External and internal exclusion of black undergraduate students from impoverished township schools in historically advantaged universities in the Western Cape

by

Memoria Celiwe Ngwenya

Thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education

in the

Department of Education Policy Studies,

Faculty of Education

at Stellenbosch University

Supervisor: Professor Yusef Waghid

December 2014

Declaration

By submitting this thesis electronically, I declare that the entirety of the work contained therein is my own, original work, that I am the sole author thereof (unless to the extent explicitly otherwise stated), that reproduction and publication thereof by Stellenbosch University will not infringe any third party rights and that I have not previously in its entirety or in part submitted it for obtaining any qualification.

1 July 2014

_____

"

"   (Celiwe Ngwenya)

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

Eqr{tki j vÍ '4236'Uvgmgpdquej 'Wpkxgtukv{

Cnít ki j u'tgugtxgf '

Abstract

The notion of inclusion refers to one of the normative ideals that may be used as a means to promote justice in a democracy. Equally so, the norm of inclusion is capable of exploring the legitimacy of the democratic processes set up for the promotion of equity and redress. The implication thereof is that the notion of inclusion is also an adequate measure for monitoring whether processes practised by polities do embrace the norms of recognition, redistribution, empowerment and justice as we come to understand them within the broader concept of inclusion.

Grounded in the theory of inclusion and democracy, this study is set against the backdrop of momentous political changes in South Africa that set the tone for transformation in higher education, amongst other democratic changes. Higher education institutions, alongside all other South African polities, introduced new open policies chock-full of democratic ideals to promote equity so as to ensure that those who previously suffered the injustice of being excluded from gaining entry to higher education are able to access it.

Based on this understanding, this study has been conducted from a conceptual point of view to investigate the approach by which two historically advantaged institutions in the Western Cape have conceptualised the inclusion of black students from impoverished schools into their institutions. I have also examined how these institutions articulate their support programmes to keep these students in the higher education system. University policy documents such as admissions policies, financial aid policies, student diversity and equity policies, and student retention and throughput rate provided information for interpretation and data analysis.

Key concepts: Inclusion, exclusion, transformation agenda, access, retention, recognition and redistribution, care, equality, social justice.

Opsomming

Die idee van insluiting verwys na een van die normatiewe ideale wat gebruik kan word om geregtigheid in 'n demokrasie te bevorder. Net so het die norm van insluiting die vermoë om die regmatigheid van die demokratiese prosesse wat ingestel is vir die bevordering van regverdigheid en herstel (*redress*) te ondersoek. Die implikasie hiervan is dat die idee van insluiting ook 'n voldoende maatstaf is om te kontroleer of die prosesse wat deur politieke eenhede uitgevoer word, die norme van herkenning, herverdeling, bemagtiging en geregtigheid omhels soos ons hulle binne die breër konsep van insluiting verstaan.

Begrond in die teorie van insluiting en demokrasie staan hierdie studie teen die agtergrond van gewigtige politieke verandering in Suid-Afrika wat die toon gestel het vir transformasie in hoër onderwys, onder ander demokratiese veranderinge. Hoëronderwysinstellings, tesame met alle ander Suid-Afrikaanse staatsbestel, het nuwe, oop beleide propvol demokratiese ideale bekend gestel om regverdigheid te bevorder om sodoende te verseker dat die wat voorheen onder die ongeregtigheid van uit hoër onderwys uitgesluit te wees, gelei het, nou toegang daartoe kan kry.

Gebaseer op dié verstandhouding is hierdie studie vanuit 'n konseptuele oogpunt onderneem om ondersoek in te stel na die benadering van twee histories bevoordeelde instellings in die Wes-Kaap tot hulle konseptualisering van die insluiting van swart studente uit arm skole in hulle instellings. Ek het ook ondersoek hoe hierdie instellings hulle ondersteuningsprogramme verwoord om hierdie studente in die hoëronderwysstelsel te behou. Die universiteite se beleidsdokumente, soos toelatingsbeleide, finansiële hulp beleide, studentediversiteits- en

v

regverdigheidsbeleide, en studentebehoud- en deursetkoerse, het inligting verskaf vir die doeleindes van interpretasie en analise.

Sleutelkonsepte: Insluiting, uitsluiting, transformasie-agenda, toegang, behoud, herkenning en herverdeling, sorg, gelykheid, sosiale geregtigheid.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Professor Waghid, my supervisor and mentor, for his support and guidance, and for always managing to make me feel capable even when I was doubtful and broken. Thank you so much Prof, not only for your technical guidance, but also for 'flaring' me up, as never in my wildest dreams did I think I would work so hard yet relish the experience. I will forever be appreciative of your teachings.

I also want to thank Dr Thandi Ngcobo from the University of the Western Cape, for being my launch pad, and for her unwavering support.

Special thanks go to my parents, my late father Sterling Nisbert Mvuyo Ngwenya, for the legacy he left behind, and my mother Lucy-Ann Nomsa Ngwenya, for her quiet reassurance and support.

Thanks also go to my mentor and brother, Dr Patrick Mzuvukile Ngwenya, for being an inspiration, my conscience and a friend, for his invaluable guidance throughout life, and for constantly reminding me of my capabilities.

And thank you to everyone who has given me love and support throughout this process.

Acronyms

AL   -   Academic literacy

APS   -   Admissions points score

AQL   -   Academic and quantitative literacy

CHE   -   Council on Higher Education

DEHT -   Department of Higher Education and Training

DoE   -   Department of Education

FET   -   Further education and training

FPS   -   Faculty points score

GNU   -   Government of National Unity

HAIs   -   Historically advantaged institutions

HE   -   Higher education

HEIs   -   Higher education institutions

HESA -   Higher Education South Africa

MAT   -   Mathematics

NBT   -   National Benchmark Test

NCHE -   National Commission on Higher Education

NFF   -   National Funding Framework

NPHE -   National Plan for Higher Education

NSC   -   National Senior Certificate

OECD -   Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development

QL   -   Quantitative literacy

SAPSE -   South African post-secondary education

Table of Contents

Chapter 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The year 2014 is the one in which South Africa celebrated 20 years of its young democracy. Coinciding with this was the country's fifth democratic elections, which, despite political manifestos differing in opinions on how South Africa should progress, went without a hitch. Looking at this feat at a glance, South Africa can easily be compared to fully-fledged democracies, in which democratic values are supposedly substantial and evolved. But the implementation of some of the new South Africa's transformation policies in the young democracy has had its fair share of imperfections. For example, in higher education (HE), the admissions processes at historically advantaged institutions are still to improve, despite the higher education system having promulgated open policies for almost sixteen years. The effect of this unfortunate situation seems to be the exclusion of black students from impoverished schools from gaining access to pedagogy that could help improve their quality of life and that of their communities.

All the same, South Africa's twentieth anniversary also coincided with the Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET) publishing the White Paper for Post-school Education and Training. The implication of this new enactment could possibly be associated with the objectives of Education White Paper 3 (1997) A Programme for the Transformation of Higher Education not being achieved on the one hand, and on the other hand with the expansion of the DHET to other, new societal needs, like dealing with unemployment and the scourge of HIV/AIDS, which are among the matters troubling societies today.

In the light of these assumptions I want to argue that a lot is yet to improve within the higher education system. This conceptual study therefore has been conducted to examine how two historically advantaged institutions (HAIs) in the Western Cape have conceptualised the norm of inclusion to ensure that access to higher education is granted to black students from impoverished schools. The aim is to contribute towards a better understanding of what drives the inclusion practices of historically advantaged institutions.

Some scholars argue that, to ensure that inclusivity guarantees a right to education for all, there is a need for institutions to acknowledge students' lived experiences (Osler & Starkey 2010:60). The implication is that, for the inclusion processes to be deemed reasonable, higher education institutions need to model their practices so that they are able to grow their students' agencies to the extent that students develop self-determination to improve their socio-economic positions. Suffice it to say that my rationale for conducting this study has been drawn from these conceptions, as will be explained below.

1.2 Rationale

Young (2000) argues that polities that choose the norm of inclusion as a policy framework to drive their democratic programmes indicate their concerns about the protection of their citizens' autonomy to participate in civic life. In addition, Young argues that if calls for inclusion persist even when transformation programmes are in place, it could mean that there still is a part of society that is experiencing some form of exclusion. Therefore, to redress the existing inequalities, polities need to investigate exclusionary features within their processes. This essentially is to say that, within the context of the higher education transformation agenda, my rationale for conducting this study emanated from my desire to understand the realities behind

the failure of historically advantaged universities to graduate the majority of black students from impoverished schools.

To get to an understanding of this phenomenon I read literature that expounded on the central meanings of the two concepts in my study; namely the norms of inclusion and exclusion. I also conducted an analysis of the Department of Education's (DoE) policy framework against the two universities' transformation frameworks to investigate synergies between the policies of the DoE and HAIs. I also investigated whether the two institutions did not extensively promote external inclusion whilst excluding students internally, perhaps through a lack of properly facilitated support structures.

My interest in this type of study was influenced by my growing up in the divided South Africa, coupled with my personal struggles in gaining access to HAIs post-apartheid. Arguably, before South Africa became a democracy it was easy to understand the exclusion of black students by HAIs, as apartheid policies excluded black citizens from basic political rights, although this did not make it right. Young (2000:6) explains that the exclusion of black citizens extended to the right to equal education and the right to participate in civic affairs, amongst others. Nevertheless, after the democratic elections of 1994 the new dispensation introduced its transformation policies to open possibilities for equal opportunities for participation in all societal spheres. Consequently, it is necessary to understand why I struggled to gain access to one particular historically advantaged university, even though I was at the postgraduate level and fulfilled the admissions requirements. My plight fuelled my desire to do research on how black undergraduate students were received by these institutions, especially those from poor schools,

3

whom I believe are worse off than I was. With this study I therefore wanted to ascertain if the two HAIs' practices are able to respond to the realities of the continuing disparities and struggles that still seem to be prevalent in higher education.

1.3 Research problem

My research problem was provoked by Mdepa and Tshiwula's (2012:23) assertion that, despite open policies that have existed in higher education for almost sixteen years, achieving the outcomes set in Education White Paper 3 (1997), such as providing equitable access to higher education, has proven challenging. The two scholars point to the poor quality of primary and secondary schooling in the poorer areas as one of the obstacles that prevent black students from low-income communities from gaining wider access to "prestige" universities, let alone remain within the system until they graduate if they gain access at all.

Mdepa and Tshiwula (2012) also claim that these challenges prove that there is neither equitable access to nor retention in higher education, since a high number of students from lower economic backgrounds fail to complete higher education after gaining access. Boughey (2012:136) echoes these sentiments, and states that the equity and redress gains made in the enrolment of black students in historically advantaged universities after 1994 are negated by figures for success. In addition, Boughey declares that the failure of the South African higher education system to graduate the black students it enrols has an impact on economic development that further could have benefited black citizens.

When taking Mdepa and Tshiwula's and Boughey's assertions into consideration, it is sufficient for me to say that black students from impoverished schools are seemingly excluded internally at historically advantaged institutions. To ascertain this, my research question was as follows:

Research question

The main question of the study is: Are black students internally excluded at historically advantaged institutions in the Western Cape? If they are not, what contributes to their (the students') internal exclusion?

From the main question, the following sub-questions were asked:

- How do the historically advantaged universities conceptualise the recruitment of students from impoverished schools?

- Do historically advantaged universities have retention strategies for struggling black students that they recruit? If they do, what contributes to their (universities) failure to retain black students from impoverished schools?

- In what ways have the HAIs' recruitment policies been informed by the "lived" experiences of black students from impoverished schools?

1.4 Significance of the study

I envisage that this study may possibly contribute towards a better understanding of the underpinnings surrounding the implementation of inclusive democratic principles, which can ensure both the external and internal inclusion of all students, and thus lead to achieving social justice in higher education.

5

1.5 Setting the scene

The literature examined for this study relates to the norm of inclusion being acceptable for promoting equity and redress in higher education. Aspects covered in this respect include the interpretation of different options for developing processes that are inclusive. The examined literature also suggests that struggles within the implementation of inclusive democracy relate to the complexities of the interpretation of external inclusion and internal exclusion, as I will partially explain in my conceptual framework below.

1.6 Conceptual framework

Different scholars conceptualise the principles of inclusion differently, thus making it a complex concept to implement. Young's (2000:17) outlook on this notion is that it is a process that may possibly be able to promote equal citizenship, and break the cycle of processes that perpetuate injustice or preserve privilege. With this, Young describes inclusion as a means that possibly may enable diversity in polities. Young cautions, however, that the commitment to inclusion should not be driven by a desire to achieve common good by assuming only norms of uniformity, because that possibly may be exclusionary to others. By implication, in the context of my study, this may well mean that processes of inclusion should not be designed to assume that all students might have been exposed to similar encounters when entering universities. The emphasis is on the norms of inclusion being able to work only if the students' lived experiences are taken into account.

Exclusion, on the other hand, denotes the experiences of individuals and groups who have been marginalised through socio-economic disadvantage (Osler & Starkey 2010:60). An example of

exclusion can be drawn from the apartheid-era policies, which excluded black citizens from basic political rights, such as access to higher education, restriction of movement and deprivation of the right to vote. Nevertheless, after the democratic elections of 1994, new processes were developed to transform the socio-economic exploitation of those excluded in the past. My conceptual framework therefore is premised on the theory of inclusion in a democracy being able to attain social justice, with the study being set against the backdrop of the new, democratic South Africa and policies that have been developed post-1994. I discuss more of the concepts of inclusion and exclusion in Chapter 2, and bring in other perspectives like those of hooks[1], Nussbaum, Fraser and Rancière, who introduce concepts such as hope, recognition and redistribution, care for others, self-worth and intellectual adventures, which can be explored in the quest to achieve justice. In Chapter 3 I deliberate on the trajectory of higher education in South Africa. This includes discussions on the development of White Paper 3, university mergers and the introduction of the new financial framework. The aim was to understand the theories that frame these policies, and thus to attempt to understand the context of development and implementation as conceptualised by the Department of Higher Education. More to the point was to gather theoretical lenses that may be useful for analysing my research data as discussed in Chapter 4. The lenses also allowed for a constructive point of view in discussing the findings in Chapter 5.

