

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION DURING THE 21ST CENTURY SOUTH AFRICA: MODES, ATTITUDES AND TRENDS

K.G. Phago

*Department of Public Administration and Management
University of South Africa*

ABSTRACT

In democratic countries such as South Africa, participation of community members in governance matters (in all three spheres) is a right. This is because the government is elected to improve the general wellbeing of the people and, therefore, community participation are required to ensure that the most pressing needs of the people are prioritised. While the government may have an indication of what the needs of the people are, a two-way relationship between community members and the government can serve to clarify instances where there are misunderstandings. Such participation could enhance public confidence in the government.

This article considers the existing modes of community participation since 1994 for provincial and national spheres of government, and since 2000 for the establishment of democratic local government. The question that guides this article is: Who wants to participate in the affairs of government? In attempting to answer this question, factors influencing community participation are considered. Furthermore, in this article a shift is undertaken to focus on the participants in the context of local government. This discussion is followed by the need to enhance community participation in matters pertaining to local government. Enhancing participation in this regard should be understood as a means of accelerating public service delivery. Finally, this article recounts community participation in relation to service delivery.

INTRODUCTION

Community participation in South Africa is regarded as an important means of deepening the relatively new democracy. The deepening of democracy is necessary since community participation should influence decision making in the government. This article highlights some important methods, attitudes and trends that currently exist in South Africa.

This article considers existing modes of community participation since 1994 for provincial and national spheres of government and since 2000 for the establishment of democratic local government. The question that guides this article is: Who wants to participate in the affairs of government? In attempting to answer this question, factors influencing community participation are considered. Furthermore, this article focuses on the participants in the context of local government. This is followed by the discussion to enhance community participation in matters pertaining to local government. The improvement of community participation in this regard is discussed as a means to accelerate public service delivery. The article concludes by recounting community participation in relation to service delivery.

MODES OF COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN SOUTH AFRICA

In South Africa prior to 1994, the involvement of community members in government affairs was considered in terms of the policy of separate development along racial lines (*cf.* Rogers 1980:7; Byrne 1999:232-233). Participation by community members from disadvantaged backgrounds was achieved through mass movements. This approach has affected the manner in which policy decisions in government were made in South Africa during both the apartheid and democratic eras (Hague, Harrop & Breslin 1998:88).

The manner in which public management decisions were made during the 20th century is evolving. This means that decisions should no longer be made by the elite few, but the community should be involved in such processes. It is also important to bear in mind that the community is made up of different segments, including individual citizens, small community groups such as civic organisations and large public interest groups.

The need to involve the community in public affairs is discussed in this article. *Firstly*, this is undertaken because both the government and the public need to understand the importance of community participation. *Secondly*, it is also imperative to indicate the timing of participation in matters of concern (of both the government and the public). These two aspects provide a new direction for 21st century public management in decision making and the development agenda of government (Thomas 1995:1-2).

In South Africa, government consists of three spheres, namely, national, provincial and local government. In order for these spheres of government to function optimally, participation of community members in the affairs has become necessary, especially on matters that directly affect the community. The Department of Provincial and

Local Government & German Agency for Technical Cooperation (Undated:20) argue for accountable, transparent and consultative governance through community participation on intergovernmental relations (IGR) matters. It is further argued that at this level of community participation, IGR makes provision for the interface of local needs and concerns. However, bringing about the satisfactory involvement of communities is challenged by the scope and nature of government in South Africa, which are wide and complex. According to Frewer, Rowe, Marsh and Reynolds (2001:1) democracy is enhanced by the involvement of the public. The involvement of the community is intended to increase the transparency of how government decisions are made. Currently, different methods of community participation are used by government when consultation processes are undertaken. These methods are further discussed below.

