

CIVIC AWARENESS AND ENGAGEMENT IN GHANA: THE CURRICULAR IMPLICATION

Amadu Musah Abudu, M.Phil

Faculty of Education, University for Development Studies, Tamale, Ghana

Moses Naiim Fuseini

Faculty of Integrated Studies, University for Development Studies, Ghana

Abstract

This study examined the curricular implications of civic awareness and engagement. It specifically focused on civic activities discussed, the level of awareness of civic issues and whether a difference existed between the respondent's general level of awareness and their civic engagement. The study employed the control group design. The sample size was 120 respondents. A structured questionnaire aided in data collection. The results showed that the respondents with citizenship education endorsed all the civic activity items depicting that they have received education on them, and that the experimental group's level of awareness on all the civic issues was higher as compared to that of the control group. The findings again showed that there is a significant difference between people with citizenship education and those without citizenship education's general level of awareness of civic issues. In addition, the results indicated that there is a significant difference between people with citizenship education and those without citizenship education's wish to take part in community service. The main conclusions drawn from this study is that the difference in the level of civic awareness is due to citizenship education, and that civic awareness increases the likelihood of a person engaging in civic activities. The study recommends that the school curriculum should include activities that promote civic awareness and civic engagement.

Keywords: School curriculum, citizen education, civic issues, civic awareness, civic engagement

Introduction

The real test of education comes in the out-of-school lives of the youth. Thus, in the school the youth are educated among others, to understand and be able to participate in all civic activities such as voting in elections, influencing public policy and working with others to improve the

living conditions of their environment. The challenge, therefore, is for the school to help the youth develop reflective attachments to their nation and a sense of kinship with citizens in all parts of the world (Banks, 1990). Citizenship education is seen as one of the oldest subjects in the school curriculum and it continues to be on the radar screen of contemporary curriculum of the school for the purpose of educating the youth on civic rights and responsibilities. Citizenship education is the type of education that fosters democratic attitudes, skills, and knowledge to engage and work on important public issues and make democracy a way of life (Dahal, 2002). The Ministry of Education and Sports (MOES) (2007) on the other hand is of the view that, citizenship education is a subject that aims at producing competent, reflective, concerned and participatory citizens who will contribute to the development of the communities and country in the spirit of patriotism and democracy (p. ii). MOES (2007) further intimate that the subject exposes pupils to the persistent contemporary issues hindering the development of the nation and the desired attitudes, values, and skills needed to solve these problems.

The attention given to citizenship education now is due to certain challenges countries face. This is because there is a growing ineptitude of the youth towards participation in civic activities. In this vein, Galston (2004), Campbell (2006), Touya (2007) and Flanagan, Levine and Settersten (n.d.) have indicated that presently there is a drop in people's engagement in civic and political activities in many countries worldwide. For instance, Touya (2007: 2) claims that:

“In recent years, surveys and studies have been showing a significant decline in the political participation and civic engagement of the inhabitants of developed established democracies. An increasing proportion of the population of these countries shows apathy toward political affairs, observed in the diminishing voter turnout, in membership in political parties, civic associations or in the involvement in social affairs.”

In addition, Delli Carpini and Keeter (1996) reiterated that the lack of civic knowledge has contributed to more limited civic involvement in key domains like voting and volunteering. This evidence has influenced countries to search for ways as how to incorporate civic activities in the school curriculum so as to enhance civic awareness and civic engagement habits.

However, according to Campbell (2006) and Touya (2007), a significant positive correlation exists between higher education and different measures of positive civic behaviour. For example, Nie, Junn and Stehlik-Barry (1996), Putman (2001), Levine and Lopez (2004) and Browne (2013) have pointed out that education is effective at promoting the measure and quality of civic participation. Similarly, Galston (2004) has argued that civic knowledge promotes support for democratic values and political

participation. He advances that people who are more knowledgeable in civic issues are more likely to take part in civic and political affairs as well as less likely to have a generalized mistrust and fear of public life. Realizing the role citizenship education can play in reversing this decline in citizens' civic awareness and engagement, most developed and developing countries alike have embark on reviewing the curriculum so as to make citizenship education a core subject, particularly at basic education level (Keating, Kerr, Benton, Mundy & Lopes, n.d.; Finkel, 2000; Dahal, 2002). More so, the pivotal role that citizenship education plays in equipping the youth with knowledge, skills and the right attitudes for social roles in the society has attracted funding from the United States Agency for International Development (USAID (Finkel, 2011). The importance given to citizenship education is a sign that it is the panacea to reversing the low- interest shown in civic engagement.