1.7 Scope of inquiry

I have conducted this study by taking cognisance of previous research that has alluded to the existence of inclusive processes at historically advantaged universities and, in retrospect, some of the students that have gone through these processes have graduated, although others are said to

---

[1] bell hooks' name will be kept in lower case in the study because that is how the authors presents herself.

be dropping out. For this reason, therefore, it is justifiable to say that I have restricted myself to two historically advantaged institutions. I also narrowed my focus to admissions policies, student diversity and equity policies, and student finance policies, since these records outline the strategies that support the inclusion and exclusion of students of the selected HAIs in my study.

1.8 Methodology

Since the aim of this study was to examine if black students from impoverished schools were excluded from historically advantaged universities, the study is framed by an interpretive inquiry, whilst the approach to the study is qualitative. I chose this method because of Neuman's (1997) assertion that interpretive paradigms and qualitative studies concern themselves with how people create and maintain their social life. Also, since the aim was to ascertain the push behind the transformation strategies of the institutions in my study, and to ascertain the dynamics that drive black students from impoverished schools away, it was inevitable that I would choose this methodology. Supporting my outlook is Waghid (2003:48), who states that interpretive inquiry helps researchers to analyse different groups' interests and expectations. Finally, I have used the interpretive paradigm to conduct this study because of its characteristics of being conceptual, with the focus being on archival data. De Marrais (in Waghid 2003) supports this method by stating that an interpretive paradigm of education policy research is characterised by the use of archival knowledge, such as journals, letters and diaries, amongst others, hence my selection of this method. And finally, I have also used data triangulation to validate the collated data.

1.9 Limitations

Elder, Pavalko and Clipp (1993) state that, when conducting a conceptual study, finding data that reflects particular cultural themes may be limiting. At the beginning of my research I anticipated

that this could be the case, since one of the institutions in my study uses the Afrikaans language in most of its policy documents. Fortunately for me there were no language barriers, as this university's policies are now documented in both English and Afrikaans to promote multilingualism. The only limiting factor was the difficulty I experienced in accessing some information on the web, since the Afrikaans-medium university stores its policies per faculty, while the English-medium university updates its website regularly, so what I read in the previous week may be updated through amendments and new information in the following week. This meant I regularly had to visit the English-medium university website to read the updated versions of their policy documents. Lastly, since most of my work was based on desktop research I had to include theoretical triangulation to verify some aspects of my findings. Adding theoretical triangulation does not mean I view this addition as a limitation; I am merely pointing out that focusing on desktop research can be limiting to a certain extent.

1.10 Chapter outline

This study is presented in five chapters. Chapter 1 is this introductory chapter, which contains the background to my study, my rationale and the research question and sub-questions. This chapter also offers a brief discussion of my conceptual framework, scope of study, methodology and limitations. In Chapter 2 I explicate the norm of inclusion, drawing from different theoretical perspectives. These perspectives also provided lenses for analysing data that have been gathered for this study. In Chapter 3 I map the trajectory of higher education transformation in South Africa. This includes a discussion of the policy framework, such as the enactment of the Higher Education Act of 1997, Education White Paper 3 of 1997, and other transformation policies in higher education that have been enacted since 1994. Chapter 4 provides my analysis of the

policies of the two historically advantaged higher education institutions in the Western Cape. In this chapter I conduct an analysis of these universities' admissions policies, as well as of all the other policies that are said to promote the inclusion of historically marginalised students. My final chapter focuses on the findings and includes reflections, conclusions and recommendations, as well as the contributions of the study.

Chapter 2
TOWARDS AN UNDERSTANDING OF INCLUSION AND EXCLUSION

2.1 Introduction

The topic for this study mentions two substantive concepts in conducting my research, namely external and internal exclusion. This chapter outlines how the two concepts are conceptualised to conclude that the notion of inclusion is a legitimate recourse for the promotion of equity and the attainment of justice in institutions of higher learning. The chapter also outlines the norm of inclusion as a powerful means to criticise the legitimacy of nominally democratic processes and decisions that are taken by historically advantaged universities that seem exclusionary (Young 2000:53). Other aspects covered in this chapter relate to the struggles relating to the implementation of the norm of inclusion.

The main purpose of this chapter is to draw from the literature elements that are important for the interpretation of the norms of inclusion and exclusion, and how they can be made to function in an equal society. Another purpose is to draw from the literature different perspectives on attaining the legitimate inclusion of others. As a result of these expected outcomes, the examined literature is grounded in a critical theoretical perspective, envisaging that the critical themes that are able to engage socially unjust issues within the institutional context will emerge.

In the context of my study, this means that the literature may well provide theoretical lenses to examine the structures and practices, rules and norms that guide the functioning of the historically advantaged universities in my study, and the language that mediates social interactions within these institutions. I have envisaged that the critical approach may also bring

an insightful assessment of the key concepts in my question. My question strives to discover if black students from impoverished schools are internally excluded at historically advantaged universities in the Western Cape and, if they are not, the question seeks to discover what contributes to the students' internal exclusion?

I have organised the chapter into two parts. The first part examines the literature that problematises the idea of inclusion. In the second part I draw on the theoretical framework that frames my thought process in the study. This includes the theoretical perspectives on attaining justice as formulated by Iris Marion Young (1990, 2000), bell hooks (2003), Nancy Fraser (1997), Martha Nussbaum (2000) and Jacques Rancière (1991). These theoretical perspectives also provide valuable diagnostic lenses to work out what could be understood as legitimate practices of inclusion. And finally, I position the concepts of inclusion and exclusion within the broader reforms in South African higher education and, in retrospect; this may allow me to draw out key sub-themes that may arise when attempting to understand the notion of inclusion within the context of South African higher education.

2.2 The current state of affairs: the inclusion of students from impoverished schools in historically advantaged universities

The drive behind the adoption of the norm of inclusion as the solution in the South African politics of social justice can be drawn from South Africa's past. Before the dawn of democracy, the politics of difference and preference was at the height of all South African polities. An example of this was the exclusion of the black majority from participating in all spheres of life. In education, black students were excluded from gaining access to higher education (Pampallis, 1991:184). Nevertheless, after the democratic elections of 1994, the new dispensation articulated

12

its transformation policies to open possibilities for inclusion and diversification in all South African polities. The Education White Paper 3: A Programme for the Transformation of Higher Education is among the transformation policies that were enacted by the democratically elected government. The White Paper formed the foundation on which the higher education sector in the democratic South Africa was to be transformed. The expected outcome was to have a transformed higher education system that was able to redress past inequalities, respond to new realities and create opportunities for all.

Unfortunately, the open possibilities in higher education have not necessarily presented equal opportunities, according to Mdepa and Tshiwula (2012:23), who argue that that there still is poor representation of black students, in the historically advantaged universities. Furthermore, Mdepa and Tshiwula mention that the argument presented by these institutions when questioned over the disappointing results of their inclusion processes is that the quality of schooling that black learners from impoverished backgrounds go through does not prepare them for the historically advantaged institutions.

On this note, Mdepa and Tshiwula (2012) argue that, although the higher education system has been extensively restructured after apartheid was abolished, these utterances seem to indicate that there still are hurdles that black students have to leap over in order to gain access to higher education. One of those hurdles is the language of instruction, since some historically advantaged universities continue to maintain the single-language feature as in pre-1994. Historically advantaged institutions are often said to plead financial constraints when questioned over their inability to implement appropriate language policies that embrace the other nine

official languages in order to accommodate many of the black students who are likely to find themselves second or third language speakers in these institutions and are unable to participate fully. What is more, Osler and Starkey (2010:60) present another hurdle. They argue that there seems to be no improvement on the past, as the historically advantaged universities have exclusive sets of rules that are not accommodative of the needs of black students from poor schools, since their past and present lived experiences are likely to prevent them from having a fair chance of gaining access to higher education like privileged students.

As I mentioned earlier, Boughey (2012:136) concurs with Mdepa and Tshiwula's view on the poor representation of black students in higher education. She says that the proportion of young people entering higher education has not changed, in spite of the shift to democracy and all the policy development this entailed. Boughey mentions, however, that enrolment patterns have changed, as there has been a hike in the number of black students seeking enrolment at historically white institutions, as these institutions are perceived to be better resourced and more prestigious. Boughey also mentions that some of the historically advantaged universities do recruit students from black social groups, and often offer financial support. Others institutions, according to Boughey, are said to have introduced alternative access routes, thus assessing students for admission on 'potential' rather than actual achievement in the school-leaving examinations. Despite the improvement thus far, Boughey expresses unhappiness about the statistics, which she avers reflect that the gains made in the enrolment of black students are negated by the figures for success, as discussed in Chapter 1 (section 1 1.3). Boughey (2012:136) concludes by stating that the failure of South African education to graduate the students it enrols has an impact on economic development, which could further disadvantage black citizens.

Nevertheless, after taking these views into consideration, I would want to acknowledge the momentum gained by HAIs in their quest to achieve diversity, as some have even made their admissions policies more flexible, as indicated by Boughey. The literature I have examined in this study would seem to indicate that HAIs have failed to ensure that the makeup of their student bodies reflects the demographics of South Africa. What is more is that the throughput rate of the students they have recruited is somewhat nonexistent, since there does not seem to be a large number of black students graduating from these institutions. Bearing all this in mind, it is sufficient for me to say that the current practise of the norms of inclusion at historically advantaged institutions has shortcomings, since students do not seem to want to stay at these institutions. In the next sub-section, I discuss alternative forms of attaining social justice.

2.3 Examining the theoretical underpinnings of inclusion: Towards an understanding of justice

In Young (2000:41), the commitment to inclusion means committing to a process that seeks to attain the common good. However, achieving the common good does not necessarily mean that the process should assume the norms of uniformity, as most groupings in the present day are multicultural, and also have different social experiences and often different interests. By implication, this may well mean that the processes that are intended for the inclusion of black students in historically advantaged institutions ought not to assume that black students are a homogenous group by virtue of being black. It should be acknowledged that some are from privileged backgrounds and schools, and that others are from impoverished backgrounds, and are products of what scholars like Mdepa and Tshiwula (2012) allude to as "poor schooling".

Also, this may mean that, in their quest to transform their institutions, historically advantaged universities should broaden their approaches to inclusion further than the distributive paradigm, because a one-dimensional focus may lead to the subtle exclusion of other students. In the context of this study, the distributive paradigm would lean towards the diversification of historically advantaged institutions, with the focus being on including black students in their systems without considering the differences in capital that black students possess for participation in these institutions. Also, it might mean that black students from poor schools would receive the short end of the stick. Young (1990:18) supports this outlook by mentioning that individuals should not be made to lie as nodes in a social field, where they get assigned larger or smaller bundles of social goods; she says people should develop an understanding that the distribution of justice includes the inclusion of rights, opportunity, power and self-respect. In the case of black students from impoverished schools it would mean taking into consideration the students' experiences.

Ultimately, in this section I have presented the existing problems in higher education, and thus alluded to the general situation in historically advantaged universities and the struggles suffered by black students from impoverished schools, such as not being able to gain access to certain higher education institutions. The following section will focus on a discussion of the norms of inclusion and exclusion so that an outline of the legitimate principles of the two notions is provided.

2.3.1 The norm of exclusion

As explained in Chapter 1, section 1.6, Osler and Starkey (2010:60) posit the socio-economic marginalisation of the other as a practice of the norm of exclusion. To add to this, Young (2000:54) says the most obvious forms of exclusion are those that keep some individuals out of the forums of debates or processes that allow those individuals and groups with greater resources and power dominative control over what happens to those with lesser powers. This form of exclusion is regarded as external exclusion, which was a familiar feature in South Africa's political affairs prior to 1994. But since South Africa became a democracy the country is belligerently trying to abandon such repressive tendencies. Despite all the efforts exerted, it is unfortunate that external exclusion still exists. What is encouraging is that, in our South African democracy, the rule of law endorsed in the Bill of Rights, the cornerstone of our democracy, frowns upon the exclusion of others by virtue of their gender, race, class or religion, and on other forms of discrimination. This, therefore, gives hope that South Africa might eventually achieve social justice.

Be that as it may, Young's (2000) argument on external exclusion is that it can be noticed easily if practised because it is characterised by deliberately leaving out certain groups. Young further mentions that the less noticeable forms of exclusion that sometimes occur even when individuals or groups are nominally included in discussions are those that inadvertently leave out groups, such as setting up exclusive sets of rules and regulations and the lack of acknowledgement of the subjectivity of the other. Examples of some of the exclusive sets of rules in university practices are likely to be documented in universities' admissions policies, language policies, and other exclusive policy documents. Young (2000) argues that it is difficult to combat this form of

exclusion, since those affected are likely not to be aware of exclusionary features until it is too late, as the exclusionary features are hidden under some form of 'values', which are often presented from a democratic point of view despite being oppressive. The exclusionary features that relate to Young's view will be discussed further in Chapters 4 and 5, where I will be analysing the universities' policies.

To sum up, Osler and Starkey (2010) and Young (2000) emphasise that exclusion is an aspect of life and can at times be difficult to notice since, in democracies, exclusion can easily be concealed beneath certain values that are said to define democratic processes. Some of the aspects discussed by the three scholars above seem to characterise the current inclusion processes of the historically advantaged universities that are socially unjust, which have been mentioned by Mdepa and Tshiwula (2012) and Boughey (2012) respectively. Nevertheless, in the next paragraphs I introduce the norm of inclusion, and mostly give the perspectives that the scholars in my study perceive as those that could achieve justice.