Izimbizo

Traditionally, when members of the community (under a headman) assemble at community meetings to discuss issues of common interest that gathering is termed *Imbizo* in *Nguni* (plural is *Izimbizo*). It is important to note that while this term is *Nguni*, other aboriginal African cultures in South Africa and elsewhere in Africa are familiar with this practice. Mabelebele (2006:105) posits that *Imbizo* should be defined as a popular platform for policy debates, discussion and performance of the implementation of government problems, and this approach has been adopted by the government since 2001. Its main purpose is to facilitate face-to-face communication between government leaders and community members. The President, the Executive, the premiers and the members of executive council of the provinces of South Africa are also engaged in *Imbizo* activities.

However, one important concern is how government officials should be held accountable by the community with regard to the promises they make during *Izimbizo* in particular. This question should serve as an eye-opener to the fact that while the interactions of politicians in senior positions with the community are important, this method has serious shortfalls. Therefore, the need to formalise government *Izimbizo* in order to hold officials accountable for the promises made, becomes more pressing.

Metropolitan subcouncils and community ward structures

It should be borne in mind that, at the municipal sphere, only metropolitan municipalities can have subcouncils, while both categories A and B¹ municipalities can have ward participatory systems (Cameron 2005:335). *Sections 8, 9 and 10 of the Local Government: Municipal Structures Act, 1998 (Act 117 of 1998)* (hereafter *Municipal Structures Act, 1998*) make provision for the different types of municipality and the type of government system that should be in place in all different types of municipality.

Chapter 4 of the Act indicates the types of internal structure and functionary which are supposed to assist the municipal functioning regarding the achievement of the

objectives, needs and priorities of the municipality. These structures make provision for the involvement of the community. However, there is no specific criterion that has been identified to ensure that the input from the community is consolidated into the activities of the municipality. Chapter 4 of the *Local Government: Municipal Systems Act, 2000* (Act 32 of 2000) (hereafter *Municipal Systems Act 2000*) stipulates aspects relating to community participation in terms of the processes, development of culture and communication of information, among others. This participatory approach is limited to municipalities, thus it is important to acknowledge the fact that such opportunities should be used optimally by community members.

However, community wards are often used as political extensions by certain councillors or political parties. Thus, ward structures are usually politically charged, instead of being apolitical. Putu (2006:9) states that while the ward councillor is regarded as the chairperson of the ward committee, community members form part of the committee to facilitate a formal channel of communication with the municipality. The purpose of the creation of the wards should be clarified to community members to ensure that all members of the community participate in their ward activities without being discriminated against on the basis of political or any group affiliation.

Traditional leaders

Traditional leaders are the custodians of the culture and customs of most communities in South Africa. The role of the traditional leaders in government affairs is recognised in sections 211 and 212 of the *Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996*. The involvement of these leaders in public administration and management affairs on behalf of their communities is encouraged to preserve community values and traditions. Furthermore, section 819(1)-(5) of the *Municipal Structures Act, 1998* not only acknowledges traditional leaders, but also makes provision for them to actively participate in municipal affairs. The *Traditional Leadership and Governance Framework Act, 2003* (Act 41 of 2003) is an important document that defines the functions of traditional leaders. Accordingly, without the full participation of traditional leaders, rural development and the entire local government development agenda will not be fully realised. This indicates that there is a need to harmonise the activities of municipalities and those of traditional leaders in matters of common interest.

The question arising in this regard is whether these legislative guidelines have a place in the traditional system of governance, as practised by the traditional leader. Thus, is there a common understanding between government and traditional leaders regarding the existing legislation? There is no easy answer to this question as there are continuing tensions between traditional leaders and municipalities, especially in rural areas. This is because traditional leaders are often undermined by municipal councillors, since there is no definite constitutional role allocated to traditional leaders in terms of issues such as land and other community disputes. The roles of municipalities and of traditional authorities should be redefined continuously in order to ensure that the two powers function co-operatively for sustainable rural development (Mtinkulu 1996; Putu 2006:30-31).

