisions taken by management instead of involving them in meaningful manner. In order to meaningfully involve them in participation she proposed that they should be empowered to do so. Bergan (2004); Persson (2004) contended that in Germany students were collectively represented in Higher Education governance in European countries. The major reason for their participation is that they were clients of the university and had a right to participate in making decisions that influence them, and that administrators and academic staff need student input in decision making (Zuo and Ratsoy 1999:14). In order to achieve this kind of participation students need to have real power (Arnstein 1969). Students themselves should be able to express their satisfaction on participation as Lu et al. (2015) contended that as pharmacy students of the inaugural class at Manchester University College of Pharmacy in Fort Wayne, Indiana, they were involved in developing their curriculum. Bovill et al. (2009) opined that the participation of students take part in curriculum development cultivates a sense of shared responsibility among faculty members and students. But Zuo and Ratsoy (1999:1) opined that in order to enable the students participate in the university governance, students should hone their group decision-making skills and demonstrate commitment to the mission of the university and its long-term interests.



## **PROBLEM STATEMENT**

Universities were built to serve communities while students were the main beneficiaries. Jagersma (2010,1) opined that students' voice have always been excluded from curriculum development and that it is time the voice is included. The study by Moreku (2014:241) has also found that in South Africa SRC participation in co-operative governance in public Higher Education was not effective due to lack of SRC participation in key governance structures. De Boer and Stensaker (2007) postulated that Germany introduced the tripartite model of governance in which students were represented on equal basis with professoriate and non-professorial academics. According to Bergan (2004); Persson (2004) students are collectively represented in Higher Education governance in European countries. Students do not only want to participate in unspecified governance but want to be involved in the shaping of the content, curriculum and design of their courses (Bols and Freeman 2011). The study by Moreku (2014:241) has also found that in South Africa SRC participation in co-operative governance in public Higher Education was not effective due to lack of SRC participation in key governance structures. As pharmacy students of the inaugural class at Manchester University College of Pharmacy in Fort Wayne, Indiana, we were fortunate to have the chance to be involved in developing our curriculum (Lu et al. 2015). Having students take part in curriculum development cultivates a sense of shared responsibility among faculty members and students (Bovill et al. 2009). This study therefore investigates possibilities of students' participation in curriculum development and governance structures of the universities. It will also investigate possible barriers to students' participation and provide recommendations.

## **DECOLONISATION OF UNIVERSITY EDUCATION**

The process of decolonizing has been focused by those who negotiated the new dispensation at the Convention for Democratic South Africa (CODESA) from 1990. This was built in the Constitution that was adopted in 1996. Chapter two of this Constitution places the responsibility of provisioning of education at higher institutions to the state. Chapter three of this constitution shows that South Africa is organised into three spheres of government namely national, provincial and local spheres. Therefore, Constitution and Legislature make Higher Education a function of national government. Section 29 (1), provides that everyone

has the right to education including further education which the State is bound to take necessary measures to ensure that this right is achievable and accessible.

Nelson Mandela's book "No Easy Walk To Freedom"(1990) is a reflection of a long road to decolonize the continent including the education curriculum and system. This legacy is more prevalent in the education curriculum and system. Tuition fees have also been used to prevent poor Blacks from acquiring university education. Decolonisation aims at providing Africans with controlled education that would serve their interests. The History subject carried with it the most indoctrinating tool since all the students from primary to secondary through to universities had to memorize the date of the arrival of Jan van Riebeeck and it was included in the examination papers. Africans were regarded as people who came into South Africa from North Africa. South African students at universities are embroiled in the education struggle to have doors of learning open in universities to help those who were prevented from accessing education and also discriminated from sharing the wealth in these universities with whites. The fees imposed on them to pay are construed as gate keeper to block them further in recent times after the fall of colonialism and apartheid. In line with Fanon (1965) who posits that the oppressed should liberate himself, they have taken the struggle upon themselves too and call for the decolonisation of universities. According to Heleta (2016) the movement to radically transform and decolonise higher education must find ways to hold institutions accountable and maintain the non-violent and intellectual struggle until epistemic violence and Eurocentrism are dismantled. Shay (2016) suggests that failure to coin a strategy to decolonize the curriculum is an admission that colonial and apartheid curriculum should continue to reproduce itself that is producing irrelevant students similar to those of the 1950s.