2.3.2 The norm of inclusion

The norm of inclusion in this study is conceptualised from a critical theoretical perspective, and is considered a normative practice that possibly may bridge differences and stimulate justice in society. The discourse in this section is presented through the theories of Young, hooks, Fraser, Nussbaum and Rancière. My discussion begins with Young (1990), whose outlook is based on the pursuit of justice under communally recognised conditions necessary for achieving non-domination and non-oppression.

18

Young (1990:40) explains injustices as products of exploitation, marginalisation, powerlessness, cultural imperialism and symbolic violence. In her argument she cites racial domination as one of the worst forms of injustice, and as having been the subject of robust debates for years, especially in South Africa. Young, however, cautions that, in addressing this form of injustice, the pursuit of justice should avoid bias systems that tend to follow positivist and reductionist approaches. By this I mean that polities tend to opt for normative theories that are grounded in claims that political issues can be dealt with in a uniform manner. For example, South Africa established its democracy in 1994 and, in issues pertaining to the inclusion of black students in higher education since then, there has been an assumption that black students from impoverished schools should be treated like their white counterparts, since the country promotes equality. Therefore no one can argue that inequalities exist in this age, thus nullifying the experiences of black students before 1994, and implying that the remnants of those inequalities are the reasons that we are involved in discourse on the plight of black students from impoverished schools today.

Young also emphasises that the norm of inclusion without the acknowledgement of difference is futile, because a denial of difference leads to the oppression of the other on one hand, and a denial of difference perpetuates the reduction of the plight of those with lesser power on the other hand. The emphasis of this assertion is on polities developing policies that understand the concepts of domination and oppression, as this will allow for the understanding of the other.

Considering our South African past, I would say Young's conception of the notion of inclusion introduces a plausible basis for attaining social justice. However, Young presents a one-sided

view, which focuses on racial diversity. As much as this view shows legitimacy to the cause, it is limited, since the landscape of South African politics and its historic feature of 'haves and have-nots' is different from in the past, when the 'haves and have-nots' were noticeable through the nuances of race. In the current circumstances, however, some historically disadvantaged individuals are found within the echelons of the 'haves'. Mdepa and Tshiwula (2012:23) allude to this transformation when they speak about a large number of previously disadvantaged students entering higher education, with a large contingency being products of advantaged schooling, implying that being black in the present era does not necessarily mean being poor, although a large number of people who live below the poverty line are black. Because of this I want to argue that, if our intention is to achieve social justice, it is imperative that we look for a theoretical framework beyond racial diversification, and open ourselves to other perspectives that possibly may connect the dynamics of race, gender, culture and class. Below I introduce bell hooks, the first of the other perspectives, whose perspective focuses on hope and care.

In her book *Teaching community: A pedagogy of hope*, hooks (2003:42) mentions that if we want to create just societies, education needs to be redefined. She then proposes the concept of democratic education. She says teachers and learners need to engage one another with the intention to promote the ethos of democratic education. In hooks's view, education is about healing and wholeness, and therefore all those engaged in education should have a passion to empower and liberate students and a passion to raise their (the students') abilities beyond their known talents. The sense I get from this quotation is that, in order to foster an ethos of care at the historically advantaged institutions, the higher education system would also need to be redesigned to an extent that all those involved in it have a deep desire to empower students so

that they are able to find themselves and their place in the world. With this conviction, the students might eventually be equipped for the ever-changing world.

In the context of my study I therefore want to argue that, for the norm of inclusion to work in historically advantaged universities, there is a need for these institutions to transcend the histories they were founded upon, which I want to position as a complex pattern of "excellence and preference". The approaches of HAIs need to embrace aspects of caring and the will to empower in their policies. They also should structure their institutions as enabling environments that strive for the holistic development of all their students. By this I mean that the historically advantaged institutions ought to develop their inclusion approaches on the intention to emancipate their students in their entirety so that, in the final analysis, the students are able to work towards changing the world around them.

My claim is drawn from hooks's (2003:41) argument in which she mentions that teachers need to have a vision to impart democratic education, and that this kind of a vision can displace boundaries such as race, gender, class or culture. Be that as it may be, hooks also says that teachers ought to strive to achieve beloved communities. In brief, hooks's argument is that teachers must teach with love, care, commitment, knowledge, responsibility, respect and trust. She then says that, if teachers have these intentions when they enter the classroom, they will be able to "open up the space of learning so that it can be more inclusive" (hooks 2003:42). In the context of my study this means that teachers in historically advantaged universities must endeavour to ensure that their policies create safe spaces for black undergraduate students who have moved from their disadvantaged but "benign" environments to new and "daunting"

institutions. By daunting I am referring to the students having to enter environments that expose them to new cultures, by virtue of the institutions being universities, and by virtue of the institutions representing "privilege and wonder".

To summarize hooks's sentiments I want to argue that she defines some of the struggles that interrupt societies, such as struggles of commitment to each other as persons, and how to navigate progressive social change. In the same breath, I also want to argue that hooks's perspective is not necessarily a "be-all, and end-all"; there is also Nancy Fraser, who avoids the comfortable and agreeable path that hooks takes, and makes a case for the "struggle for recognition".

From her perspective, Fraser (1997:12) reasons that, in the struggle for social equality, there is a need for the development of a critical theory of recognition that could identify and defend the versions of the cultural politics of difference that exist in any institution. In explaining the politics of difference, Fraser comments on cultural domination and socio-economic domination as the fundamental injustices. She then proposes the use of the concepts of recognition and redistribution to combat these injustices, and explains that the two are important together more other than apart, since they are always interwoven.

Fraser (1997:13) then explains that, because socioeconomic injustice is rooted in the political-economic structure of society and can manifest itself as exploitation, economic marginalisation or deprivation, it is necessary that policies that are developed to guard against the perpetuation of such forms of exclusion in the struggle for recognition and redistribution. Fraser also explains

cultural injustice and states that it is rooted in social patterns of representation, interpretation and communication. Examples of these include cultural domination, non-recognition of the other and disrespect. One example of cultural injustice can be drawn from Mdepa and Tshiwula (2012) and Boughey's (2012) findings, which illustrate students from impoverished schools being deprived of access to pedagogy, with universities citing their lack of abilities for participation in these institutions. And when they are accepted in the historically advantaged institutions, black students from poor schools are subjected to non-recognition and non-representation of their cultures, since historically advantaged institutions do not offer legitimate courses that are facilitated in African languages, except the situational language skills that are not necessarily beneficial for black students are offered by certain historically advantaged universities, including the Afrikaans university in my study, and African languages courses. This apparent unfortunate situation can also be interpreted as the source of the students' discomfort.

Boughey takes this a step further by drawing in Scott, Yeld and Hendry's (2007) findings of their study of the cohorts of students admitted to HE in 2000, that shows the throughput black students as almost non-existent since the proportion of black students from the 56% of the cohorts of students who had dropped out of university by 2004 regardless of institution was much higher than their white counterparts. The higher education institutions black students dropped out from include historically advantaged institutions, considering that Boughey has also stated that in the late 1990s and early 2000s most historically advantaged institutions recruited black students.

On its own, in my point of view, the non-existent throughput of black students is not only tantamount to symbolic injustice, but also a form of oppression by which black students are "imprisoned", since historically advantaged universities recruit students with false promises of

23

excellence without having systematically identified and planned how to tackle the injustices that can implicitly or explicitly be present.

In the context of my study, the implication is that, for inclusion processes to be fair, the historically advantaged universities need to develop normative processes that are friendly to all students, irrespective of where they come from. The processes should equally recognise the socio-economic status of black students from impoverished backgrounds, and that their impoverished backgrounds limit their choices of better schooling options. Finally, the historically advantaged universities should recognise and accommodate other South African languages. They should show interests in growing those languages into academic languages.

When looking at the three theories that I have discussed alongside each other, Young's diversity theory, hooks's democratic education and Fraser's theory of recognition and redistribution, I want to assume that their ideas are similar, since they are firmly rooted in distributive justice, which focuses mostly on "allocating" materialistic forms of justice to those who were marginalised, although Fraser begins her perspective with the recognition of an injustice. An example of an injustice surfaces in Young (2000:52), who argues in her discussion of the construct of race as the source of domination and oppression, and that to mitigate social injustice, black people, since they were oppressed, should be granted equal status to white people. In this case, granting equal status to both black and white people could mean an equal distribution of power. The assumption is that all races will be able to engage each other in debates when they have equal status. In the context of my study this would mean that, if both black and white students have equal status, they are likely to end up at the same institutions. The

shortcoming in this regard, however, is that opening the debates to all does not necessarily mean that all parties will possess equal capital for participation in such debates.

If I were to again locate Young's outlook in the context of my study I would say that, if all students were recruited on an equal footing by historically advantaged institutions, black students from impoverished schools were likely not to be accommodated by these institutions, as the capital that they possess is limited as pointed out by Boughey (2012) and Mdepa and Tshiwula (2012). Also, if the measures by which the historically advantaged institutions accommodate black students treat all black students as a homogenous group, I want to argue that it is an unfair process, as black students are heterogeneous; some are now privileged, while others' lived experiences are still disadvantaged. Therefore, whatever the historically advantaged institutions have in place is flawed if their systems do not accommodate difference. In a nutshell, the manner in which liberal politics outlines racial diversity as a tool for attaining social justice can be a disingenuous exercise, since the whole process does not necessarily provide for the differences that exist in a society.

hooks's (2003) theory, on the other hand, argues that education should be able to dismantle oppression and build community across racial, gender, class and national lines. She also argues for communal coherence and collaborations between students and teachers. In the case of my study, hooks does not define how this 'Utopia' can be created when there are such enormous disparities between black students, and disparities between black and white students. In addition, hooks's whole argument revolves around the education system being re-imagined and shaped into democratic education, thus articulating that the whole idea of an education trajectory should

be able to empower students to an extent that they are able to reshape their livelihoods, alluding more to the students being given skills to work and improve their world. hooks's ideal is perfect in theory as she does allude to the politics of difference, but unfortunately she does not tell us how this can open doors for students who are unable to enter the historically advantaged system.

Although Fraser (1997) also argues for recognition before the affirmation of persons, what may well be a little problematic with her perspective is that, in the quest to quell the ills of domination and oppression, polities may choose to affirm others just for the sake of affirming them, without fair judgment. As an example I will draw from Boughey's (2012) assertion that some universities bend rules and include black students based on potential rather than on matric performance. This seems condescending and may carry a bigger stigma, since if the historically advantaged universities give black students from impoverished schools a concession to enter, they might expect the students to assimilate their cultures, instead of broadening their [the institution's] scope to accommodate black students' cultures.

In summary I want to argue that, distributive justice should not be the only norm used to promote social justice, as it can only enhance the legal forms of justice without making provision for the *sense of self*. For this reason I introduce Nussbaum, whose perspective of achieving social justice does not rely only on human rights as a baseline, but who believes in a balance between human rights, development of self-worth, and care for others. Nussbaum (2000:12) introduces the capabilities approach. She speaks of human beings having capabilities to choose to be morally upright, and thus doing good to others. The key idea from Nussbaum's perspective is the empowerment of others such that they can realise their true worth and be able to navigate their

26

worlds. In the context of my study, Nussbaum's perspective may well mean that the historically advantaged institutions ought to acknowledge the capabilities students from impoverished schools bring to their institutions, like the richness of their African languages and cultures, and work from that direction to shape the students' academic world, instead of making the student adapt to most of the institutions' cultures.

Besides tapping other people's capabilities, Nussbaum also mentions that, at the best of times, people seek to make decisions that would involve others and, when encountered with such decisions, people should take into account not only their own judgment, but should also take into consideration the judgments of those who would be affected by such decisions. Nussbaum then mentions that politically just processes need constant revision in order to achieve processes that are respectful of others' choices (Nussbaum 2000:103).

In this regard Nussbaum concurs with Young (1990) and Fraser (1997), who hold that, in order to achieve social justice, it is important to understand the concepts of domination and oppression as seen through the eyes of the oppressed. Also, the essence of Nussbaum's Young's and Frsaer's approaches to inclusion is that inclusionary programmes should not carry homogenous themes because if they do they would be ignoring the differences of the others' lived experiences, as well as differences of opinions.

Nussbaum's norm of inclusion focuses on the affirmation of others' potential. The only obstacle presented by this perspective if it were to be used by the HAIs on its own is that black students will always fall short when trying to gain access to historically advantaged institutions because

27

their potential might not be the potential the historically advantaged institutions expected. Also, if by any chance the students are accepted at these institutions, they will first need to acquaint themselves with the way of life at these universities before they are able to navigate their way. So Rancière's intellectual adventure, with its theme of "ignorance and discovery", can be an ideal partner when developing processes of inclusion.

Rancière (1991) speaks about abolishing the distance between teaching and learning, as this seems to create "distress" between the teacher and students. Rancière argues that, instead of assuming that the pedagogical encounter comprises of the teacher having superior knowledge because of his level of expertise, and the student being inferior because of his ignorance in the pedagogical adventure, there should be an assumption that both the teacher and the learner possess equal intelligence. He says the intellectual adventure should see both teacher and student as companions journeying together ignorantly in search of collaborative adventures, which are not set by teachers, but my mutual determination of adventuring into the world of intellectual discovery.

Rancière furthermore emphasises that pedagogical exchanges flow when teachers abandon their roles as the dominant partners and assume the role of an ignorant companion. In contrast, if the teacher thinks like an explicator his act leads to stultification of the process and the student, meaning that the process becomes stifling and thus leaves the student feeling disempowered (Rancière 1991:13). Suffice it to say that, in their efforts, teachers should make the students' journey unexpected and unpredictable, yet liberating. This knowledge exchange may lead to the emancipation of both adventurers and thus open doors for inclusionary pedagogical adventures.