Public consultation, meetings and hearings

Another method of public participation is public consultation, meetings or hearings (Moodley & Govender 2006:831). In this case, the municipality or government department publishes the date and time, as well as the topic, on which the community's input should be solicited. Invitations are also sent to members and relevant structures of the community to ensure that different views from the community are petitioned. This is done primarily to consolidate input from the stakeholders who are affected by or interested in the issue. The government should ensure that records of stakeholders attending the meetings are kept so that in future invitations are sent to existing stakeholders as well as possible new ones. In this regard, there is also a need to make provision for feedback on the developments and decisions taken after deliberations between government and stakeholders (see Idasa 2002).

Conferences, workshops and events

It is important that some events should allow for community participation through educational opportunities. These events are in the form of conferences and workshops, for example, the City of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality, uses the Tshwane Business Week (TBW) which is held annually for this purpose (City of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality 2003:3). TBW is a local economic development initiative to encourage community members to participate in the economic development activities of the municipality. In this initiative, community members meet with public officials and are encouraged to make an input on local economic development matters. According to the City of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality (2003:4) some of the resolutions of the first TBW were adopted by the Council during June 2003.

From the above, it may be deduced that the framework for community participation in South Africa has been established. This means that guidelines and these modes to community participation must be adhered to by government and community members. It is therefore recommended that participants in government activities be provided with opportunities to ensure a useful input whenever policies are developed. Accordingly, the relationship between government and civil society should be encouraged to promote maximum community participation and open discussion on matters of concern. The facilitation of regular meetings between government and such stakeholders are necessary to keep abreast of developments with regard to the implementation of decisions taken. The following are the goal posts for community participation:

- facilitating and information gathering to improve the public's understanding of the role of government (or departments) regarding existing projects/programmes and other identified activities;
- assuring the dissemination of reliable, timely and useful information on the work of government (or departments);
- contributing to public understanding, education as well as empowerment, for maximum participation by community members;

- promoting opportunities for the public to participate in all relevant activities; and
- enhancing the understanding of the government (or departments) and the public by including and considering sectors of the public which are not active.

These goals for community participation are essential for the promotion of vibrant engagements between government and community (Commission for Environmental Cooperation 1999:4). Despite attempts to create an enabling environment, the question still remains: Who wants to participate in government affairs?

ATTITUDES AND TRENDS: WHO WANTS TO PARTICIPATE IN (LOCAL) GOVERNMENT MATTERS?

This question of who wants to participate remains valid even for 21st century South Africa's public administration. Brynard (1996:41-42) identifies two sides to this question. *Firstly*, people often complain about their exclusion from the participation process. This means that the involvement of community members is sometimes minimal or non-existent in certain issues. *Secondly*, people do not participate even when they are given opportunity to do so. This situation poses a dilemma for government. The dilemma is whether these views, as raised by Brynard, are related. If so, it could be either that due to a lack of active involvement by the community, or a lack of proper consultation by government, the community remains apathetic towards government activities. Therefore, there is no indication of what could be the potential problems inhibiting community participation from this point of view. Despite this, the challenges facing community participation remain unresolved. In an attempt to resolve these problems, factors influencing the extent and level of community participation are identified. These factors are discussed below.

FACTORS INFLUENCING COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

Chapter 4 of the *Municipal Systems Act* 2000 stipulates that it is the responsibility of municipalities to develop a culture of municipal government that complements formal representative government with a system of participatory governance. In this regard, the municipality should create conditions in the community that are conducive for engaging in municipal affairs. However, there are several aspects influencing community participation that need to be taken into account when dealing with participatory government. In fact, a proportion of people actively participate in local government affairs more than most (Phago 2004:38; Clapper 1996:57).

Clapper (1996:59) discusses attitudes towards community participation (as adapted from Milbrath & Goel 1977). Comparative research by Milbrath and Goel (1977) in Clapper (1996:59) reveal that participation trends from seven different countries proved to be the same in the participatory behaviour of community members. The three main participation attitudes in the modes of community participation are the following:

- The apathetic, who are little informed or aware of the government matters. This group is unpredictable in its participation in matters of concern.