In Ghana, the National Commission for Civic Education (NCCE) came into being in 1993. The NCCE's mandate is derived from the 1992 Constitution of the Republic of Ghana (Articles 231-239) and the National Commission for Civic Education Act, 1993, Act 452 (NCCE, 2011). The NCCE has the duty of promoting political participation, creating and sustaining awareness of the principles and goals of the Constitution of Ghana to all citizens (i.e., students and non-students). Since the NCCE came into being, it has had a nationwide presence through its regional and district offices, which provides a platform that enables it to reach out to every community. Though the NCCE was to help in ensuring civic awareness in Ghana, available evidence suggests that it is not on top of its responsibilities because the District Level Elections (DLE) over the years has shown a low turnout rate. The evidence points to a dwindling interest as the first DLE of 1988/89 recorded a voter turnout of 59.3%, the second in 1994 recorded 29.3%, the third (1998), fourth (2002) and fifth (2006) recorded voter turnout of 41.6%, 31.1% and 39.3% respectively (NCCE, 2010). Similarly, people are not willing to take part in community service as they stand aloof waiting for the central or local government to fix all their community problems. These situations at the national level equally exist in the study site, the East Gonja District of Northern Ghana. This makes it important to find out the degree of understanding the people have on civic issues and whether the level of awareness the beneficiaries of the NCCE programmes have will influence their engagement in civic issues.

2. Research Questions

What is the respondents' level of awareness about civic issues in the East Gonja District?

How does the awareness the beneficiaries of the NCCE programmes have influenced their engagement in civic issues?

What are the curricular implications of civic awareness and engagement?

3. Hypotheses

H₀: There is no significance difference between people with civic education and those without civic education's level of awareness of civic issues

H₁: There is a significance difference between people with civic education and those without civic education level of awareness of civic issues

H₀: There is no significance difference between people with civic education and those without civic education's wish to take part in community service

H₁: There is a significance difference between people with civic education and those without civic education's wish to take part in community service

4. Literature Review

4.1 Issues Discussed in Citizenship Education

A myriad of issues fall under the umbrella of citizenship education. Some of the discourses in citizen education hinges on rights, responsibilities, democratic values, functions of government, electoral process as well as community voluntarism (USAID, 2002; Boyte, 2003; Kuntuvdyi, Ziyoev, Ulmasov & Yusufbekov, 2007; NCCE, 2010). According to Boyte (2003), citizenship education focuses on either civics courses or service learning. The authors indicate that whereas civics courses emphasize liberal political theory and are right-centred, service learning emphasizes voluntarism and communitarianism. The writers advance that teaching students about public work and organizing skills is absent from these two common approaches. For USAID (2002), it states that adult citizenship education programmes cover many concerns from voter education through human rights knowledge to the citizen leadership training. With respect to NCCE (2010), it is involved in public education in the local government system to engender citizens' understanding, appreciation, and participation in local governance for a successful national and District Level Election. It further notes that the discussions centred on the electoral process, social auditing, women's participation in governance, and lower structures of the local governance system at the District Assembly. The citizenship education carried out by NCCE targets people in the formal school system and those out of school. In the cases of Kuntuvdyi *et al.* (2007), they claim that during the Soviet Union,

citizenship education focused on educating citizens about the government, society, citizens, and propaganda that was helpful to the state ideology. In the Soviet, citizenship education was tantamount to indoctrination, as citizens had no choice but to learn and go along with the ideology; there was no room for personal interpretation. The government used all public institutions and sometimes even violence if necessary to prepare citizens to live in and be proud of a communist society.

4.2 Awareness Levels of People on Civic Issues

In terms of understanding levels of people on civic issues, Kurtz, Rosenthal and Zukin and (2003), Finkel (2003), and Owen, Soule and Chalif (2011) found that the exposure of people in the citizenship education lead to improvement in their civic awareness. For example, in Finkel's (2003) study in South Africa, Dominican Republic, and Poland, he found that citizenship education did increase individuals' awareness of the political process in the Dominican Republic and Poland, but did bolster in all three countries the core democratic orientations of political efficacy and political tolerance. Similarly, in Kurtz *et al.* (2003) study, they found that citizenship education results in an increased likelihood to vote and increased civic knowledge and engagement. For the specifics, they indicated that 71% of those who took civic and 57% of those who did not have civic education said voting was what made one a good citizen; 90% of those who had civic classes and 80% of those without civic education noted that obeying the law was what made one a good citizen; 59% of those who had civic education and 42% of those without civic education pointed out that paying attention to government was what made one a good citizen; and 54% of those who took civic and 39% of those who did not take part in civic lessons said contacting elected officials on issues was what made one a good citizen. These results clearly points to the fact that citizen education increases knowledge in civic issues.