In the context of my study, HAIs ought to introduce intellectual adventures when accommodating black students from impoverished schools so that the students may end up accepting their new environments, leading them to being able to remain within the higher education system until they graduate.

2.4 Diagnostic lenses to examine legitimate inclusion practices in my study

The literature I have analysed thus far has given me some understanding of how the norms of inclusion and exclusion function. The most vital aspect that arose from the literature was that the norm of inclusion should not be understood as a universal concept, but rather as a multidimensional one. This means if the historically advantaged universities want to allow all students to gain access, regardless of race and social status, they should envisage the norm of inclusion as a means to an end, and that its implementation cannot be executed from a nuanced understanding of the concept. By this I mean that historically advantaged institutions ought to integrate different theories that relate to both the social and political forms of attaining justice in higher education.

The examples of multidimensional approaches I drew from the theories I examined begin with Young (1990) and Fraser's (1997) perceptions of inclusion, which can be regarded as addressing the political forms of justice since they focus on diversity, recognition and distribution. The argument here is that, to achieve educational justice, racial inequalities need to be addressed, and that there has to be active recognition of the plight of students from impoverished schools. Furthermore, instead of looking at these students' predicament as just being poor, there should be an acknowledgement that their circumstances are the remnants and legacies of apartheid.

After having addressed the political issues, the historically advantaged universities ought also to look at the socio-economic issues and thus, hooks's (2003) hope and caring form of democratic education, Nussbaum's (2000) empowerment and self-determination, and Rancière's (1991) idea of an intellectual adventure should be considered as multiple ways of achieving justice. The focus of these theories is on people and the environment. To contextualise this, we would be referring to the environment that the black students will inhabit. My argument is primarily that if the historically advantaged universities want to manage their inclusion effectively, they should look beyond their fixed structures.

In my analysis of the two institutions' policy documents in Chapter 4, therefore, I use these perspectives as the point of reference, and as the diagnostic lenses through which to assess the policy structures and processes of two historically advantaged universities, and thus to assess whether black students from impoverished schools are internally excluded in these universities, resulting in their failure to complete their studies. This will include assessing how the historically advantaged universities plan to deal with the barriers faced by black students from impoverished schools, and also work out what could be seen as legitimate practices of inclusion.

2.5 Key sub-themes that have developed from trying to understand the norm of inclusion

The key sub-theme that has developed from the theorists' perspectives is that the legitimate norm of inclusion can be achieved through the promotion of co-existence. The processes that may assist in attaining co-existence ought to recognise difference and validate the other, whilst promoting equity. Having derived this sub-theme, in the next chapter I discuss the trajectory of higher education policies, thus evaluating how the planning of the new policies was conceived in

order to bring a sense of balance to higher education, in moving from a segregated higher education system to a new, evolved system suitable for a democratic society.

Chapter 3
MAPPING THE TRAJECTORY OF HIGHER EDUCATION TRANSFORMATION IN SOUTH AFRICA

3.1 Background

Since 1994, a countless number of institutional changes have been implemented to replace the inequitable apartheid policies in South Africa. The divisive apartheid practices were replaced by the unified, democratic practices of the Government of National Unity (GNU), which was introduced to take the new South Africa onto a new platform of global politics. In higher education the basis for change was driven by a desire to transform the vastly stratified higher education system, characterised equally by racial and geographical, and institutional type segregation, into a new system that would unify higher education and foster new habits and behaviours.

The Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD 2008:327) expounds on the above by reporting that, under apartheid rule prior to 1994, higher education was characterised and shaped by sets of legal and policy provisions that separated the different components and actors within the system according to race and ethnic group on the one hand, and institutional types on the other hand. This means that the segregation in South African politics was administered through self-governing states known as the TBVC states that accommodated mostly Africans, namely the Republic of Transkei, the Republic of Bophuthatswana, the Republic of Venda and the Republic of Ciskei. The Republic of South Africa consisted of mostly the main cities in the country, and formed part of what could be regarded as the "white" South Africa.

At the same time, this fragmentation meant that educational affairs were also administered separately. The administration of the higher education institutions (HEIs) fell under the Minister of Education and Culture, who reported on matters related to white education to the House of Assembly. Coloured and Indian education also fell under the Minister of Education and Culture; however, according to the principle of separate representation, the Minister of Education and Culture reported to different chambers in the national parliament – the House of Representatives on matters related to coloured education, and the House of Delegates on matters pertaining to Indian education. There was no provision for the representation of Africans in Parliament since the apartheid government regarded African education a general affairs subject, unlike the other groups, whose education fell under own affairs (OECD 2008:326).

With the advent of democracy in 1994, however, a new path was mapped that would develop new policies, which were deemed to represent all South Africans. According to the OECD (2008), the establishment of the National Commission on Higher Education (NCHE) later in 1994 initiated the process of change in higher education. The NCHE became a platform for robust debates on issues related to higher education (HE), and on social issues. In January 1997, to ensure that the HE system would work in unison with the changes taking place in the country, the Parliament of the Republic of South Africa enacted the Higher Education Act, 101 of 1997. The Higher Education Act (Department of Education 1997b) became a legal foundation and provided a framework for HE. The act also provided standards to regulate higher education and for quality assurance and quality promotion. Basically, the Higher Education Act provided a blueprint for transitional arrangements and for counterbalancing certain apartheid laws.

To initiate the transition process the Department of Education (DoE) issued Education White Paper 3: A Programme for the Transformation of Higher Education, which outlined the HE framework for change. The framework followed NCHE guidelines. White Paper 3 published guidelines by which the higher education system was to be planned, governed and funded. The most prominent intention introduced in the White Paper was the need to address social needs and to transform the higher education system so that it redressed past inequalities, met pressing national needs and responded to new realities to create opportunities for all.

Needless to say, countless changes have occurred in policy implementation in higher education since then, but what seems to have remained the same as before the enactment of the democratic HE policies is the prevention of black undergraduates from impoverished schools from gaining access to higher education. Mdepa and Tshiwula (2012:23) and Boughey (2012:136) allude to this phenomenon by citing the scarcity of black students from impoverished schools graduating from historically advantaged institutions (HAIs), thus suggesting the existence of exclusionary processes that bar black students from poor schools from accessing higher education at these universities.

Given the poor representation of black students in historically advantaged institutions, this section examines how the higher education system has mapped and managed educational change from 1997 to 2014. The idea is to try to understand tensions that may exist between HE policies and the HEIs' policies. Hopefully I will gain a broader understanding of HAI structures and practices that may be preventing the developments surrounding open access for all students. The space I will confine myself to in my analysis will be the policies in the areas of access to and

equity in higher education. The background for my inquiry is the White Papers of 1997 (Department of Education 1997a) and 2014 (Department of Education 2014), the National Plan for Higher Education (NPHE) of 2001, the Higher Education Act 101 of 1997 (Department of Education 1997b), and the OECD Review of 2008. My main aim in this section is to investigate if policy diffusion has taken place between the higher education system and HEIs, more especially the historically advantaged universities. I also wanted to investigate why certain changes, such as the inclusion of black students from impoverished schools in historically advantaged universities, seem to be ineffective.

As such, the newly issued White Paper for Post-School Education and Training has stimulated my enthusiasm for conducting this study by affirming the higher education's commitment to rekindling the principles of academic freedom, institutional autonomy and public accountability that formed part of the transformation agenda of Education White Paper 3. This also seems to indicate that the policy makers are privy to the failures of the implementation processes of certain policies. The Education White Paper (Department of Education 2014:27) also states that the principles tabled in the 1997 White Paper are still as important as they were then, since "there is no moral basis for using the principle of institutional autonomy as a pretext for resisting democratic change or in defence of mismanagement. Institutional autonomy is therefore inextricably linked to the demands of public accountability". In short, this citation suggests that if the exclusion of black students from impoverished schools in historically advantaged institutions persists, such exclusion should be linked to resistance against democratic change and to mismanagement. Institutions that still carry out this form of injustice therefore ought to be made to be duty bound. In the next section I will begin with the key aspects of the trajectory of

higher education to examine the nature of educational change adopted by higher education institutions, including some of their successes and failures.

3.2 The beginning of the trajectory, 1994 to 1999

Essentially, the period from 1994 to 1999 was a phase that focused on policy development. All policies developed during this era had a common goal, namely to redress the imbalances created by South Africa's fragmented past. At the heart of the HE system was Education White Paper 3 of 1997, which, according to the OECD (2008), presented a framework for achieving a single national, coordinated higher education system that is diverse in terms of the mix of institutional missions and programmes. This refers to a different spectrum of offerings by different higher education institutions, such as public universities, technikons and colleges, and private higher education providers. The Education White Paper 3 also advocated a national higher education plan that would benchmark the transformation process. To ensure that the Education White Paper 3 goals were achieved, the Ministry of Education established the Council on Higher Education (CHE) and assigned it a quality promotion and quality assurance function. This meant that the CHE became responsible for the monitoring of higher education institutions, initiated the transformation agenda for HE, and also suggested strategic interventions.

Progressing from Education White Paper 3, the key policy framework that followed became the National Plan for Higher Education of 2001. According to the OECD Review (OECD 2008), the National Plan became necessary since some of the key development programmes announced in White Paper 3 had not been attained. An example of this may well be the slow progress in granting students from impoverished schools equitable access to historically advantaged universities. So far, the disappointing outcomes may well be blamed on the Department of

Education for opting for an incremental approach instead of making change implementation mandatory for HEIs. The inference is that the DoE skirted away from hostile confrontation, favouring "constructive engagement" when dealing with HAIs. It thus desired change, yet took a more collegial approach to HEIs' change implementation processes. To a certain extent the DoE's collegiality has become a contradictory rhetoric, since this lethargic pace has deviated from the initial goals of Education White Paper 3, which speak more about the transformation of higher education to the extent that it is accessible to all.

The OECD (2008:331) Review reasons that the incremental approach resulted from a lack of human capacity, and a lack of technical skills and analytical skills within the system, to implement the comprehensive and all-encompassing transformation agenda articulated in Education White Paper 3. This means that shifting policies from the DoE domain to HEIs was difficult; hence the partnership between DoE and HEIs became a little inconsistent. In other words, instead of HEIs working together, they competed, with the HAIs becoming front-runners since they were well resourced. Suffice it to say that the consequences that we suffer in higher education today emanated from incapacity within the HE systems to effect meaningful change during the transitional period.

In 2001, the OECD Review states that the Minister of Education released a National Plan for Higher Education (NPHE), which brought new transformation measures that resulted in a reduction in the number of public higher education institutions in South Africa (Department of Education 2001:87). The NPHE mapped new processes with the hope that these would bring

about positive outcomes in HE. Below I shall introduce the new National Plan and its values, and later ascertain if these values have been transferred to higher education institutions.

3.3 The National Plan for Higher Education of 2001

The introduction of the National Plan for Higher Education, according to the OECD (2008:332), validated the vision of transformation of the higher education system as outlined in Education White Paper 3. In the period when the NPHE was promulgated, HE faced unavoidable challenges, such as competition between public HEIs, declining student enrolments, an intensified dropout rate and financial constraints. The OECD states that some of these challenges were worsened by unplanned change that came in the form of increased enrolments in higher education after 1994. This set of circumstances resulted in students attending historically disadvantaged institutions (HDIs) and their universities being affected the most, since the HDIs did not have the capacity to market themselves or to recover the loss that resulted from unrecovered fees. Seemingly, the HDIs increased student numbers and incurred debts, and later there was no way out for these institutions but to establish rigid processes to recover any debts incurred. The new processes resulted in a decline in student numbers, since many could not afford to pay their outstanding debts. The OECD (2008:332) stated that the combined effect of declining enrolments and declining financial resource budgets allocated to HEIs challenged the implementation processes that would have accentuated the White Paper 3 agenda "to redress past inequalities and to transform the higher education system to serve a new social order, to meet pressing national needs, and to respond to new realities and opportunities" (Department of Education 1997:1.1).

Based on these challenges, and the failure to achieve some of the intentions of Education White Paper 3, the National Plan introduced a new policy that led to the merger and incorporation of institutions and programmes. Before the mergers there were 36 public higher education institutions in South Africa, structured along racial and ethnic lines. There also was a distinction between universities and technikons. Of the 36 public higher education institutions, 10 had been reserved for white people, with four being for English-speaking students and six for Afrikaans-speaking students. Two urban universities were reserved for coloured and Indian students, there was one distance learning institution, and six institutions operated in the TBVC areas. The technikons consisted of seven reserved for white students, two reserved for coloured and Indians students, one for distance learning and five that were reserved for African students operating in the TBVC (OECD 2008:333). The introduction of the mergers became a lifeline for HDIs, since it was becoming impossible for them to compete with well-resourced institutions that had an advantage of resources inherited from their privileged past. The HAIs also had advantages in terms of location and recruitment. Suffice it to say that, because of the geographical and racially repressive fragmentation, the National Plan made provision for the restructuring of HE, which resulted in a new public institution landscape and programmes, with 24 public HEIs – 11 traditional universities that focus on research and professional degree qualifications, seven universities of technology that offer a mix of technological, vocational, career-oriented and professional programmes leading to a certificate, diploma or degree; and six "comprehensive universities" that combine both types of HEI (Council on Higher Education 2004:27). Two more HEIs have recently been established in Mpumalanga and the Northern Cape.