Decolonising the governance structures that also decides on fees should be prioritized as fees for university education in South Africa is too expensive to afford and negatively affect students who want to study there given the fact that poverty and inequality have characterised South African society for many years of apartheid rule.

According to Cloete (2016:7) currently the situation is exacerbated by the fact that government funding is insufficient particularly at undergraduate level. South Africa as a country that emerged from the discriminatory education policies for different population groups is expected to introduce free education to students. The constitution that was adopted

by South Africa in 1996 should be a tool of ruling class for redistribution of power for the provisioning of free education the way successive colonial and apartheid states used their power to redistribute wealth in favour of the rich thus widening inequalities that still exist today (Wood 1964:109). Fanon (1965) argues that the destruction of the neo-colonialism which perpetuates unequal access into tertiary education would also lead to the destruction of the system of dependency of the colonized people of the world which capitalist system of education sought to inculcate in them for its own purposes of under-developing them (Fanon 1965).

According to Makgoba (2015:7) for over three centuries Africans were denied education and those who were lucky to get it received inferior version that consigned them to servitude. This runs straight to the call by Patrice Lumumba that Africa has to do justice to itself in order to stand as a prosperous continent (New Africa 2002, 23).

## **DISCUSSIONS**

### **STUDENTS PARTICPATION IN CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT**

A lot of research has been written about the involvement of students in curriculum development but it is also important to postulate the reasons of their involvement and also some theories that support this involvement. Brunner's (1961) theory of discovery learning is used as a theory to support the participation of students in curriculum. Brunner (1961) wrote that discovery learning was a constructivist learning theory that includes inquiry based integration strategies. According to this theory Bruner was aware about the limitations of students in participation and therefore invites teachers to assume the role of facilitation where they assist students in participating but through learners' prior knowledge and previous experience.

According to Conrad (1989) participation transforms schools into learning centers and not the one that turns them into centers of indoctrination. Once schools become learning centers students are able to discover learning on their own and see the world from a different eye as postulated by Bruner in his discovery learning. Discovery learning as postulated by Bruner has the power of transforming students from being observers of learning process to the one of participation (Cox 1998). Whilst Bruner presents theory of discovery learning, Arnstein 1969 provides a model called ladder of participation that comprises eight rungs in view of the fact that learners develop through stages and may not have acquired necessary skills to participate

in all the levels. This model by Arnstein (1969) recognises that inasmuch students should be participant in learning but not all can participate meaningfully in development of university curriculum. Bruner himself has conceded that learners pass through different stages of intellectual development and this is a clear admission that there are those stages which allow them participation in areas such as curriculum development. Once they reach the development stage as Bruner postulates they are prepared to participate in influencing decolonising of the curriculum through engagement with other stakeholders in determining what type of content should be included in the curriculum something which academics or professors are not able to do (Maserumule 2015).

The model postulated by Arnstein (1969) in relation to participation suggests that learners do not participate at every rung. For instance in the two rungs at the bottom namely Manipulation (1) and Therapy (2), there is no participation by learners other than that as Bruner wrote teachers should give guidance or to educate them. Informing (3) and Consultation (4) rungs are tokenism with no guarantee for the learners' participation to be taken seriously by teachers to change the status quo. Rung (5) Placation is where the learners are provided with opportunities to participate by making advices but the problem is that those in power and in this case university authorities have the prerogative to take decision. In rung (6) Partnership the participation is advanced and offers the learners opportunity to enter into negotiation and can answer the questions on what curriculum and its significance is. But as for participation to develop it, they are still at a stage they might not be able to take those decisions. One might say they are still at the undergraduate level. At the top of the rung are (7) Delegated power and (8) Citizen control where the students have decision-making power and managerial power and this is where students may be able to define, locate and decide the content of the curriculum and negotiate to suggest how it should be implemented. At this level of rung 7 and 8 students might be at post-graduate such as holding Masters and Doctoral degrees. The last two rungs can illustrate maturity level where learners have developed from early stage that's pre-school, primary, secondary and university where the teachers guided them till post-graduate level for them participate as adults in decision-making processes that determine the curriculum as postulated by Bruner.