Owen, Soule and Chalif (2011) found in their study that higher levels of citizenship education are positively associated with political knowledge gain. The writers indicated that the Civic Education and Political Engagement Study (CEPES) data show that, with the exception of the presidential succession item, people who have no classroom citizenship education have far less knowledge of basic facts about government and politics than people who have taken a civics or social studies course. Owen *et al.* (2011) pointed out that people whose civic education experience includes participating in a civics program, like Close Up, We the People, or Street Law, are substantially more likely to answer the knowledge questions correctly than the public. They further noted that 64% of people who have taken a citizenship course and participated in a programme could correctly state the number of United States of America's senators compared to 47% of those who have taken a social studies course only and 33% of those lacking

formal citizenship training. The results further revealed that people who have participated in a citizenship education programme (35%) were twice more likely to answer the United States of America's Constitution question correctly than those who have no classroom citizenship training (17%). These findings of Owen *et al.* (2011) illustrate that citizenship education increases one's awareness of political issues in a country, which is consistent with the finding of Finkel (2003) with respect to the discovery made in the republic of South Africa.

Finkel (2013) found that in the case of Kenya's Citizenship Education Programme (NCEP), large differences in changes were clear among people exposed to NCEP workshops versus control people in a series of constitutional knowledge and awareness orientations. The author noted that people who attended workshops were more likely to report increased awareness of the contents of the constitution, increased likelihood of having seen the document itself, increased awareness of the various proposals being discussed to reform the constitution, with the changes among treated people being nearly double to those observed among the control group. Finkel's (2013) study and Owen *et al.* (2011) one are similar since they both considered people with citizenship education and those without. Their results are also consistent since they both found that those with citizenship education have more knowledge on civic issues than those without civic education.

4.3 Civic Engagement

The construct civic engagement refers to the ways in which citizens take part in the life of a community to improve conditions for themselves or to help shape the community's future (Adler & Goggin, 2005). The findings on the link between citizenship education and civic engagement have produced contradictory findings. While others have discovered that citizenship education contributes to increased civic engagement, some other studies have produced contrary results. In terms of citizenship education enhancing civic engagement, the findings of Delli Carpini and Keeter (1996), Finkel's (2000), Putnam (2000), Patrick (2002), United States Agency for International Development (USAID) (2002), Kurtz *et al.* (2003), Levine and Lopez (2004), Converse (1972) as cited in Campbell (2006) and Browne (2013) support assertion that citizenship education has a positive impact on civic engagement. For instance, Converse (1972: 324) as cited in Campbell (2006: 25) memorably phrased his description of the tight link between education and engagement:

“Whether one is dealing with cognitive matters such as level of factual information about politics or conceptual sophistication in its assessment; or such motivational matters as degree of attention paid to politics and emotional involvement in political affairs; or questions of actual

behavior, such as engagement in any of a variety of political activities from party work to vote turnout itself: education is everywhere the universal solvent, and the relationship is always in the same direction. The higher the education, the greater the ‘good’ values of the variable. The educated citizen is attentive, knowledgeable, and participatory and the uneducated citizen is not.”

Similarly, Putnam’s (2000) study also found a strong nexus between education and civic engagement. Putnam (2000: 186) claims that:

“Education is one of the most important predictors – usually, in fact, the most important predictor – of many forms of social participation – from voting to associational membership, to chairing a local committee to hosting a dinner party to giving blood. The same basic pattern applies to both men and women and to all races and generations. Education, in short, is an extremely powerful predictor of civic engagement.”

For Patrick (2002), he notes that knowledgeable citizens are better citizens of a democracy about their possession and use of civic skills. The writer adds that political knowledge induces greater levels of political engagement. In the case of Levine and Lopez (2004), they claim that in a range of civic engagement measures, the people who chose to take civics, politics, or social studies classes were much more engaged in community affairs and politics than other young people were. They adduced that those people who report that they recently chose to take a civics or social studies class are more likely than other young people who do not and they report that: they helped solve a community problem; they can make a difference in their community; they have volunteered recently; they trust other people and the government, they have made consumer decisions for ethical or political reasons; they believe in the importance of voting; and they are registered to vote. This also signifies that there is a positive correlation between citizenship education and political participation. Similarly, Browne (2013) discovered that in Project Citizen a citizenship education programme that implemented in Thailand, it increased young people’s likelihood of engaging politically and in other aspects of society.