Although the mergers were meant to bring about a new system that reflected a wide spectrum of democratic HEIs differentiated only by their mission, entrance requirements and the qualifications and programmes they offer, the mergers unfortunately did not come without challenges. The OECD Review (2008:338) states that

> The situation suggests that while most "traditional", research intensive universities have not been affected by the mergers, a limited number has been affected, as a consequence of the apartheid legacy with disadvantaged institutions, especially those in rural areas of the former TBVC areas, still disadvantaged in terms of infrastructure, teaching facilities and staffing. However, other types of institutions, namely the "comprehensives" are struggling with multiple challenges that, coupled with management problems, leave these institutions at an academic risk.

As present, some institutions like the University of Zululand, Tshwane University of Technology, Walther Sisulu University, Vaal University of Technology and the Central University of Technology are under administration because of an erosion of the culture of teaching and learning and the mismanagement of finances[2]. In cases like these, the OECD (2008) Review's recommendation is that the comprehensive universities need to be decisive about their offerings, since if they become all-in-one institutions, they run the risk of alienating students.

To sum up, in this sub-section I have discussed the rationale behind the introduction of the National Plan for Higher Education, and also alluded to its introduction being linked to the

---

[2] Source: http://www.pmg.org.za/report/20130814-universities-under-administration-update-department-higher-education-and-training-africa-institute-south-africa

alleviation of the financial burden borne by HDIs, as well as the improvement of access to quality education for all students. In the next paragraphs I shall discuss student access and equity and financial need to analyse how the National Plan has influenced the policies surrounding these aspects.

3.4 Student access and its struggles

The Education White Paper 3 of 1997 speaks of the achievement of equity in higher education as one of the fundamental goals of transformation in South Africa. Achieving equity has been the central goal reiterated in many of the policy documents that have followed Education White Paper 3, including the most recent Education White Paper of 2014. Regrettably, with all the equitable principles in the national policy frameworks, the current state of affairs in the context of my study seems to dispute that the policy provisions were even adhered to by the HAIs. Instead of striving for completely equitable processes, some of these institutions have processes that externally include black students in their systems, but when the students get there, the majority of them do not remain in these institutions until they graduate. For some or other reason they choose to drop out, which is rather peculiar, since opportunities like these are supposed to be appreciated. From this problem I want to argue that internal exclusion of black students might exist at these institutions, hence the students' dropout rate. As explained by Boughey (2012:136), "By the end of 2004, five years after entering higher education, only 30% of the cohorts of students admitted to South African institutions of higher education had graduated. 56% had left the institutions at which they initially registered without graduating and 14% were still in the system". Boughey states further that "More significant is the fact that figures for black students were much worse than those for their white peers regardless of institution, area of study or type of qualification".

When looking at this at face value one could possibly argue that the external inclusion of learners might have been designed to ward off political pressure without having thought the process through. This seemingly make-believe system allows for the realignment of racial inequalities, which could loosely be seen as "gaining numbers" for the HAIs. Jansen (2002:200) explains these manoeuvres as political symbolism, inferring the possibility that policies are sometimes not designed to change practice, but merely to generate new policies since there is a call for them. In the case of my study, the motives for creating inclusion policies for black students may be pure, since the agency of not wanting to disregard the national call for equitable structures and open universities seems to be there, but unfortunately in most universities there is a lack of systematic planning that would ensure the students' throughput.

Be that as it may, the argument that I want to present in this study begins with statements drawn from the Education White Paper for Post-school Education and Training (background and challenges), which explains the provisioning of higher education institutions as units that are there to educate and provide high-level skills for the labour market; and also to produce new knowledge, assess and find new applications for existing knowledge, and validate knowledge and values through the higher education curricula. In addition, HEIs are also there to provide opportunities for social mobility and the strengthening of social justice and democracy, thus helping to overcome the inequities inherited from our divisive past. Similarly, the Education White Paper 3 of 1997 carries the same sentiment in its founding statement, and the stipulation was that universities were crucial institutions in terms of reaching the country's national development objectives. The objectives include supporting the rest of the post-school system and

aligning curricula and research agendas to help meet national objectives, including tackling the challenges of poverty, unemployment and inequality.

It is from these premises that my argument rationalises that there are tensions between the national provisioning and how HEIs present themselves. The current HEIs structures and inclusion processes show some disparities. Some institutions seem to indicate that they are designed for a particular type of student. These tensions can be addressed by HEIs re-evaluating who they are and whether they do meet the HE goals. That is to ensure that all students, regardless of their gender, race or creed, do not only gain access to higher education, but that access is granted with the intention to retain all students until they graduate. The outcome should be that higher education institutions prepare students for participation in nation building, and achieve this feat through equitable access to higher education, and through the dissemination of quality education. Thereby they would achieve what hooks (2003) declares to be democratic education.

Furthermore, the NCHE Report (in OECD 2008:339) recommends that tensions between equity and development can be resolved through increased participation, meaning fast tracking the HE discrepancies by relaxing the rigid recruitment processes practised by HAIs. However, the OECD Review argues that, as a rule, increased participation in HE should be systematic as the process currently is unrealistic because it presents a wide range of problems. Amongst these problems cited by the OECD Review are the impracticalities that come with the recruitment of black students from impoverished schools, as a large number of these students do not obtain endorsed Senior Certificates because many take their Matric subjects at the standard grade level,

especially in Maths and Science. On the other hand, the OECD Review mentions that the notion of increased participation does not meet the NPHE target since most black students who manage to gain entrance into traditional universities presently amid their current recruitment processes are black students who come from historically advantaged schools. The OECD Review then argues that, because of this, the increased participation impasse has made universities accept under-prepared students, the vast majority being from impoverished backgrounds, thus implying that the reasons HEIs are unable to retain students in their systems could emanate from this flexing of the rigid recruitment strategies.

Tying the above to the context of my study, I would say that the OECD Review suggests that the most severe problems in higher education are still financial need and a continuous struggle to curb the dropout rate, which ultimately can be linked to the under-preparedness of students and a lack of funds. From these assertions I want to argue that the HEIs need to transform their recruitment methods and better their support structures if they want to recruit and retain black students from impoverished schools since the black students' financial and under-preparedness struggles seem to be enduring.

While mapping the trajectory of higher education thus far I have alluded to the difficulties surrounding black students from impoverished schools gaining access to higher education being linked to a lack of academic capital and financial need. I have also made reference to policy implementations, such as adopting an incremental approach and institutional mergers, and their challenges. Next, I will discuss retention and throughput.

3.5 Retention and throughput

One of the features that I attach to equity and redress in higher education is equitable access to higher education and a solid throughput rate. This may well refer to the manner in which HEIs recruit and how they plan management structures to retain the majority of their students until graduation, which would also ensure that the students are employable and therefore able to improve their social status. The OECD Review (2008) comments on this notion by pointing out that the inequitable structures of the apartheid system prior to 1994 gave biased throughput results in the sense that there were fewer black students who graduated from HEIs, yet black students were a majority in the country. That being said, the Review also remarks that, by 2005, the average success rate of African students who graduated from universities was still far less than that of white students. Although the OECD ties the reasons for these skewed results to disproportions in universities' resources, to the legacy of apartheid, and to a certain extent to the mergers and socio-economic status of the students some HEIs recruit, it (the OECD) views this state of affairs as a serious concern. Boughey (2012:136) shares the same sentiment on the subject, namely that the higher education system still has a crisis on its hands, when she states that it is unfortunate that gains that were made by recruiting black students in higher education have been negated by a failure to graduate those students. This provides an indication that, despite the new democratic processes in higher education, access by and retention of black students from poor schools is still yet to be attained.

Attached to these challenges, according to the Higher Education Quality Committee (HEQC) (in OECD 2008), have been the disparities in funding and governance structures between the HDIs and HAIs. During the apartheid era, HAIs were well resourced because of the status quo. But in

the new democracy, HAIs still are advantaged, despite the transformation processes that have been adopted and implemented. It is difficult for the DoE to find the balance, since the HAIs have enough resources and skills that were acquired in their privileged past.

That the higher education system has also adopted cooperative governance to restore the financial need in the HEI system has made things even worse, as this has made the HAIs much stronger and weakened the HDI systems. On paper it seems outstanding that the higher education transformation agenda has carefully chosen to be inclusive towards a number of stakeholders, but in practice this innovative governance construction has demanded a great deal from universities' structures. This has also left those institutions that could not adapt wanting. The new developments have also brought in something of an element of competition within the HEI structures.

In the context of my study, this phenomenon is leaving black students from impoverished schools out in the cold, since most institutions have started to benchmark themselves according to what is deemed efficient in the market. This can be interpreted as the recruitment of those students who can pay their way, and those who come from privileged schools and backgrounds, which the institutions would not waste money trying to improve their limitations. Supporting this claim, the OECD (2008:355) contends that the cooperative governance strategy has opened competitive pressures amongst HEIs, resulting in the majority of them opting for market systems approaches to managing their universities:

The inefficiency of institutional forums, particularly in relation to the participation of previously disadvantaged groups, coupled with multiple demands on universities, forced some institutional leaders to start playing "a most pivotal role in the governance and management of their institutions" … On the other hand, most notoriously in some Afrikaans speaking universities and technikons, but generally across the system, South African HEIs started applying to themselves the governance models and styles described in the comparative international literature as "New Managerialism".

New Managerialism arguably is a neo-liberal ideology that essentially is about quality management, in terms of which knowledge and power are taken away from professionals practising in the field and placed in the hands of auditors and policymakers who have very little to no understanding of the field[3]. One can also argue that these are the consequences and demands of globalisation.

In an effort to restore these financial struggles, the Ministry of Education introduced the new funding framework (NFF) (Department of Higher Education 2004), which was believed to be one of the measures that might level the playing field and speed up the transformation agenda in HE. The intentions of this process were to create a support system that eventually would improve the access and throughput targets of the HE system. To date the results have been dismal. Steyn and De Villiers (2007) argue that achieving such results is unavoidable if the management of the NFF is left to the whims of the market system and uncoordinated institutional decisions on student enrolments and programme offerings. The argument is that the NFF should be influenced

---

[3] Source: http://www.jceps.com/print.php?articleID=31

by central enrolment planning via approved institutional enrolment plans for graduate outputs. The core of their argument is that the underlying philosophy of the DoE's transformation agenda is that the higher education system is planned, governed and funded as a single, national, coordinated system. Since this is a national goal, the DoE therefore should ensure that the objectives are implemented. The essence of the arguments is that there is a need to reclaim the purpose of education in order to achieve socially just results.

The OECD (2008) also mentions that the NFF is goal oriented and performance driven and is intended to enable the distribution of government grants to institutions in line with national goals and priorities and approved institutional plans. This also means that the NFF has moved away from the South African Post-Secondary Education (SAPSE) standard of funding, which advocated shared costs, thus expecting the student and the parent to contribute to what the government puts in, but it still has stringent rules as HEIs are funded on the basis of their performance. The OECD Review (2008) discusses some of unintentional or unanticipated consequences that come with coupling funding to an institution's demographic composition. One of those is that thousands of black students enrolled at formerly "white" institutions will be funded by government at levels lower than those applicable to their peers at formerly "black" universities. This becomes unfair, since black students from impoverished schools are also supposed to be allowed mobility to attend at universities of their choice.

In closing I want to argue that the tensions within the NFF stem from the government grants that are distributed according to quotas, meaning that HEIs receives substantive grants depending on the number of black students that they recruit. This move favours HDIs, but does not necessarily

work in the favour of black students enrolled in white institutions. This does not necessarily resonate with national goals, since it tends to restrict the movement of black students from impoverished schools, as they can be funded fairly only if they are in HDIs. This technically seems like an extension of segregation. It therefore is important that the funding system is decentralised so that it follows the students wherever they want to study, or better still, improves the students' capacities so that even black students from impoverished schools become eligible to attend HAIs. Another tension is that the NFF does not provide funds for residence and experimental training, which can be regarded as problematic since needy students who would want to specialise in particular fields may end up forsaking their dreams because of a lack of funding, and that again limits these students' access to education.

In essence, my argument is in defence of the principle of redress in HE being practiced following national goals and those of the transformation agenda of higher education, and that the practised norms should show impartiality. What I mean is that the distribution of funding should not distinguish between race, ethnicity, or gender, although the processes should not plead ignorance of South Africa's fragmented past. South Africa may have a growing black middle class that has been empowered by the new conditions created by the arrival of democracy (Department of Education 2014), but there is still a large number of students who have no alternative but to attend impoverished schools.

To conclude this chapter I want to refer to the policy framework on admissions, funding, student diversity and equity, and student throughput, as these factors stood out in the trajectory of the transformation of higher education. The interesting factor surrounding these themes is that the

policies that the DoE has introduced, which are supposedly designed to redress the imbalances in order to make the system accommodative of all, sometimes do not enhance the plight of black students from impoverished schools. It is not surprising that it is almost two decades since the beginning of the new agenda, yet the majority of those that were disadvantaged by the system in the past are still on the receiving end. For instance, if we look at the mergers and corporative governance moves adopted and introduced by the DoE, they seem to have crippled the HDIs and restricted the movement of black students, since the HAIs more or less were given an autonomous choice to determine access to HE. That we now have a new policy framework does not necessary help if we have not achieved at least some of the objectives of Education White Paper 3.

Also, in as much as it is understandable that the agenda of the Education White Paper of 2014 (Department of Education 2014) broadened its scope and drew in new social ills because the colour of poverty has changed, the fact that a large number of those who are still trapped in poverty today are black students who attend impoverished schools, and who still are being excluded by the system, should not be dismissed. Suffice to say that the struggle against racial imbalances in higher education has not ended, hence my motivation to conduct this study. In the next chapter my report on my research begins, with the focus being to find out if the two institutions in my study have exclusionary processes such as those referred to by Mdepa and Tshiwula (2012) and Boughey (2012).