- The spectators. There is sporadic tendency for this group to involve itself in government matters.
- The gladiators. This is a highly active group compared to the others. Participants in this group include professional and semi-professional politicians, political activists, individuals who are highly ranked in corporate, associational and community life, and who have contacts and friends in the political arena.

This deliberation is important in highlighting the different attitudes and trends of community members towards governance. It should assist in encouraging communities in cases where participation is low. In addition, there are four personal factors affecting community participation (Clapper 1996:59-67):

- *Firstly*, community participation as a function of stimuli. The environment in which citizens have a huge influence. The environment is fed with stimuli from various sources such as the mass media, meeting attendances, personal conversations and other relevant literature.
- *Secondly*, community participation as a function of personal factors. Individual personal beliefs, attitudes, knowledge and traits, among others, are the major influence on community participation. Because people have differing behavioural patterns, it follows that their behaviour and/or conduct in as far as politics are concerned would differ. Some are more interested than others while others are not interested at all.
- *Thirdly*, community participation as a function of social position. This results from personal status such as age, sex, education, race, and residence, among others. In this area, based on this social status, some people feel more confident and qualified than others to get involved and participate.
- *Fourthly*, community participation as a function of environmental variables. Environmental variables are external as opposed to the factors discussed that have concentrated on those internal to the individual. Such environmental factors included are, *inter alia*, cultural milieu, socio-structural character of the community and the political setting.

From the above it would seem that identifying such factors influencing the involvement of communities and other stakeholders and design methods to enhance participation by community members are necessary. This is because identifying factors influencing community participation could pave the way for the participation of community members in relation to matters pertaining to local government.

PARTICIPANTS IN THE 21ST CENTURY SOUTH AFRICAN LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Obviously, every functioning municipality established in accordance with the law should attempt to satisfy the needs of its participants. Participants vary from individuals, corporations, nongovernmental organisations, civic organisations to community-based organisations. These participants in municipal affairs can either

function as interest groups or pressure groups. According to Bekker (1996:30), the labels *interest groups* and *pressure groups* can be used interchangeably; however, the distinction can be made for purely academic purposes. The reason for using them interchangeably is that both the interest groups and the pressure groups seek to influence the policies of the government of the day. Therefore, participants in the South African context of local government affairs in particular, should be regarded as municipal participants.

Bekker (1996:32) mentions that during the late 1980s the inhabitants in the traditional coloured and black areas became directly involved in resistance to the apartheid local authorities in their areas. This involvement resulted in the first steps of democratisation of the local government on 1 November 1995 to allow for the transition period. The adoption of the *Constitution*, 1996 also became relevant to matters pertaining to local government and stakeholder participation. Section 152(v) of this 1996 Constitution stipulates that local government should encourage the involvement of communities and community organisations in matters of local government. Certainly, this statement gave way to the establishment of democratic and integrated developmental local government (see Fowler 2003:8). By 2000, the new image of the democratic local government in South Africa was established. The newly created municipalities included the City of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality (CTMM), which was inaugurated on 5 December 2000 (*cf.* Cameron & Stone 1995:32; *City of Tshwane Annual Report 2000/02:1*).

Notwithstanding the above, some of the issues pertaining to community participation in municipal affairs still remain valid. One of the issues is the preparedness and ability of the community to participate in local government affairs after the first and second democratic local government elections have taken place. It should be borne in mind that immediately after 1994 participation in black and coloured areas was aimed at facilitating the spirit of *Masakhane*² and the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP). Community participation in democratic administration, especially in local government is normally increased when needs of the citizens are not being met. Such situations in South Africa have been evidenced by the recent marches throughout the country against particular municipalities' poor service delivery. One example of such a municipality is Mqaka Local Municipality in the Free State, which is unable to provide services. This made national headlines when its residents took to the streets, especially during late 2004 (*cf.* Phago 2004b).