Decolonising of curriculum is no longer the state responsibility alone as Ramoupi (2014) has argued and academics that fear tampering with the existing set up as Maserumule (2015) has shown.

### **STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN GOVERNANCE BODIES**

The distinction of participation on curriculum and participation in governance is made allow the two participations separate. Participation in the former is limited to dealing with curriculum decolonizing while the latter deals with daily implementation of this curriculum. Policies for organisations are implemented by administration or bureaucracy. In the case of universities, Senates and Councils are the key structures that are mandated to run the affairs of these universities. Therefore these may be regarded as structures holding the chess to make any change needed including the changing and implementation of the decolonised curriculum. As Maserumule has postulated that academics are the products of western education and most probably are beneficiaries of such education, students who are calling for decolonised education will need to participate in both bodies namely senates and councils. Students' elected bodies would need to be accommodated so that they also monitor the implementation of agreed policies.

As Marx and Engels in Wood (1964) have defined universities as social capital which makes them community properties or assets, there is a reason for the participation of students. In fact Bruner (1961) concurs that students have reached maturity level particularly when Arnstein's (1969) rungs 7 and 8 are applied which define them as responsible graduates. But Shay (2016) has warned that while students would need to participate in the management and administration of the institutions of higher learning to promote inclusiveness there is potential for resistance from those academics who benefit from the status quo. According to Conrad (1989: 2) the participation of students lays the ground for turning universities into centres of learning rather than maintaining the curriculum that produces centres of servitude as planned by colonial and apartheid policies. On the other hand, Jagersma (2010:1) in corroborating Conrad in his study found that students' voice has always been excluded from curriculum development and that it is time the voice is included.

According to Heleta (2016) participation of students in management and administration will act as tool to hold institutions accountable and maintaining the non-violent and intellectual

struggle until epistemic violence and Eurocentrism are dismantled. At rungs 5 and 6 students can participate meaningfully in the management and administration though those to participate may be drawn from the elected student bodies. Participation in management and administration has the potential to promote ownership of all agreed policies and might also limit the rate of university strikes.

The participation in management and administration would reverse the advancement of Eurocentric paradigms and knowledge and promote original African writing and pan-African perspectives as observed by Ramoupi (2014: 284). According to Acharya, (2015) the participation of students in governance structures of universities enhances the performance of those structures. Studies in Nepal have shown that participation of students in governance increase cooperation which is necessary for the effective running of the university. Study conducted on student participation in the governance of two universities in Nepal: Tribhuvan University (TU) and Kathmandu University (KU indicated that student participation in the governance of TU and KU varies in types, intensity levels and outcomes. Whilst the same study has revealed that student participation in governance reduce differences between management and student and leading to quality decision-making, the students in this study are not accorded equal responsibilities and they are only consulted to make comments while there is no guarantee that their inputs would be seriously taken in decision-making process.

The findings corroborate Arnstein's (1969) who wrote that consultation which is placed in rung 4 denotes tokenism since the participants are merely used to rubber stamp decisions taken by authorities to maintain the status quo. This participation is therefore misleading and disempowers those it intends empowering.

### **SOME POSSIBLE BARRIERS FOR PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS**

Participation of students in curriculum, management and administration will not happen without some hindrances. Le Grange (2016:5) posits that decolonization will be difficult to achieve because to achieve it "we can't simply turn back the clock-we can't begin on a clean slate". Contrary to this assertion Clapham (1985: 160) contended that decolonization like a revolution should bring "*rapid, violent, and irreversible change in the political organization of a society*". Similarly Ramoupi (2014) posited that the state should smash the old order and put the country on a new mind-set contrary to the one apartheid created which refuses to die.

Suggestively, the statement by Le Grange (2016) means that the country should postpone poverty by another day in treating the symptoms instead of dealing with the root cause because the country could not turn back the clock. Le Grange's assertion runs straight into Maserumule's argument (2015) who argued that university academics and professors could not decolonize because they too were the graduates of the current universities and suggestively comfortable with its defense.

Foreign academics were seen as a barrier too. They fear losing their comfort zone if they let it go that students participate in decision-making since in one of the universities they occupy more than 2/3<sup>rd</sup> of majority when compared with South Africans (Mafukata 2016).