In spite of some studies finding a positive relationship between citizenship education and civic engagement, others have made contradictory discoveries (Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA), 1999; Galston, 2001; O’Toole, Marsh & Jones, 2003; Phelps, 2006; Brody, 1978 as cited in Campbell, 2006; Campbell, 2006; De Brito, 2010). For example, Brody (1978) as cited in Campbell (2006) has labelled the phenomenon of falling political engagement in the face of rising education, the “paradox of participation”. In the view of Campbell (2006: 27), “more puzzling is the fact that the decline in voter turnout, and other civic indicators, is concentrated among the youngest age cohort of the population – who

generally also have the highest average level of education.” For Galston (2001), he states that in spite of huge increases in the formal educational attainment of the United States of America’s population during the past 50 years, levels of political knowledge have barely budged. The author claims that today's college graduates know no more about politics than did high school graduates in 1950. De Brito (2010) points out that in recent years in Southern Africa elections have been marked by an extremely low voter turnout (less than 50%), namely the Mozambique elections of 2004 and 2009, the Lesotho election of 2007 and the Zambian presidential election of 2008.

5. Methodology

The *control group design* laid the basis for conducting this study. According to Kumar (1999), a control group design consists of a *controlled* and *experimental group* and that these groups are to be comparable as far as possible in every respect except the intervention. This research design was right for this study because it involved collecting data from the experimental and control groups on their awareness levels of civic issues and level of civic engagement. This was to make sure that a comparison between the two respondent groups was possible. Any differences between the *controlled* and *experimental group’s* level of awareness and civic engagement are because of the intervention (*civic education*). The sample population consisted of persons aged 18 years and older in the East Gonja District. They constitute respondents with citizenship education provided by NCCE (*experimental group*) and those without citizen education (*control group*) provided by NCCE and who have not had any formal education (This is to make sure that they are not exposed to any form of civic education as the formal school offers civic lessons). The sample size was 120 respondents constituting 60 respondents in the *experimental group* and 60 in the *control group* (See *Table 1* for details of the sample), which was determined through a non-statistical means. Best and Kahn (1995) noted that there is no fixed percentage of subjects that constitute the size of an adequate sample influenced the choice of the sample size. The study used quota sampling in dividing the sample population into those with citizenship education and those without citizenship education and the sample units for the stratum picked. A structured questionnaire aided the data collection. The structured questionnaire contained closed ended items on civic issues (i.e., *rights as a citizen, responsibilities as a citizen, democratic values, electoral process, need to engage in community service, principal economic and social policies of the nation and operation of government*) discussed. In addition, it had items on the level of awareness of civic activities discussed, general level of awareness about civic issues and wish to take part in community service. The

civic issues were ranked on a five-point Likert scales ranging from strongly disagreed (1) to strongly agreed (5) and very low (1) to very high (5) to measure their perception of those issues. Data analysis execution used statistical product for service solution. The analysis involved using cross tabulations, frequencies, and percentages to analyse the respondents' perceptions on civic issues they are educated on and their level of civic awareness. The purpose of the Mann Whitney U test was to test the two hypotheses in section 3. The significance level was 0.05

Table 1: Sample Size Distribution of Respondents

Respondent Category	Sex		Total Sample
	Male	Female	
Respondents with civic education (<i>experimental group</i>)	22	38	60
Respondents without civic education (<i>control group</i>)	26	34	60
Total Sample	48	72	120

f=frequency; %=percent

6. Results and Discussions

6.1 Civic Issues NCCE Educate People on

Table 2 gives the details of the civic issues NCCE educates its target population.

Table 2: Respondents' views on Civic Activities they are educated on by NCCE

Civic Activity Item	Respondents <i>with</i> civic education conducted by NCCE (<i>experimental group</i>)				
		Strongly Disagree/Disagree	Uncertain	Agree/Strongly Agree	Total
Rights as a citizen (<i>i.e., freedom of speech and expression, right to vote and to be voted for</i>)	<i>f</i>	5	12	43	60
	%	8.3	20.0	71.7	100
Responsibilities as a citizen (<i>i.e., obeying the law, tax obligation, protecting government property</i>)	<i>f</i>	8	14	38	60
	%	13.3	23.3	63.3	100
Democratic values (<i>i.e., tolerance, cooperation,</i>	<i>f</i>	3	16	41	60
	%	5.0	26.7	68.3	100

<i>compromise</i>)					
Electoral process (<i>i.e.</i> , voter registration, voting process)	<i>f</i>	8	14	38	60
	%	13.3	23.3	63.3	100
Need to engage in community service (<i>i.e.</i> , voluntarism)	<i>f</i>	6	13	41	60
	%	10.0	21.7	68.3	100
Principal economic and social issues policies of the nation	<i>f</i>	3	16	41	60
	%	5.0	26.7	68.3	100
Operation of government (<i>i.e.</i> , executive, parliament, judiciary)	<i>f</i>	4	10	46	60
	%	6.7	16.7	76.7	100

T=total; *f*=frequency; %=percent

Considering the civic activities NCCE carry out, it is observed from Table 2 that rights as a citizen; responsibilities as a citizen; democratic values; electoral process; need to engage in community service; principal economic and social policies of the nation and operation of government were all endorsed by the respondents. This signifies that most of the respondents largely *agreed/strongly agreed* with the items. As the respondents are educated on these issues, it has the potential of increasing their awareness and knowledge on them. The findings of this study on the civic issues NCCE educates people on are consistent with the discoveries made by USAID (2002), Boyte (2003), Kuntuvdyi *et al.* (2007) and NCCE (2010, 2011).