Community participation in local government affairs remains a relevant and important aspect of municipal administration for the 21st century. Community participation is also a *sine qua non* for developmental local government. While participation remains relevant, modes, attitudes and trends of participation will change from time to time, depending on many aspects including community culture and the existing governmental system. The culture of community participation should be enhanced in all municipalities to ensure that the participation process is localised. Post-apartheid community participation, though still through mass action to some extent, has changed direction from large-scale mass mobilisation to democratic debates and legalised strikes in some sectors. Nowadays community strikes are based on the municipalities' inability to deliver services and not necessarily on partiality (discriminatory approaches). Legislation (*Municipal*

Structures Act, 1998; Municipal Systems Act, 2000) has been promulgated to facilitate the transformation and democratisation of municipalities. The existing concern is whether individual municipalities are positioned to translate such legislation into service delivery, and if not, what the reasons are for failing. It is important to mention that municipalities in South Africa are still facing enormous challenges to provide community fora for participation, let alone undertaking community development agendas in terms of public service provision.

Since the challenges of community participation occur not only in South Africa, international experiences are important to consider. According to Ludeking and Williams (2005), community participation is not sufficient in itself without the community being made aware of various options and rights. Thus, people need the capacity to participate effectively. Such capacitation would ensure that participation is not just a reaction to the municipality's failure to provide the required community services. Active community involvement should be encouraged from the initial stages of needs assessment planning and community consultation. Ludeking and Williams (2005: Online) identify the following as important lessons for community participation:

- community participation is a necessary but insufficient methodology for poverty reduction;
- women and men living in low-income settlements should also acquire planning, monitoring and evaluation skills, as well as resource mobilisation techniques and negotiation skills that give them adequate capacity to participate equally and effectively; and
- communities with skills and capacities are better suited to pursue their own interests and fulfill their partnership role in own or joint activities with municipalities and other stakeholders.

International lessons and trends in community participation are necessary to be taken into consideration, especially as globalisation is advancing rapidly. Information sharing with similar forms of governance ensure that better and informed decisions are made on how 21st century local government community participation should be facilitated. Such information sharing should also be done as an attempt to improve community participation in local government matters.

ENHANCING COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT MATTERS

The participation of stakeholders, especially citizens whose needs should be met by the municipality, is important. Thus, an all-inclusive engagement of the community by individual municipalities is pivotal for the advancement of the development agenda. The community should be encouraged to participate in municipal affairs by creating conditions conducive for their participation. This means that the establishment of active fora and platforms should be created to enhance community participation. In South Africa, among other means, the ward system is used as a tool for community

participation. Although the ward system was established to ensure community participation in municipal affairs, other means such as community fora are vital in specifying the needs of the community and communicating them to the municipality (Phago 2004b:38).

The *White Paper on Local Government*, 1998 stipulates that municipalities should develop mechanisms to interact with community groups to identify service needs and priorities, as well as community resources that can be unlocked and channelled for developmental ends. Municipal delivery systems should be inclusive and accommodate groups which are, or tend to be, marginalised or disadvantaged, such as people who cannot read or write, people with disabilities or women (*Local Government Review* 2003/04:38; Thornhill 2004:477; RDP White Paper 1994:41).

Enhancing participation of the community in local government also derives from a notion of the rent boycotts and strikes during the 1970s and 1980s. Subsequently, the democratisation of local government in South Africa during 1993 and 2000 respectively have not been easy (*Local Government Transition Act*, 1993 (Act 209 of 1993)). The underperformance of so many municipalities in service delivery is also a contentious issue which has resulted in many marches in the since 2004, for example, the Mqaka Municipality in Free State Province (Phago 2004). Furthermore, research indicates that municipal elections are far less competent compared to national and provincial elections that are held concurrently (Ababio 2004:276). Lack of information flow from the municipality, which prevents community members from staying informed and making valuable inputs, inhibits positive participation. Ababio (2004:277) further mentions that the majority of communities are not aware of their role in the new local government structure. This can also partly be attributed to the reasons for lower percentage polls and lack of sufficient information, as indicated earlier in this article. In ensuring a smooth information flow, the establishment of multipurpose community centres (MPCCs) are required to function in the following two ways:

- as a support mechanism for providing community members who are willing to actively participate in municipal affairs with information; and
- for designing and compiling information for a computerised permit system. The computerised permit system can help provide comprehensive information in an easier manner, except when one is in need of a consultant (Serbia 2005: Online).