Chapter 4
AN ANALYSIS OF INCLUSION POLICIES AT TWO HISTORICALLY ADVANTAGED INSTITUTIONS IN THE WESTERN CAPE

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter I present an analysis of the transformation policies of two historically advantaged institutions in the Western Cape, University of Cape Town and University of Stellenbosch, which I have chosen to refer to as University A and University B. My intention is not to take away the striking efforts of these institutions to transform, but to highlight some anomalies in their admissions processes that impede student inclusion.

In addition to the above, the primary goal of this analysis is to understand the context in which the policies of the two institutions are made, and more than anything else I want to understand if the internal exclusion of black students from impoverished schools at these institutions is an intended or unintended effect. To achieve this I have limited my attention to admissions policies, student diversity and equity policies, and student finance policies. My assumption is that these may outline strategies that support the inclusion or the exclusion of black students from impoverished schools in the systems of these historically advantaged institutions. My analysis of these policies therefore is pursued through a qualitative research methodology, whilst the method I use to analyse text is interpretive inquiry.

My reason for selecting this methodology is based on Neuman's (1997) extrapolation of qualitative research methodologies, where he explains that the interpretive paradigm and qualitative methods of research concern themselves with how people create and maintain their social life, and that this methodology gives the researcher possibilities to view social life in terms

of processes rather than fixed systems. The implication is that the interpretive paradigm and qualitative method are more likely to allow for a constructive interpretation of the processes than conventional methods such as interviews and observations (Ritchie & Lewis 2003).

The theoretical lenses I use in this analysis include Young's diversity theory, hooks's democratic education theory, Fraser's theory of recognition and redistribution, Nussbaum's capabilities approach and Rancière's intellectual equality, particularly since these perspectives offer different approaches that may balance our understanding of attaining social justice. The policies are also examined against the developments introduced in the trajectory of the higher education system in the period between 1997 and 2014.

Since the main aim of this section is to evaluate the implementation processes of policy change by the historically advantaged institutions and the effects thereof on black students from impoverished schools, the study answers the following questions:

Are black students internally excluded at historically advantaged institutions in the Western Cape? If they are not, what contributes to their (students') internal exclusion?

From the main question, the following sub-questions were asked:

- How do the historically advantaged universities conceptualise the recruitment of students from impoverished schools?

- Do historically advantaged universities have retention strategies for struggling black students that they recruit? If they do, what contributes to their (universities) failure to retain black students from impoverished schools?

- In what ways have the HAIs' recruitment policies been informed by the "lived" experiences of black students from impoverished schools?

Before getting into a detailed analysis of the policies, I believe it is important to first provide the historic background of the two HAIs in order to give the context of what these institutions represent, as well as to understand their perspectives on change. Below is an historical overview of the institutions in my study:

4.2 Historical overview of the HAIs in my study

The backdrops of University A and University B are different, yet comparable. They are different because they were provided to offer instruction in different language mediums. University A was established to serve an English-speaking community, whilst University B was established to serve an Afrikaans-speaking community. Their being similar, on the other hand, is attached to their long history of existence, which dates back to the 19th centuries respectively[4]. The implication is that these institutions were also affected by colonial rule (the Dutch colonial period and the British colonial period), and also experienced three periods of party politics (the Union of South Africa, the National Party government and the democratic South Africa), with each government imposing its political influence on these universities' topographies. With this overview I therefore want to argue that encased in these long histories are established traditions.

---

[4] Sources: https://www.uct.ac.za/about/intro/history/
http://www.sun.ac.za/english/about-us/historical-background

On one hand, there is academic excellence, which has been the vanguard of these institutions' traditions since their establishment, and has made the two institutions be counted among the front runners in higher education in South Africa. On the other hand, both University A and University B have at some stage of their existence been used as cornerstones of racial separation. An example of this claim is that these universities once granted access to higher education only to the privileged. The colour of privilege at the time was white, both English and Afrikaans speaking[5]. As disaffecting as this may have been, according University A historic background, they had allowed a handful of black students to study at it in the early 20th century[6], although the history of University A does not, however, mention the selection criteria used to select the handful of black students referred to, nor does University A's history explain the faculties these students were registered in. University B's historical background on the other hand shows that the university was open to a single white Afrikaans-speaking group of students since inception till the 1990s[7].

More to the point is that after the National Party victory in 1948, the nationalist government became focused on separate development. In higher education this came in the form of the Extension of the University Education Act (No. 45) of 1959, which prohibited white universities from accepting black students, except with the special permission of a cabinet minister (Pampallis 1991:184). The implication is that even University A ceased granting access to black students. As an alternative, the nationalist government opened several new universities and colleges for black, coloured and Indian students. The non-white groups were allowed to attend a

---

[5] Source: http://countrystudies.us/south-africa/56.htm
[6] Source: https://www.uct.ac.za/about/intro/history/
[7] Source: http:// www.thehopeproject.co.za/ Downloads/Hoop%20boekie_Transforming_PRINT_low%20res.pdf

"white" university only if they studied a course that was not offered at their "own" institutions. It would have been unlikely for Afrikaans universities to grant access to non-whites. In any event, such a feat is not mentioned in the historic background of the Afrikaans university in my study. History tells us that there was never room for social inclusion in Afrikaans universities. Also, apart from being exclusionary of other cultures, even when dealing with their "own", under National Party rule, these universities admitted students mostly on academic excellence and appointed their staff in the same way (Pampallis 1991:184).

Supporting Pampallis's view of the nationalist government's separate development is the Council on Higher Education Report (in OECD 2008:325), which states that, prior to 1994, higher education under apartheid rule was characterised and shaped by sets of legal and policy provisions that separated the different components and actors within the system according to race and ethnic groups, on one hand, and institutional types on the other. This status quo remained until the advent of democracy in 1994. More to the point is that the nationalist government's ingenuity had trickled into the new black or bush universities, as they were derogatorily referred to. Pampallis (1991) mentions that the nationalist government ensured that mostly Afrikaans-speaking academics who were loyal to the National Party, and who were expected to transmit the nationalist agenda of a superior race, staffed black universities.

All the same, I have opted to look at the two institutions from their colonial past, as this may place into perspective the values upon which these institutions were founded, alongside the values that are promoted by these institutions today. I also want to draw people's attention to the fact that exclusion in higher education did not necessarily begin with the National Party

Government in 1948; the institutions in my study have had a long history that promoted difference, long before apartheid was institutionalised. I also want to illustrate the change in organisational culture in current times while examining whether the past influences the present.

The OECD Review (2008) points out that a number of policies that necessitate institutional change have been published since 1994 to replace the inequitable exclusion policies in South Africa. The divisive apartheid practices in higher education have been replaced by policies that seek to foster new habits and behaviours. Of important was the publishing of White Paper 3 (Department of Education 1997). White Paper 3 outlined the manner in which higher education functions, with the key principles being to foster redress and the promotion of equity. In the context of my study, redressing past inequalities may well be described as the granting of equitable access to higher education, thus also giving black students from impoverished schools an unprejudiced opportunity to also gain access to higher education.

This analysis therefore has been conducted by taking into consideration the past histories of these institutions, and thus trying to understand if the histories of these institutions have a strong influence on their new and progressive policies.

The succeeding paragraphs introduce the present features of these institutions, and this will be followed by the analysis of their policy structures.

4.3 The institutions' perceptions of self

According to the preamble written by University A's principal on its website, University A is a cosmopolitan university with a diverse cultural influence that brings together a blend of different forms of knowledge and thinking. It is said that diverse traditions characterise the experience of

students when studying at this university. The preamble goes on to state that students are also exposed to a life of leadership and service through social engagement, because University A is committed to producing graduates who are not only well educated, but also mindful of the responsibilities of democratic citizenship, a basis upon which this university makes its most profound contribution to the development and transformation of the South African society at large[8].

The most important feature that is worth mentioning about University A is the university's academic reputation, which, according to the university's overview, is underpinned by its distinctive research and the faculty that possesses strong academic values, which they eagerly impart to their students. The university further mentions that their alumni are outstanding contributors to the larger society, and this is cited as testimony of the university's academic excellence.

University B, on the other hand, also perceives itself as the provider of a unique campus atmosphere that is attractive to all students, both local and foreign, who seek excellence in their academic lives. The institution's website goes on to state that the university's architecture from various eras attests to its culture, which provides a sound academic foundation and the establishment of an institution of excellence. The university also boasts the creation of a new vision that is to take it through the 21st century. The new vision includes the institution's initiatives that involve using their resources in search of sustainable solutions to improve the quality of life of people in both South Africa and Africa at large, by eradicating poverty,

---

[8] Source: http://www.uct.ac.za/about/welcome/english/

promoting human dignity and health, promoting democracy and human rights, promoting safety and security, and promoting a sustainable environment and a competitive industry[9].

University B's website, like that of University A, goes on to talk about its pursuit of excellence, and lists all the achievements that the university is proud of, including being rated one of the leading tertiary institutions based on research output, student pass rates, and rated academics and scientists in South Africa.

I would say that the self-perceptions of these two institutions are very similar, especially when they discuss their traditions of academic excellence and their quest to attain recognition as centres of excellence in higher education according to world standards[10]. In the next paragraphs I begin examining the policy statements of the two institutions to investigate if their perceptions of self match their procedures and policies.

4.4 The institutions' policy statements

As indicated in the introduction to this chapter, my focus is on examining the rules and regulations of the two institutions to try to discover the causes of the internal exclusion of black students from impoverished schools. The policy documents that I have chosen to examine are the admissions policies, student diversity and equity policies, and student finance policies, as I envisage that they may be in a position to answer my research question. I have decided to leave

---

[9] Source: http://www.sun.ac.za/english/about-us/Why-SU

[10] Sources: http://www.sun.ac.za/english/about-us/Why-SU
        http://www.uct.ac.za/about/intro/history/

out the student throughput and retention figures, which I had included in my initial proposal, because both institutions attest to be having problems with maximising the numbers of students they graduate. The admissions policies, student diversity and equity policies, and student finance policies therefore are sufficient, since they could explain the exclusionary features within these institutions' processes. The data also may outline the strategies that support the inclusion of black students from impoverished schools in the historically advantaged higher education institutions, or the lack of such strategies.

4.4.1 How do the historically advantaged institutions conceptualise the recruitment of students from impoverished schools?

In my analysis of the data related to this question I looked at the admissions policies and student diversity and equity policies of the two institutions. My frame of reference was White Paper 3: A Programme for the Transformation of Higher Education (Department of Education 1997:1.1), which lays the foundation for the transformation agenda in higher education and states that higher education needs to address social needs and redress the inequalities created by South Africa's fragmented past. On the basis of this question I therefore sought to understand how the two institutions have theorised and streamlined their policies of redress in a manner that they are able to level the inequitable past that is higher education being reserved for the privileged (Department of Education 1997:4.3). I address the institutions separately below.

4.4.1.1 University A's admissions policy

To redress past inequalities, University A's admissions policy describes its policy framework as designed to ensure that this English-medium institution has a student body that is diverse and reflects the demography of the South African population.

Following this, the admissions policy introduces a somewhat intricate declaration that stresses that, although the institution concerns itself with "access and redress", it seeks to recruit the best students, because University A works very hard to promote the institution's success and maintain its academic reputation. Thus, one aspect implies the acknowledgement of University A's historical inadequacies while looking forward with their transformational agenda to include historically marginalised groups, while the other aspect categorically explains the university's interest in recruiting only the 'best' students who have potential to be part of this institution.

What is striking about University A's guidelines for admission and its student equity policy is that the policy reaffirms the university's stance of redress, and emphatically states that they have clear redress policies for admission, and apply these as a matter of conviction and because the law require it[11]. The institution is equally vocal about the type of students it recruits. One therefore cannot help but wonder if the aspect of recruiting the best students is not used as part of this institution's hidden agenda in order to prevent the massification of students from impoverished schools, which might lead to the institution eroding its status. Nevertheless, the policy document further articulates that this institution has an obligation to provide redress for past racially-based discrimination in South African society, schools and public higher education, and that they acknowledge that the effects of pre-1994 discrimination still remain in the South African society.

To meet the institution's inclusion obligation, the admissions policy states that, for the 2013/2014 cycle, applicants were invited to stipulate in their application the groups they belong

---

[11] Source: https://www.uct.ac.za/downloads/uct.ac.za/about/policies/admissions_policy_2012.pdf

to, i.e. whether they belong to historically disenfranchised groups, namely black, Indian, coloured or Chinese South Africans. If the applicant from a historically disenfranchised group chooses not to categorise him/herself, the policy document explains that the applicant would then be treated as an applicant in the open admissions category, which is a category reserved for those who do not need redress recognition for admission.

The admissions policy document further mentions that the population group measure is used by the university with the intention that it would allow the institution to give disadvantaged South Africans of ability the opportunity to develop their full potential. Finally, the policy document states that University A is still working on a new measure for future recruitment endeavours, which would bring about a redress policy that would target students who were disadvantaged in the past and the present. Those regarded, as presently disadvantaged are students from impoverished schools.

Being a member of the historically disadvantaged groups does not necessarily mean that one was guaranteed admission, although University A's student equity policy promotes flexibility with regard to granting access to these students. Despite this, the policy document stipulates other requirements that prospective students have to meet to be admitted as students of this institution. The minimum admission requirement for the Bachelor's degree in South Africa is a National Senior Certificate (NSC), with an achievement rating of 4[12]. University A's admissions requirements explain that the NSC is not the be-all and end-all of admissions, but rather that admission to all undergraduate students is competitive, so they use an Admissions Points Score

---

[12] Rating 4 is a qualification at Level 4 on the National Qualifications Framework (NQF).