6. 2. Awareness about Civic Issues

The details of the comparison between respondents who have citizenship education and those without citizenship education are captured in Table 3.

Table 3: Respondents' Level of Awareness about Civic Activities

Civic Activity Item		Respondents' (<i>control group</i>) without civic education level of awareness about civic activities				Respondents' (<i>experimental group</i>) with civic education level of awareness about civic activities			
		VL/L	M	H/V H	T	VL/L	M	H/V H	T
Rights as a citizen (<i>i.e.</i> ,	<i>f</i>	34	21	5	60	7	23	30	60
	%	57.5	35.0	7.5	100	11.7	38.3	50.0	100

freedom of speech and expression, right to vote and to be voted for)									
Responsibilities as a citizen (i.e., obeying the law, tax obligation, protecting government property)	<i>f</i>	33	22	5	60	4	32	24	60
	%	55.0	37.5	7.5	100	6.7	53.3	40	100
	%	60.0	32.5	7.5	100	3.3	50.0	46.7	100
Democratic values (i.e., tolerance, cooperation, compromise)	<i>f</i>	42	15	3	60	11	16	33	60
	%	70.0	25.0	5.0	100	18.3	26.7	55.0	100
Electoral process (i.e., voter registration, voting process)	<i>f</i>	36	18	6	60	7	28	25	60
	%	60.0	30.0	10.0	100	11.7	46.7	41.7	100
Need to engage in community service (i.e., voluntarism)	<i>f</i>	34	21	5	60	5	26	29	60
	%	57.5	35.0	7.5	100	8.3	43.3	48.3	100
Principal economic and social policies of the nation	<i>f</i>	25	31	3	60	7	24	29	60
	%	42.5	52.5	5.0	100	11.7	40.0	48.3	100
Operation of government (i.e., executive, parliament, judiciary)	<i>f</i>	24	31	5	60	4	23	33	60
	%	40.0	52.5	7.5	100	6.7	38.3	55.0	100

T=total; *f*=frequency; %=percent; VL/L=Very Low/Low; M=Moderate; and H/VH=High /Very High

From Table 3, the results illustrate that 50% of the respondents who have citizenship education have *high/very high* awareness level about their rights as citizens and that represent most of them. In the case of those respondents who did not have citizenship education, the results illustrate that most of them representing 57.5% have *very low/low* awareness level about their rights as citizens. The current finding on this citizenship education item corresponds with the discovery of Finkel (2013) that in Kenya people who took part in the NCEP workshops were more aware of the content of the constitution with specific reference to their rights than those who did not take part in the program.

With regard to awareness level about responsibilities as a citizen, the results prove that a difference existed between the awareness levels of respondents with citizenship education and those without citizenship education. For the respondents with citizenship education, the results show that most (53.3%) of them had *moderate* knowledge about their responsibilities as citizens. In terms of the respondents without citizenship education, the results denote that 55%, which represent a large proportion of them, indicated that they have *very low/low* level of awareness about their responsibilities as citizens. In juxtaposing the results of the two respondent groups, it is obvious that those who have taken citizenship education lessons have a better level of understanding of their responsibilities as citizens than those without citizenship education. With respect to the experimental group, the results show that most of them representing 55% noted that they have *high/very high* awareness level about democratic values. For the control group, the results revealed that 70% representing majority of them said that they have *very low/low* level of awareness about democratic values. It is clear that the introduction of civic education (i.e., the intervention) has contributed to the experimental group having more knowledge in democratic values than the control group. Finkel's (2003) finding that people with civic education had increased comprehension of democratic orientations of political efficacy and political tolerance in South Africa, Dominican Republic, and Poland than those without supports the present discovery.

Result on the degree of awareness of respondents with citizenship education and those without citizenship education on electoral process illustrate that a difference exist in their level of awareness. Considering the respondents with citizenship education conducted by NCCE, the results denote that 46.7% of them constituting majority stated that they have *moderate* knowledge about the electoral process. In terms of those without citizenship education, most of them representing 60% indicated that they have *very low/low* awareness level about electoral process. Based on the results, it is obvious that the introduction of citizenship education has led to the experimental group having a better level of awareness on the electoral process than those from the control group. The current finding is consistent with Finkel's (2003) discovery that people with citizenship education had better awareness of the political process in the Dominican Republic and Poland than those who did not have civic lessons.