To further ensure the co-ordination of activities for community participation, different participants should be brought together to share information and ideas. This can be done by establishing citizen advisory boards, which would ensure that all participants receive similar information and that each participation group has a representation on the board. Furthermore, adopting the *Batho Pele* (people first) White Paper of 1997 should provide municipalities with a direction for enhancing community involvement, since *Batho Pele* is also about improving service delivery with the involvement of people, as well as through the application of its eight principles. These principles are as follows:

- Consultation: Citizens should be consulted about the level and quality of the public service they receive and wherever possible should be given a choice about the services that are offered.

- Service standards: Citizens should be told what level and quality of public services they will receive so that they are aware of what to expect.
- Access: All citizens should have equal access to the services to which they are entitled.
- Courtesy: Citizens should be treated with courtesy and consideration.
- Information: Citizens should be given full, accurate information about the public services that they are entitled to receive.
- Openness and transparency: Citizens should be told how national and provincial departments are run, how much they cost, and who is in charge.
- Redress: If the promised standard of service is not delivered, citizens should be offered an apology, a full explanation, a speedy and effective remedy; and when complaints are made, citizens should receive a sympathetic, positive response.
- Value for money: Public services should be provided economically and efficiently in order to give citizens the best possible value for money (Price Waterhouse Coopers 2006).

These principles should be included in every municipal programme, such as the integrated developmental programme, local economic development and other developmental initiatives within municipalities. The nature of these *Batho Pele* principles is such that they encourage a two-way relationship between municipalities and their communities. This kind of relationship should result in accelerated public service delivery and community development.

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION AND SERVICE DELIVERY: A CRITIQUE

The main objective of involving the community in municipal affairs is to ensure ever-improving service delivery approaches, thus enhancing municipal services. As articulated in both the *Municipal Systems Act, 2000* and the *Municipal Structures Act, 1998*, community participation is of paramount importance in many aspects of municipal service delivery. However, community limitations must also be specified. This means that in circumstances where there is scope for participation, municipal officials should clearly indicate such to potential participants. Community participation is also important for ensuring a process of reporting on performance within the municipality. Since the municipality is in the service to its community, it is appropriate to keep, for example, the council, staff, other organs of state and the community informed of service delivery approaches, changes and developments.

Ideally, the participation of community members should ensure that service delivery is substantially enhanced. To this end, there is a legislative framework that governs community participation in municipal affairs. *Constitution, 1996* is not clear on aspects of municipal community participation, the *Municipal Structures Act, 1998* and Chapter 4 of the *Municipal Systems Act, 2000* lay down guidelines for community participation in municipalities. This is an important initiative since it provides community members with a model for how they should get involved in governing issues.

However, since the establishment of democratically elected municipalities in 2000, there have been challenges hampering proper municipal functioning. Some of the challenges include community demonstrations against their incorporation into other provinces, demonstrations against the renaming of certain streets and roads in South Africa, as well as demonstrations against lack of proper service delivery (Phago 2004:1). These are some of the examples in which the participation of local communities in their municipal affairs are imperative.

The question which may arise in this regard is whether communities are consulted in terms of the law whenever decisions are made. If the answer is in the affirmative, then perhaps community participation and education relating to the law has not been sufficient. If the answer is in the negative, then local government officials should be taken task to ensure that they are always compliant with the law. This question is important in order to identify potential gaps in the implementation of participation and/or consultation policies within local government. The available participation structures in local government should be made accessible to community members in order to accelerate municipal service delivery. It might be a good idea for every municipality to establish a non-political office to oversee the consultation process. This office should ensure that all municipal processes are undertaken in a transparent manner and include all the stakeholders of the municipalities as outlined by section 17(3) of the *Municipal Systems Act*, 2000.