The other barrier in participation is associated with fear of the unknown where students and teachers will be afraid to take the risk of something never happened before (Bovill ND). It is commonsense that academics had for centuries wielded authority in curriculum and management decisions where students were not acknowledged as participants who could offer something other than listening and answering examination papers (BovillN.D). Similarly, Maserumule (2015) has found that academics or professors do not want to temper with status quo and rather maintain it as long as it provides them with security. Students' limited knowledge will be another hindrance as long as it provides them with security curriculum design.

The other barrier that might compromise participation is politics. The study by Acharya (2015) in Nepal, Tribhuvan University (TU) and Kathmandu University (KU) has found that student's participation was influenced by political parties at TU and by institution authorities or university at KU something that has the potential to weaken the students' participation in governance structures of universities.

## **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This study has made the following findings and recommendations:

Literature has shown that many universities in Europe have allowed students to participate in curriculum and governance. Their participation has been within the approach of shared governance. Many workshops were conducted which also recommended that students were beneficiaries of education and therefore should participate in shaping their affairs.

Participation by students increased cooperation between universities authorities and students as the studies in Nepal by Acharya (2015) in the two universities Tribhuvan University (TU) and Kathmandu University (KU) had evidenced. Pharmacy students of the inaugural class at Manchester University College of Pharmacy in Fort Wayne, Indiana, confirmed that they were fortunate to have the chance to be involved in developing their curriculum (Lu et al.

This study recommends that in order to address the barriers discussed above, students should be equipped with knowledge to participate with other stakeholders to make a meaningful participation. Students should be oriented, inducted, trained and mentored to put their theoretical knowledge into practice in decision-making. Both academics and students should be workshopped by professionals to accept that change is on-going and see the opportunities that go with it. Political influence should be barred from the university campus so that students are not manipulated by party politicians for selfish reasons. Lastly this study recommends that universities should be forced to submit their audit reports annually the senate and councils and also public media for public scrutiny. The State, academics and students need to find a way of implementing shared governance in order to fast-track decolonization.

## **REFERENCES**

- Acharya, S. L. 2015. Student Participation in University Governance: A Comparative Study between Tribhuvan University and Kathmandu University, Nepal. Unpublished MA degree. University of Os
- Arnstein, S. R. 1969 'A Ladder of Citizen Participation', Journal of the American Planning Association. 35 (4): 216 -224.
- Bergan, S. (N.D) Student Participation in Higher Education Governance.



- Bergan, S. (2004). Higher education governance and democratic participation: The university and democratic culture. In S. Bergan (Ed.), *The University as Res Publica: HE Governance, Student Participation and the University as a Site of Citizenship* (pp. 13–30). Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Bols, A. and Freeman, R. 2011. Engaging Students in Shaping their Curriculum. *Education Developments Issue*, 12 (2), 5–9.
- Borg, P.J. and Gall, T.R. 1993. *Understanding Reflective Models*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. London: Oxford University Press
- Bovill, C. (N.D). Student Engagement: Students as Active Partners in Shaping their Learning Experience.
- Bovill C, Morss K, Bulley CJ. 2009. Should Students Participate in Curriculum Design? Discussion arising from a first year curriculum design project and a literature review. *PRIME*. (2):17–26.
- Bruner, J. S. 1961. The Act of Discovery. *Harvard Educational Review*, 31(1): 21-32.
- Cloete, N. 2016. Free Higher Education. Another Self-destructive South African Policy 1 Nico Cloete Paper published by the Centre for Higher Education Trust.
- Cobbett, W. and Cohen, R. 1988. *Popular Struggles in South Africa*. Trenton: Africa World Press.
- Conrad, C.F. 1989. Meditations on the Ideology of Inquiry in Higher Education: Exposition, Critique and Conjecture. *The Review of Higher Education*, 12, 199-220.
- Cox, J. 1998. An Introduction to Marx's Theory of Alienation. Issue 79 of *International Socialism*, Quarterly Journal of the Socialist Workers Party (Britain).
- de Boer, H. and Stensaker, B. 2007. An internal representative system: the democratic vision. In P. A. M. Maasen, & J. P. Olsen (Eds.), *University Dynamics and European Integration* (pp. 137–163). Dordrecht: Kluwer
- Department of Education. 1997. *Higher Education Act 101, 1997*. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- DFID. 2015. Delivering quality education in protracted crises: A discussion paper
- Duff, J. and Berdahl, R.O. 1966. *University Government in Canada*. Ottawa, ON: Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada and the Canadian Association of University Teachers