In terms of need to engage in community service activities, the results suggest that a difference existed in the awareness levels of the respondents (experimental and control group). The results on the experimental group illustrate that 48.3% of them constituting the greatest hold the opinion that they have *moderate* level of awareness about the need to engage in

community service. In the case of the control group, the results proves that 57.5% representing most of them noted that they have *very low/low* awareness level about the need to engage in community service activities. Considering the results, it is obvious that the introduction of citizenship education to the experimental group have led to them having a better appreciation about the need for them to take part in community activities.

The results denote that majority (48.3%) of the respondents who have citizenship education seem to have *high/very high* awareness level on the principal economic and social policies of the country. In the case of the respondents without citizenship education, the results depict that 52.5% (which represent most of them) indicated that they have *moderate* knowledge about the principal economic and social policies of the nation. In a whole, the results show that the exposure of respondents to citizenship education improves their understanding levels of the economic and social policies of the country than those without citizenship education.

The results on the experimental group illustrate that most (55%) of them have *high/very high* levels of awareness about the operations of the government. In terms of the time the respondents did not have civic education, the results show that 52.5% of them who constitute majority noted that they have *moderate* awareness level about the operation of government. Comparing the results on the level of awareness of the various respondent categories, it is clear that most of the respondents having civic education are more aware of issues surrounding the operation of government that those without civic education. The discovery of Owen *et al.* (2011) and Finkel (2013) that people with civic education are more aware about their political leadership, their roles, and institutions compared to those without civic education corroborates the finding of this study.

6.2 General Level of Civic Awareness

The levels of civic awareness are captured in Tables 4 and 5.

Table 4: Ranks

Respondent category		N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
How will you rate your general level of awareness about civic issues in East Gonja District?	People with civic education (<i>experimental group</i>)	60	79.65	4779.00
	People without civic education (<i>control group</i>)	60	41.35	2481.00
	Total	120		

Table 5: Summary of Mann-Whiney U test on difference in General Level of Awareness about Civic Issues

	How will you rate your general level of awareness about civic issues in East Gonja District?
Mann-Whitney U	651.000
Wilcoxon W	2481.000
Z	-6.526
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.000*

* $p \leq 0.05$

From Tables 4 and 5, it is clear that the Mean rank for the experimental group=79.65, Mean rank for control group=41.35, $U=651.000$ and $p=0.000$ are associated with level of level of awareness of civic issues between those with citizenship education and those without. The evidence shows that the p value is less than the alpha value of 0.05. On that basis, H_0 that is, there is no significant difference between people with civic education and those without civic education's general level of awareness of civic issues is *rejected*. This means that the alternate hypothesis, H_1 is *accepted*. This implies that there is a significant difference between people with citizenship education and those without citizenship education's level of awareness of civic issues. Comparing the Mean ranks for people with civic education against that of those without civic education, it noticed that the Mean ranks for people with civic education is higher and so contributes more to the difference. This discovery is consistent with the findings of Putnam (2000), Kurtz *et al.* (2003), Finkel (2003), Converse (1972) as cited in Campbell (2006) and Owen *et al.* (2011).

6.3 Civic Engagement

The respondents were required to indicate their desire to participate in civic activities. The responses are shown in Tables 6 and 7.

Table 6: Ranks

	Respondent category	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
How would you rate your wish to take part in community service (i.e., volunteering in communal labour)?	People with citizenship education (<i>experimental group</i>)	60	76.00	4560.00
	People without citizenship education (<i>control group</i>)	60	45.00	2700.00
	Total	120		

From Tables 6 and 7, it is observed that the Mean rank for the experimental group=76.00, Mean rank for the control group=45.00,

$U=870.000$ and $p=0.000$ are associated with the desire to take part in community service between those with civic education and those without civic education. The evidence shows that the p value is less than the alpha value of 0.05. On that basis, H_0 that is, there is no significant difference between people with civic education and those without civic education's wish to take part in community service is *rejected*. This implies that H_1 is *accepted*. The results illustrate that there is a significant difference between people with civic education and those without civic education's desire to take part in community service. The Mean rank for people with citizenship education was higher and so contributes more to the difference. This signifies that the difference resulted from the introduction of the intervention citizenship education. Kurtz *et al.* (2003), Levine and Lopez (2004) and Browne's (2013) discover that exposure of people to civic education motivated them to have an interest in engaging in community service corroborates this study's finding.