From the above it is evident that community participation in South African local government is not happening properly. This highlights the negative effects of local government service delivery. In democratic countries such as South Africa, the need to ensure that communities are involved in the governing matters is high. Accordingly, the involvement of community members in governing affairs should be understood as another means of deepening democracy and not delaying the development agenda of the government. Community apathy in governing matters should be addressed as a matter of urgency since it has the potential of discrediting many decisions taken and ultimately the legitimacy of government to its people.

CONCLUSION

Participation in the context of the *Municipal Systems Act*, 2000 should be interpreted as the involvement of the community in ensuring the proper functioning of the municipality by enabling it to plan and implement its ideas. For example, the community should be involved in the preparation, implementation and review of the integrated developmental plan. In ensuring that participation is formalised and structured, the *Municipal Structures Act*, 1998 was promulgated to make provision for ward systems which identify specified and defined community boundaries.

Without the involvement of its community in local government, community development will never be achieved with maximum results. It is therefore important for every municipality to distinguish and engage those who will be directly and indirectly affected by a specific service provision. International trends should always be considered and the ways in which other democratic governments globally engage

stakeholders and respond to the pressing needs of the people. Factors that influence participation should be indicated in order to find the reasons for low participation. If low, the exploration of the means for enhancing community participation should be undertaken. It is necessary to ensure that community participation serves to increase and improve service delivery.

NOTES

- 1 Part 2 (sections 8, 9 & 10) of the Municipal Structures Act, 1998 (Act 117 of 1998) provides for the types of municipality that should exist in South Africa. These are placed into three categories, namely: A, B and C. The difference in this regard is based on the collective executive system, mayoral executive system, plenary executive system, subcouncil participatory system and ward participatory system. The Act also specifies how each category should combine the foregoing systems to qualify as either category A, B or C municipalities.
- 2 The Masakhane Campaign is part of the broad national strategy to create conditions necessary for the success of the RDP. It is aimed at mobilising all sectors of society to be actively involved in redressing imbalances of the past and creating a society characterised by new values and norms, a new consciousness and sense of responsibility among all citizens to transform governance and build a united nation. Visit the website at: <http://www.southafrica-newyork.net/consulate/governme.htm#masakhane>

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ababio, E.P. 2004. Enhancing community participation in developmental local government for improved service delivery. *Journal of Public Administration and Management*, 39(2) .
- Bekker, K. (ed.). 1996. *Citizen participation in local government*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- Brynard, D.J. 1996. Public participation in local government and administration: bridging the gap. *Politeia*, 15(2).
- Byrne, S. 1999. Israel, Northern Ireland, and South Africa at a crossroads: Understanding intergroup conflict, peace-building, and conflict resolution. *International Journal of Group Tensions*, 28(3/4):231-252.
- Cameron, R.G. 2005. Metropolitan restructuring (and more restructuring) in South Africa. *Public Administration and Development*, 25.
- Cameron, R.G. & Stone, A.B. 1996. *Serving the public: a guide for practitioners and students*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- City of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality. 2000/02. *City of Tshwane Annual Report*. Pretoria: CTMM.
- Clapper, V.A. 1996. Positioning citizen participation in democratic local government. In Bekker, K. (ed.). 1996. *Citizen participation in local government*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- Commission for Environmental Cooperation. 1999. *Framework for public participation in Commission for Environmental Cooperation Activities*. Canada: CEC.
- Department of Provincial and Local Government. 2003/04. *Local Government Review: A special edition dedicated to the municipal excellence (VUNA) awards*. Pretoria: DPLG.
- Department of Provincial and Local Government & German Agency for Technical Cooperation. Undated. *Working together for development: Understanding Intergovernmental Relations*. Pretoria: (Global Print)/DPLG & GTZ.