- Fanon, F. 1965. *The Wretched of the Earth*. Middlesex: Penguin Books
- Heleta, S., 2016, 'Decolonisation of higher education: Dismantling epistemic violence and Eurocentrism in South Africa', *Transformation in Higher Education* 1(1).
- Jagersma, J. 2010. Empowering Students as Active Participants in Curriculum Design and Implementation. *Empowering Students in Curriculum Decisions*
- le Grange, L2016. Decolonising the university curriculum. *South African Journal of Higher Education*.30 (2), 1-12.
- Lu, C.Y. Nguyen, O, and Ersin, O.H. 2015. Active Student Engagement in Curriculum Development Am. 2015 Mar 25; 79(2), 30.
- Mafukata, M.A. 2016. South African and its second student revolution in the transformation of University education: the case of a rural-based university. *International Journal of Higher Education and Sustainability*, 1(2).
- Makgoba, M. 2015. We are our own solution in City Press, November, 7
- Mandela, N. 1990. *No Easy Walk To Freedom*. Johannesburg: Heinemann.
- Maserumule, M.H. 2015. Why Africa's professors are afraid of colonial education being dismantled. *The Conversation*.
- Mitra, D. 2004. The Significance of Students: Can Increasing 'Student Voice' in Schools Lead to Gains in Youth Development, *Teachers College Record*, Volume 106, Number 4.
- Moreku, C. 2014. The involvement and participation of student representative councils in co-operative governance in higher education institutions in South Africa. Unpublished Ph.D degree from Central University of Technology, Free State
- New Africa. 2002. Mrs Lumumba speaks.
- Ngcokovane, C. 1989. *Demons of Apartheid: A Moral and Ethical Analysis of the N.G.K., N.P. and Broederbond's Justification of Apartheid*. Braamfontein: Skotaville Publishers.
- Nonxuba, A. 2016. In Evans J. What is decolonized education? News 24.
- Nyborg. 2011. Governance and Student Participation: The challenges of the ESU Budapest declaration. Aghveran, Armenia
- Ngussa, B.M. and Makewa, B.N. 2014. Student Voice in Curriculum Change: A Theoretical Reasoning. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*.3(3) (Special Issue).

- Oslo Conference. 2003. Seminar on Student Participation in Governance in Higher Education. Norway.
- Planas, A, Soler, P, Fullana, J, Pallisera, M, Vilà, M. 2011. Student participation in university governance: the opinions of professors and students, *Studies in Higher Education*, 38 (4), 571-583.
- Persson, A. 2004. Student participation in the governance of HE in Europe. In S. Bergan (Ed.), *The university as Res Publica: HE Governance, Student Participation and the University as a Site of Citizenship* (pp. 13–30). Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Popovic, M. 2011. “Student Participation in Higher Education Governance” General Report. Aghveran, Armenia, 8-9 December 2011
- Ramoupi, N. L. 2014. African Research and Scholarship: 20 Years of Lost Opportunities to Transform Higher Education in South Africa Ufahamu: *A Journal of African Studies*, 38(1)
- Reddy, T. 2004. Higher Education and Social Transformation - South Africa Case Study Republic of South Africa. 1996. Constitution of the Republic of South Africa. Government Printer.
- Shay, S. 2016. Decolonising the curriculum: it’s time for a strategy.
- Swain, H. 2012. The Guardian, Tuesday 12 June
- Tamrat, W. 2016. Student Participation in Higher Education Governance: Trends and Practices in Ethiopian Public Universities. 7 (4), 2-7.
- Thyer, B.A. 1993. Single-systems research design (in a R.M. Grinnell) (Eds.), *Social Work Research and Evaluation* (4<sup>th</sup> Ed.). Itasca, IL, F.E. Peacock, 94-117.
- Wood, E.M. 1964. The Communist Manifesto 150 years later in Marx, K and Engels, F. The Communist Manifesto.
- Zuo, B. and E.W. Ratsoy. 1999. Student Participation in University Governance. The Canadian Journal of Higher Education La revue canadienne d'enseignementsupérieur XXIX (1),1-46.