Table 7: Summary of Mann-Whiney U test for difference in Participation in Community Service

	How would you rate your wish to take part in community service (i.e., Volunteering in communal labour)?
Mann-Whitney U	870.000
Wilcoxon W	2700.000
Z	-5.379
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.000*

7. Conclusion

It is clear that all the citizenship education items were endorsed by the experimental group as issues on which NCCE educate them on. In terms of their level of awareness about citizenship education activities, the findings show that there is a great difference in terms of awareness between the experimental and control groups. The results depict that the experimental group's level of awareness on their rights as citizens; responsibilities as citizens; democratic values; electoral process; need to engage in community service; principal economic and social policies of the nation; and operation of government is higher compared to that of the control group. The results showed that there is a significant difference between people with citizenship education and those without citizenship education's level of awareness of civic issues. It was also found that there is a significant difference between people with citizenship education and those without citizenship education's desire to take part in community service. The rejections of the null hypotheses suggest that the difference might have resulted from the exposure of the experimental group to citizenship education.

8. Implications of the findings for curriculum development

The Curriculum of the school, whether stated or implied consist of a set of educational objectives, a body of subject matter, a list of exercises or activities to be performed and a way of determining whether or not the objectives have been achieved by students. The curriculum is the content of education and therefore should reflect the knowledge, skills and attitudes and values that citizens need to propel the society to greater heights.

The findings of this study have some implications for all stakeholders in the development of school curriculum. The study revealed that there is a significant difference between people with citizenship education and those without citizenship education's level of awareness of civic issues. Those with citizenship education tend to know and protect their rights as well as execute their responsibilities. The finding is therefore instructive to teachers, school administrators, parents and curriculum planners whose business is to provide learning experiences for the youth to enable them participate in civic activities of the society. The school should create an environment that will enable students to acquire these values so as to be effective and participatory members of the democratic political community. In particular, schools should make efforts to involve pupils in issues concerning school life, such as school facilities, organization, rules, volunteering activities and matters relating to teaching and learning. The teacher should enable learning through action; taking citizenship beyond the classroom to achieve tangible changes in the community. The curriculum should be updated to include relevant active citizenship opportunities and map civil society actors to support schools to take practical action with their communities. Teachers should use topical political and social issues to bring citizenship content to life and to help pupils develop key citizenship skills of research, discussion and debate, as well as to respect the views of others, think critically, evaluate and reflect. For example, after learning about human rights, diversity and inequality, students should be provided the opportunity to address these issues in their local community.

9. Recommendations

Since people who have exposure to citizenship education tend to have more awareness about civic issues as well as having a greater likelihood in participating in community service than those without citizenship education, it is important that civic issues are factored into the school curriculum at all levels of education in the country. As more people get educated, the likelihood of them engaging actively in community activities will be high.

Citizenship education clubs should be formed in schools and where they already exist, strengthening them is perfect. It is important to have the civic clubs because they serve as a conduit through which the NCCE staff

visit schools to conduct education on civic issues. As students become aware of their civic duties, they would develop the interest in taking part in civic activities of their communities, and this they would carry into their adulthood.

References:

- Adler, R.P. & Goggin, J. (2005). What do we mean by “civic engagement”? *Journal of Transformative Education*, 3(3), 236-253. DOI: 10.1177/1541344605276792.
- Banks, J. A. (1990). Teaching strategies for the social studies: inquiry, valuing, and decision-making (4th ed.). London, Longman Group Ltd.
- Best J.W. & Kahn, J. V. (1995). *Research in education*. (7th ed.). New Delhi: Prentice-Hall of India.p. 19.
- Boyte, H. (2003). Civic Education and the new American patriotism post-9/11. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 33 (1), 85-100.
- Browne, E. (2013). *Civic education: approaches and efficacy* (GSDRC Helpdesk Research Report 947). Birmingham, UK: GSDRC, University of Birmingham. [Online] Available: <http://www.gsdr.org/go/display&type=Helpdesk&id=947> (June 10, 2013).
- Campbell, D.E. (2006). *What is education’s impact on civic and social engagement?* A Paper Presented at the Symposium on Social Outcomes of Learning, held at the Danish University of Education (Copenhagen).
- Dahal, D.R. (2002). *Civic education: The problems and possibilities of a democratic public life in Nepal*. Kathmandu, Nepal: Society for the Promotion of Civic Education in Nepal.
- De Brito, L. (2010). *A challenge for democracy: low turnout in Mozambique, Lesotho and Zâmbia*. Conference on “Electoral Processes, Liberation Movements and Democratic Change in África” Organised by IESE and CMI, Maputo.
- Delli Carpini, M. X. & Keeter, S. (1996). *What Americans know about politics and why it matters*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Finkel, S.E. (2000). *Civic education and the mobilization of political participation in developing democracies*. A paper prepared for the conference of “Political Participation: Building a Research Agenda, Princeton University.
- Finkel, S.E. (2003). *Can democracy be taught? Adult civic education, civil society and the development of democratic political culture*. [Online] Available: <http://www.wmd.org> (June 10, 2013).
- Finkel, S.E. (2011). Adult civic education and the development of democratic political culture: Evidence from emerging democracies. In S.