(APS) and Faculty Points Score (FPS) to assess potential students' performance at school, in addition to the NSC results. Class size also determines how the recruitment process flows. In addition, the students need to take the National Benchmark Test (NBT). University A asserts that their scoring processes are flexible, with historically disadvantaged students being granted concessions. For example, if 10 is the total score that a potential student needs to acquire, the historically disadvantaged students are allowed to produce a total score of 8 to be granted access to the institution.

As brief background, the NBTs were commissioned by Higher Education South Africa (HESA) to assess the academic readiness of first-year students. The idea with the NBT is to assess the ability of the candidates in the following areas: Academic Literacy (AL), Quantitative Literacy (QL) and Mathematics (MAT). AL and QL can be joined together under Academic and Quantitative Literacy (AQL). The results of this test are used to better inform learners and universities about the level of academic support that may be required for the successful completion of programmes. The results are also supposed to be used by universities in course development, programme planning and placement decisions. The results may also be used to make up a specific proportion of the applicant's score.

Nevertheless, University A's admissions policy states that not all applicants are expected to write MAT, that the Faculties of Humanities and Law write AQL tests only, but that the NBT is crucial for admission because if potential students do not write the test, their applications for admission to the institution are likely to be declined.

Be that as it may, the interpretation I have given above is of the current admissions policy, whereas the university is set to introduce new policies for 2016. The proposed admissions policy aims to improve on the university targets for redress, thus trying to ensure that the student body is diverse and representative of the South African population. The institution also aims to relax its selection processes, thus acknowledging a lack of an enabling environment for poor students. The quality of schools attended, the education levels of the parents and grandparents, income and dependence on social grants, and the language spoken by the parents should this be different from the medium of school education (English and Afrikaans) will also be taken into consideration. The implication I draw is that historically disadvantaged students will be given an extra score that would acknowledge their disadvantaged status. Needless to say, the institution intends to keep the NSC and NBT assessments, and the additional score will be added to the NSC and NBT scores. Finally, the proposed admissions policy still maintains that the selected students ought to have a high probability of graduating.

I will not dwell much on the above, since the policy document is still in its proposal phase. However, I want to indicate that some of the proposed inclusion notions can still be seen in the current policy – that is, the only new proposal is the measure of disadvantage that the institution intends to introduce. The selection band seems new, but somehow it also tends to lean towards a quota system, which can easily work against black students from impoverished schools.

4.4.1.2 University B's admissions policy

University B's admissions policy, on the other hand, begins by drawing provisions from the HE Act 101 of 1997 and the Promotion of Equality and Prevention of Unfair Discrimination Act, Act

4 of 2000, explaining these acts as the frame of reference for the institution's policy structures. By this the institution affirms its commitment to promoting diversity. The admissions policy goes on to explain that University B is committed to the pursuit of responsible coherence between national and institutional objectives with regard to important principles such as institutional autonomy, academic freedom and public accountability. To attain coherence, the policy document set out that University B's focus is to extend its academic excellence by upholding standards of high academic achievement, maintaining and improving its high success rate, while honouring the university's commitment to redress and the shaping of future leaders. The implication is that, although University B strives for the inclusion of the historically disenfranchised, the university is committed to granting access only to those students who fit into University B's virtue of academic excellence. Even if students are from economically needy circumstances, they have to have academic potential to study at University B.

University B's policy document also explains that gaining access to this institution is highly competitive because there are limited places available, and because of the university' strategic and purposeful enrolment. Although the policy document does not mention it, I got the sense that the university's strategic and purposeful enrolment refers to a quota system. Since it is not clarified well, it may be assumed that the university plans to allow only a handful of black students into their system. Anyway, the policy document further mentions that since 2013, undergraduate students who apply for places at University B are also expected to take the NBT test. According to the admissions policy, the test scores are used to assist students with additional

marks to gain access to specific faculties. The historically disadvantaged students are also granted concessions in their scores[13].

Apart from the above, the admissions policy alludes to University B's language policy, which emphasises Afrikaans as the medium of instruction at this institution because of the institution's because the university uses Afrikaans to empower a large and diverse community that wishes to go through university in Afrikaans. Apart from that, the language policy states that keeping Afrikaans as medium of instruction is also meant to preserve culture, since Afrikaans is a standard language that has functioned as an academic language for decades and that the university sees as a national asset, since it represents one of the stronger language communities in the country. The policy document goes on to explain that, among both students and staff, speakers of Afrikaans are in the majority at University B[14].

Despite the university having Afrikaans as a default language, the language policy document explains that University B is committed to multilingualism in that the university takes into consideration the multicultural and multilingual reality of South Africa by, alongside the particular focus on Afrikaans, also taking English and isiXhosa into account. It is further mentioned that English is sometimes used as the language of undergraduate learning and instruction, depending on the language abilities of the lecturer and the composition of the students and programme.

---

[13] Source:
http://www.sun.ac.za/english/Documents/Yearbooks/2014/WEB_2014%20Part%201%20General.pdf#search=admissions%20policy pages 93-105

[14] Source: http://www.sun.ac.za/english/policy/Documents/LangPolFinal2002.pdf#search=language%20policy
 Pages 2

Thus, to answer my first question: How do the historically advantaged institutions conceptualise the recruitment of students from impoverished schools? The inferences I have made are that the two institutions indicate that their students need to be academically strong, and proficient in English in the case of University A and proficient in Afrikaans in the case of university B, in addition to their NSC results. University A's admissions requirements are benchmarked on the NSC results and the AQL results, and the student should also have done well in their FPS. For University B an applicant also ought to have met the subject requirements for admission, and ought to have fared well in their NBT assessment. The problem with this is that Afrikaans is challenging for many black students from impoverished schools, and they may fare badly in the NBT assessments, since anecdotal evidence states that these students go through a poor quality of primary and secondary schooling (Mdepa & Tshiwula 2012:23). This therefore means that black students from impoverished schools may not have enough cultural capital for these assessments. For those who might rise above the assessment challenges, Afrikaans may turn out to be the language of instruction in their faculties, which may also be a frustrating factor that might lead to some students dropping out of university.

4.4.2 Do the historically advantaged institutions have retention strategies?

According to Scott and Letseka's (2009) study on student inclusion and exclusion at the University of the Witwatersrand (Wits), interviews conducted for the Student Retention and Graduate Destination Study revealed that institutional culture impacts on retention, and that Wits had an alienating culture that led to feelings of exclusion and lack of belonging, especially for previously disadvantaged individuals, although some students felt it was not as bad as in the past. Scott and Letseka then identified points of power that sustain this state of affairs among students.

66

Students from different population groups cited a number of issues for dropping out of university. Lack of funds, failing of courses and little self-confidence were among the reasons, and black students cited no induction programmes the most. For this sub-question I therefore am using this set of circumstances as point of reference. This means that in the analysis of policy for this question, I focus on how the two institutions plan financial assistance for their students, since a lack of funds was scored as most challenging for black students, and analyse their development programmes, since a lack of confidence, failing courses and no induction were also seen as problems. The development programmes will be addressed in my last question, since I am assuming that they will focus more on "lived" experience. My analysis is geared primarily towards understanding the structures developed to retain students, and the impact of these structures on the external and internal exclusion of black students from impoverished schools.

4.4.2.1 University A's financial policies

Driven by the provisions of Education White Paper 3 (Department of Education 1997a), the Higher Education Act of 1997 (Department of Education 1997b) and the National Plan for Higher Education of 2001, which require of education institutions to address past inequities through various processes of redress and development, University A's introductory statement mentions the university's commitment to providing a broad-based financial assistance programme, and that financial assistance at this institution is a combination of the National Student Financial Aid Scheme (NSFAS) and the university's bursary funding. The university also guarantees that, in terms of their financial assistance programme, no student/applicant who applies on time and qualifies for aid will pay more than the expected family contribution determined by the government's National Means Test to calculate financial eligibility. The test calculates an expected family contribution that the student and his/her family/guardian need to

67

contribute towards the approved cost of attendance. A provision in the institution's policy stipulates that no financially needy student would pay more than his/her expected family contribution unless they incur costs not covered by the financial aid policy.

University A's financial assistance guidelines state that financial aid is only awarded to students who are financially needy and academically competent, or have a high level of academic achievement. The money can be used to pay for study-related costs as determined by the donor, such as tuition fees, accommodation, meals and books. Most importantly, funding is also linked to academic competence or achievement; since donors want to be sure that their money is spent on students who take their education seriously. The idea is that even financially needy students need to be academically competent to qualify for financial aid.

University A awards financial aid in the form of bursaries, loans and scholarships. Bursaries awarded to students are mostly from private companies, NGOs, government departments and Sector Education and Training Authorities (SETAs), although the university sometimes facilitates the process. Attached to these awards is a set criteria (such as financial need, academic merit, field of study, gender, and place of birth). The donor decides what study-related costs will be covered. Students who complete their studies successfully usually do not have to repay a bursary, but some bursaries do include a service contract with the company granting the bursary. Loans are monies lent to students on condition that they will repay after completion of their studies. These are contractual, and the students are expected to pay them back in a given time frame. Scholarships are merit based, granted on a student's past or present academic excellence. Scholarships have no conditions attached.

The eligibility criteria for all include that the candidate is a South African citizen or in possession of permanent residency status. The student should be in pursuit of his/her first undergraduate qualification, and be financially needy. Lastly, the policy document explains that the applicant should not be under administrative order, meaning that the person should not be undergoing debt counselling. What is unexpected about this is that it seems as if the "sins of the father are being visited upon the son", because my assumption is that these students may just be entering university at the age of 18, 19 or 20 and may never have had debts, unless this implies that their parents should not be under administrative order.

Nevertheless, students who want to apply for financial aid can download the application form online or obtain a hard copy in the admissions pack sent to students. After completion, the form is taken to the Financial Aid Office before the deadline. If the National Student Financial Aid Scheme (NSFAS) funding is insufficient to meet costs, University A provides top-up funding. Applicants who are not eligible for NSFAS funding may be considered for University A's funding subject to available funds, but only those who applied for financial aid via the university are considered. Finally, eligible students are automatically considered for renewal of their funding based on academic performance each year and the number of years of study. No student is funded for longer than the minimum duration of the programme plus one additional year.

It is understandable to give the students an extra year's grace in addition to the duration of the course, since some may still need to complete a module or two to finish the course. However, what is intriguing is the manner by which University A facilitates NSFAS funding. How can one not qualify for NSFAS if one is needy, unless the parent's administrative order is used against

the student? Also, that the student is to apply to University A for private bursaries may also lead to exclusion. I have gone through University A's Financial Assistances Application Form to see if is user friendly. Unfortunately it is not, as there are so many unnecessary documents that a potential student needs to submit, such as Bond Statements and a copy of the Lease Agreement if the student lives in rented accommodation, to mention but a few. One can only wonder what might happen to a student who cannot submit all attachments. In essence I would say that some of these requirements are exclusionary.

4.4.2.2 University B's financial policies

University B's financial assistance policy, on the other hand, begins by alluding to its inclusivity plan in terms of which it admits students of any race, colour, nationality or ethnic origin to all rights, privileges, programmes and activities generally accorded or made available to students of the university, and that the university does not discriminate on the basis of race, colour, nationality or ethnic origin in the implementation of its educational policies, its scholarship and loan programmes, or its sport programmes. Therefore the university goes to a great deal of effort to provide as much support as possible to those who gain admission but lack the financial means required. University B provides three forms of financial assistance, namely bursaries, loans and bursary loans. According to University B's Financial Aid Policy, bursaries are paid to deserving students and cover their studies in full or in part. Service agreements are sometimes attached to bursaries. Loans are provided to needy and deserving students to pay their studies in full or in part. Students are expected to pay the loan back after completion of their studies. Bursary loans are provided to needy and deserving students to pay their studies in full or in part. Depending on certain criteria, part of this loan may be converted to a bursary.

Apart from the above, present and prospective students at University B are eligible for bursaries and/or bursary loans based on scholastic or academic achievement. Candidates who obtain 85% or more in their NSC receive a rebate from the university. Life Orientation and Additional Mathematics are not considered for the rebate. Students who have good sporting abilities also receive special scholarships. University B has a list of family trusts that the students can apply for, and provides comprehensive bursary grants per faculty on their website. To apply for these bursaries, students can go straight to the website of participating donors or apply via the Financial Aid Offices. University B ensures that needy students who have been recruited to this university receive financial assistance.

As progressive as University B's financial assistance seems to be, a search of the website to look for bursaries and loans showed that most bursaries and family trust requirements can be exclusionary to the needs of black students from impoverished schools, which somehow may lead to these students dropping out. Actually, most family trust funding at University B comes from Afrikaans-speaking families who are interested in funding Afrikaans-speaking students. For those bursaries that are granted on the basis of academic excellence, most students from impoverished schools fall short. This in turn may lead to students from poor schools dropping out of university.

Ultimately, I would say that both universities have comprehensive financial assistance programmes, but unfortunately these programmes also show preferences. In most cases they look at the students' academic performance. From my point of view this is also exclusionary of many

black students from impoverished schools as they come from an immobilising schooling background.

4.4.3 In what ways have the HAIs' recruitment policies been informed by the "lived" experience of these students?

Both institutions have structures in place for intervention programmes that address the "lived" experiences and gaps that may be present between these universities and the capital that the students bring into these institutions from their impoverished schools. However, this does not necessarily mean a student will necessarily be placed in the faculty that they initially applied for. For example, at University A, a prospective student might have applied for the Faculty of Education, but if the student does not meet the criteria for the general degree he/she is considered for a place in the extended BA or B Social Science degree programme. Only students from the historically disadvantaged communities are accepted in these extended programmes.

According to the University A's admissions policy, students can only be admitted to these programmes if they show potential to succeed at the university but did not make the NSC APS scores required for general degrees, or they may not have scored well on enough on their MAT scores to be admitted to programmes with Economics and Psychology as majors. The admissions policy further explains that extended programmes are structured over four years, and students are given guidance and academic support through special lectures, tutorials and workshops. Students are also in regular consultation with academic advisors.