- Fowler, T.G. 2003. Excellence in public service through service delivery. A speech delivered by the MEC on the Africanising Public Administration colloquium: Issues for leadership and good governance hosted by the School of Public Administration and Management of the University of Pretoria, 21 October 2003.
- Frewer, L., Rowe, G., Marsh, R. & Reynolds, C. 2001. *Public participation methods: evolving and operationalising an evaluation framework. Summary project report.* Norwich: Norwich Research Park.
- Hague, R., Harrop, M. & Breslin, S. 1998. *Comparative government and politics: an introduction.* Fourth edition. London: McMillan.
- Idasa. 2002. Participatory governance at local level. Available online at: <http://www.idasa.org.za> [Accessed 14 May 2007].
- Ludeking, G. & Williams, C. 2005. Poverty, participation and government enablement part 1: research findings, lesson learnt and recommendations. Available online at: <http://www.scn.org/ip/cds/cmp/modules/iss01.htm#1%20B> [Accessed February 2005].
- Mabelebele, J. 2006. Ideological objectives underpinning imbizo as a model of communication and governance. *Communicare*, 25(2).
- Moodley, S. & Govender, J. 2006. Local government policy and development. *Journal of Public Administration*, 41(1).
- Mtimkulu, P. 1996. Traditional leaders and the Constitution. *Politeia*, 15(2): <http://www.unisa.ac.za/default.asp?Cmd=ViewContent&ContentID=941> [Accessed 28 July 2008].
- Phago, K. 2004a. Enhancing service delivery in the City of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality: Public Private Partnerships and their role in extending access to local governance. Unpublished MAdmin: Vista University (Mamelodi).
- Phago, K. 2004b. Reengineering and rethinking municipal service delivery through local economic development initiatives. The paper was presented at the 5th Annual Conference of SAAPAM in Port Elizabeth, South Africa, 25-26 November.
- Price Waterhouse Coopers. 2006. Batho Pele service excellence: Premier's good governance awards of 1999/2000. Available online at: <http://www.bathopele.co.za/bathopel.html> [Accessed 28 July 2006].
- Putu, M. 2006. *The role of ward committees in enhancing public participation in Rustenburg municipality: a critical evaluation.* Pretoria: Idasa.
- Republic of South Africa. 1993. *Local Government Transition Act, 1993 (Act 209 of 1993).* Pretoria: Government Printer.
- Republic of South Africa. 1994. *White Paper on Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP).* 1994. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- Republic of South Africa. 1996. *Constitution of the Republic of South Africa,* 1996. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- Republic of South Africa. 1998. *White Paper on Local Government,* 1998. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- Republic of South Africa. 1997. *Batho Pele White Paper (White Paper on Transforming Public Service Delivery),* 1997. Pretoria: Government Printer.

- Republic of South Africa. 1998. *Local Government: Municipal Structures Act*, 1998 (Act 118 of 1998). Pretoria: Government Printer.
- Republic of South Africa. 2000. *Local Government: Municipal Systems Act*, 2000 (Act 32 of 2000). Pretoria: Government Printer.
- Republic of South Africa. 2003. *Traditional Leadership and Governance Framework*, 2003 (Act 41 of 2003). Pretoria: Government Printer.
- Rogers, B. 1980. *Divide and rule: South Africa's Bantustans, revised and enlarged edition*. International Defence & Aid Fund.
- Serbia. 2005. Serbia Local Government Reform Programme. Available online at: http://www.slgp.usaid.org.yu/eng/six_areas/cit_participation.html [Accessed 14 September 2005].
- Thomas, J.C. 1995. *Public participation in public decisions: new skills and strategies for public managers*. California: Jossey-Bass.
- Thornhill, C. 2004. Municipal government: acknowledging democratic imperatives. *Journal of Public Administration and Management*, 39(4.1).