- Odugbeni & T. Lee (Eds). *Generating genuine demand for accountability: Public opinion and state responsiveness*. Washington, D.C.: CommGap (World Bank).
- Finkel, S.E. (2013). *The impact of adult civic education programmes in developing democracies* (WIDER Working Paper No. 2013/064). United States of America: UNU-WIDER.
- Flanagan, C., Levine, P. & Settersten, R. (n.d.). *Civic engagement and the changing transition to adulthood*. Center for Information & Research on Civic Learning & Engagement (CIRCLE).
- Galston, W.A. (2001). Political knowledge, political engagement, and civic education. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 4, 217-234. DOI: 10.1146/annurev.polisci.4.1.217
- Galston, W.A. (2004). Civic education and political participation. *Political Science and Politics*, 37(2), 263-266. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017.S1049096504004202>
- Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA). (1999). *Youth voter participation: Involving young people in tomorrow's democracies*. Stockholm. [Online] Available: www.idea.int/99df/daniela-int2.html. (June 10, 2013).
- Keating, A., Kerr, D., Benton, T., Mundy, E. & Lopes, J. (n.d.). *Citizenship education in England 2001-2010: Young people's practices and prospects for the future: the eighth and final report from the Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study (CELS)* (Research Report DFE-RR059).
- Kumar, R. (1999). *Research methodology: A step-by-step guide for beginners*. New Delhi, India: SAGE Publications. p. 91-92.
- Kuntuvdyi, N., Ziyoev, T., Ulmasov, R. & Yusufbekov, Y. (2007). *Development of civic education in Tajikistan: Problems and prospects*. Peaceful Development Academy. [Online] Available: http://www.akdn.org/publications/civil_society_tajikistan_edu_civic.pdf (June 10, 2013).
- Kurtz, K., Rosenthal, A. & Zukin, C. (2003). *Citizenship: A challenge for all generations*. National Conference of State Legislatures. [Online] Available: <http://www.ncsl.org> (June 10, 2013).
- Levine, P. & Lopez, M.H. (2004). *Themes emphasized in Social Studies and Civics classes: New evidence*. The Center for Information & Research on Civic Learning & Engagement. [Online] Available: http://www.civicyouth.org/PopUps/FactSheets/FS_Themes_Emphasized_SocStudies_Civics.pdf (June 10, 2013).
- Ministry of Education Science and Sports (2007). Teaching syllabus for citizenship education (PRIMARY 4 - 6). Available online projectoverseas.wikispaces.com/.../Citizenship%20Education%20P4.../Cit

- National Commission for Civic Education (NCCE). (2010). *Seventeenth Annual Report – 2009*. Accra, Ghana: NCCE.
- National Commission for Civic Education (NCCE). (2011). *Seventeenth Annual Report – 2010*. Accra, Ghana: NCCE.
- Nie, N.H., Junn, J. & Stehlik-Barry, K. (1996). *Education and democratic citizenship in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- O’Toole, T., Marsh, D., & Jones, S. (2003). Political literacy cuts both ways: The politics of nonparticipation among young people. *The Political Quarterly*, 74(3), 349–360. DOI: 10.1111/1467-923X.00544
- Owen, D., Soule, S. & Chalif, R. (2011). *Civic education and knowledge of government and politics*. Paper Prepared for Presentation at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Seattle, Washington.
- United States Agency for International Development (USAID). (2002). *Approaches to civic education: Lessons learned* (Technical Publication Series). Washington, DC: Office of Democracy and Governance.
- Patrick, J.J. (2002). *Defining, delivering and defending a common education for citizenship in a democracy*. Paper Presented at the Summit on Civic Learning in Teacher Preparation, Boston,
- Putnam, R.D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Phelps, E. (2006). *Young adults and electoral turnout in Britain: Towards a generational model of political participation* (SEI Working Paper No 92). United Kingdom: Sussex European Institute.
- Touya, D.M. (2007). *Civic awareness: Family traits or schooling*. [Online] Available:http://www.economics.neu.edu/activities/seminars/documents/dmiles_seminar.pdf (October 10, 2013).