As much as I would like to applaud University A for trying to accommodate the "lived" experiences of black students from impoverished schools within their systems, I am uncertain how the institutions' system works. For instance, a particular student from an impoverished background may have wanted to be in the engineering faculty, but his/her APS and MAT scores do not match the institution's engineering faculty requirements. What is the justification for "downgrading" this student's ambition to BA or B Social Science? By downgrading I do not necessarily mean that these faculties are lesser than engineering, but want to point out the student's choice was something else and the institution selects to place the student in these faculties, thus making these faculties seem academically less rigorous than engineering.

At University B, on the other side, students are also admitted to the extended degree programmes (EDPs) only if they show potential for studying successful at this institution. The faculties that provide this alternative academic route are the Faculties of Arts and Social Sciences, Theology, Economic and Management Sciences, AgriSciences, Science, Engineering and Medicine and Heath Sciences. Students at University B are likely to end up with their initial preference. According to the policy document of this institution, EDPs vary from faculty to faculty. In some programmes the first year may consist of foundation modules, and in others the first academic year is spread over two years, thus lengthening the degree programme by one year. Finally, EDP classes are compulsory the student may be suspended if he/she is absent without a valid excuse, thus limiting their chances for readmission.

In essence one could argue that both institutions have fully-fledged developmental programmes, although they still have a long way to go to prevent the exclusion of students at these institutions.

For instance, if students are made to study in faculties that were not even their second or third choice, as happens at University A, they are likely to stay only a few months and drop out if they feel unchallenged or demoralised. At University B, students really have a chance to get what they wanted in the first place because of how the EDP structures. But what could make them leave would be their financial woes and the university culture, which still sees the Afrikaans as the default language. For these reasons I therefore would say that the two institutions' transformation policies still need to be re-imagined, since in their present forms they carry rules that can be exclusionary to some.

4.4 Conclusion

To conclude this chapter I want to argue that the two institutions do have equitable structures that can support the inclusion of black students from impoverished schools. However, I also want to argue that evidence exits that these institutions' exclusive traditions might somehow prevent their structures from being accommodative of black students from impoverished schools, because both institutions keep referring to students who must be academically competent or academically deserving to apply for admission and for financial assistance. Furthermore, in the analysis of the policies of these institutions I discovered a few unreasonable practices, such as having to relegate students to different courses if they did not do well on their entrance assessments, which is the practice at University A, and the language issue at University B. For instance, what happens if only one student does not speak Afrikaans in a class at University B? The class obviously will be conducted in Afrikaans and that could lead to the student feeling alienated and possibly dropping out. Another aspect is the funding issue. I went through both

institutions' funding sites and found University A to be very challenging. University B was not as challenging, but their funding policies can be exclusionary.

In the next chapter I provide a detailed interpretation of the policy recommendations in relation to how I imagine these can be improved, thus drawing from the theoretical perspectives of Young, hooks, Nussbaum, Fraser and Rancière.

Chapter 5
FINDINGS AND REFLECTIONS

5.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a discussion on the findings as presented in Chapter 4, where I presented an analysis of the admissions requirements of both University A and University B, and also presented the interventions that the two institutions have in place for the inclusion of historically disadvantaged students in their university systems. The interventions come in the form of bursaries, loans and extended degree programmes. In this chapter I discuss the exclusionary features within the transformation policies of the two universities. The discussion will be in two parts, with the first part focused on the exclusionary features, and the second part offering suggestions that could improve the processes at these institutions.

Before getting into my discussion, I would like to refer to Education White Paper 3: A Programme for the Transformation of Higher Education, where it states that:

> The principle of equity requires fair opportunities both to enter higher education programmes and to succeed in them. Applying the principle of equity implies, on the one hand, a critical identification of existing inequalities which are the product of policies, structures and practices based on racial, gender, disability and other forms of discrimination or disadvantage, and on the other a programme of transformation with a view to redress. Such transformation involves not only abolishing all existing forms of unjust differentiation, but also measures of empowerment, including financial support to

bring about equal opportunity for individuals and institutions (Department of Education 1997:1.18).

Placing the above quotation in context, I would say the key principle to achieving justice in higher education is to ensure that the principles of redress are conceptualised in a manner that ensures that past inequalities are eradicated to such an extent that a gateway is opened for equal opportunities. With that in mind, I also want to refer back to an assertion I made in Chapter 2: "Towards an understanding of inclusion and exclusion", where I alluded to Young's (2000:53) assertion that refers to the norm of inclusion being a powerful means to criticise the legitimacy of nominally democratic processes and decisions that have been taken. Hence, I use the two declarations as my point of reference for the discussions in this chapter. Moreover, Education White Paper 3, which offers the principles that should frame the policies of the two universities in my study, and Young's theoretical perspective ground my thoughts.

When I began this study, my investigation was focused intently on finding if there was internal exclusion of black students from impoverished schools by historically advantaged institutions, thus trying to ascertain the reasons behind black students leaving historically advantaged universities before they even graduate (Boughey 2012:136; Mdepa & Tshiwula 2012:23). As my investigation progressed I discovered that University A and University B's policies possess features that can also make it difficult for black students from impoverished schools to even gain access to higher education, which drew me to the conclusion that maybe the few black students that have gained access to these institutions could be from privileged schools and former Model C schools.

Based on this assumption, I want to conclude that cultural traditions in these institutions may have more to do with black students leaving before they graduate. So, the discussion in this chapter will focus on two subjects, namely the customary notion of excellence and the issue of language, since these two aspects seem to possess features that could be exclusionary towards black students from poor schools.

To problematise my findings, I first want to quote Osler and Starkey (2010:61), who argue that "if discriminatory elements of exclusion are overlooked, there is a danger that the complex nature of exclusion will not be understood and that measures to address it will be inadequate". Bearing this assertion in mind I would say that in order for the two universities to achieve adequate transformation, their policies should be able to address the discriminatory elements that came with segregation and structural inequality (Pampallis 1991:175). In the context of this study I want to argue that the most important discriminatory element that ought to be removed is the non-recognition of the socio-economic standing of black students from impoverished schools as this hinders their chances of gaining access to the historically advantaged institutions. Fraser (1997) argues that the denial of recognition can impair persons in their positive understanding of self. In this case, because of the constant exclusion of black students from impoverished schools, the students might end up doubting their academic abilities.

While weighing up my findings according to this outlook I also want to argue that, overall, there seem to be no improvements from the past, as the historically advantaged institutions in my study still have exclusive sets of rules. An example of this is the notion of excellence, which serves as the be-all and end-all for both universities in my study. Bleiklie (2011:21) explains that

in the past the notion of excellence in higher education was seen as a form of virtue that is expressed by the outstanding quality of academic work, and further states that in recent years however, the notion of excellence has increasingly come to be attached to the standing that universities receive after their strengths against all the universities' core missions – teaching, research, knowledge transfer and international outlook have been examined. In the case of my study, in the past the notion of excellence was attached to racial discrimination, and presently the notion of excellence is attached to competitive economic and political entrepreneurialism that is driven by world powers as Bleiklie alludes to. Nevertheless since University A and University B are firm on the notion of excellence being a criterion to gain access to these universities, one may want to associate their standpoint to two factors, one would be these universities' historical exclusionary past, and the second being the institutions trying hard to attain global recognition as universities that are known for global knowledge transfer.

To explain this further I want to refer back to Chapter 4's discussion on "the institutions' perception of self". Both institutions mention that they are reputable for their academic excellence, and the University B going further to talk of the QS (Quacquarelli Symonds) world rankings[15]. Both institutions have also attested to being havens for all students, both local and foreign, who seek excellence in their academic lives. If one looks at these proclamations alongside the socio-economic circumstances of black students from impoverished schools, one would argue that black students from poor schools are deliberately excluded. However, unlike in the apartheid era, when the notion of excellence was used to endorse the social standing of whites (Pampallis 1991:184), the notion of excellence could be a means to limit the number of

---

[15] Source: http://www.sun.ac.za/english/about-us/Why-SU

black students who want to gain access to the historically advantaged institutions because they can become a burden with their limitations.

On this note I would say it has been an open secret that black students from impoverished schools still fall short of the requirements demanded by institutions similar to those in my study because of their lower socio-economic status, which predetermines their poor schooling. Mdepa and Tshiwula (2012:23) distinctly allude to this in their study, "Student diversity in South African higher education", when they say that the poor quality of primary and secondary schooling in the poorer areas still prohibits students from gaining access to higher education. Despite this, University A and University B still expect black students from poor schools to excel in the same manner that privileged students excel. In the same breath, I am not suggesting that black students from impoverished schools do not have potential to excel, but rather that their socio-economic status prevents them from developing their capacities so that they are on a par with their privileged black counterparts. Nussbaum (2000:5) states that the most humane way in which policies are to be developed for the inclusion of people is to focus on what people are actually able to do and to be. So to insist that black students from impoverished schools bring along identical cultural capital to those who attend well-resourced schools in order to gain access to these institutions is illogical and scornful of their plight, and this mindset constitutes marginalisation at its worst.

Young (1990:54), in explaining how marginalisation works, likens the plight of black students from impoverished schools to the plight of the aged and the disabled, who at most times are reliant on government generosity for their survival. Young says the marginalisation of the aged

and disabled happens when they are subjected to patronising, punitive and arbitrary treatment endorsed by policies and people associated with welfare bureaucracies. In the context of my study, I would say it is patronising and punitive for the universities in my study to enforce rules that are known to place black students from impoverished schools at a disadvantage, especially since the black students' socio-economic standing and lived experiences limit them. More to the point is that whatever limitations these students possess are not their own doing, but was contributed to by history.

Although the picture is not encouraging, inroads have been made. Some of the interventions presented in Chapter 4 have the potential to accommodate black students from all walks of life, but only if the institutions in my study can take time to reflect, question and re-imagine their intentions for and approaches to the notion of inclusion. It is also stimulating to know that University A is working tirelessly to improve their admissions policies. In the next paragraphs I present some of the aspects that need to be re-evaluated.

5.2 Analysis and discussion of the admissions policies of the institutions in my study

On the question of how the two institutions conceptualise the recruitment of black students from impoverished schools, the admission policies suggest that both University A and University B recruit new undergraduate students using demographic quotas, with University A having a policy framework that articulates the university's desire to have a student body that mirrors the demography of the South African population. This outlook is a little unrealistic, since according to this university's policies class size determines student numbers. So, considering that black

students are a majority and many of them are from poor schools with little or no capital for gaining access to University A, this means that this measure would need to be re-evaluated.

What is confusing is that University A's admissions policy states that the institution has an obligation to provide redress for past racially-based discrimination in South African society, schools and public higher education, and that they acknowledge that the effects of pre-1994 discrimination still remain in the South African society, yet their policies still exclude black students from impoverished schools. That applicants in the 2013/2014 cycle were invited to stipulate in their application forms the groups they belong to – whether they belong to historically disenfranchised groups, namely black, Indians, coloured or Chinese South Africans, did not seem to help black students from impoverished schools, as their National Senior Certificate (NSC) results combined with the National Benchmark Tests (NBTs) and Faculty Points Score (FPS) reflect their limitations. As Mdepa and Tshiwula (2012:23) have mentioned, these students lack the cultural capital for historically advantaged universities. Suffice it to say that those black students who manage to produce good or acceptable scores sometimes have to go through the extended degree programme (EDP). What may well be seen as alienating in the EDP is that it seems restricted to BA or B Social Science. To satisfy my curiosity about EDP being restricted, I called University A's Admissions Office to find out if there was an EDP for engineering. I was told that there was, but that the university does not advertise it since students would not exert themselves with the hope of getting into the engineering studies extended programme. Again this takes me back to the notion of excellence being at play. As it is, one would then argue, any student who wishes to study engineering would exclude himself/herself if his/her FPS were low, since EDP for this field is not made tangible.

I also want to relate another exclusive feature of University A's policies. A student whom I know through the bursary programme that I manage applied to study Chemical Science at University A in 2011. He was not accepted into this programme but was accepted for their extended programme. Unfortunately the extended programme was in Social Sciences, this student decided to exclude himself and went to study at another university, where he recently completed his BSc Biotechnology degree. Because he wanted so much to be part of University A, he went back as a first-year student in Chemical Science, and the institution has readily accepted him into the programme because he brings the cultural capital that these universities seek, which incidentally is associated with the notion of excellence, and the reality that the student did not have to write the NBT and FPS since he already had an undergraduate or first degree. As much as the student eventually gained access to the course and the university of his choice, it does not make this detour fair, as some students would not be as resilient and would easily be crushed to the extent that they quit higher education altogether.

Apart from the recruitment exclusion, University A's financial assistance programme also offers bursaries and loans using the notion of excellence as criterion. This is corroborated by University A's policy statement that states that financial aid is only awarded to students who are financially needy and academically competent, or have a high level of academic achievement. The question is: what chances do learners from impoverished schools have to acquire financial support from this institution?

University B's admissions policy, on the other hand, seems flexible because their NBT scores are used to augment the students' NSC results, unlike at University A, where these scores are

counted independently of each other. Also, if the student is admitted to the extended programme, s/he is able to get into the course of his/her choice. The similarity to University A, however, lies in their emphasis on the notion of excellence. For instance, although University B seems flexible, their admissions policies do indicate that they are interested in students who have the potential to excel in their studies, thus being interested in academic excellence.

Apart from their notion of excellence being exclusive, University B also has a language policy that is exclusionary. For instance, University B's language policy stipulates that Afrikaans is the default language because "culturally Afrikaans is a standard language that has for decades functioned as an academic language and is a national asset as a fully developed cultural language, and because Afrikaans is used to empower a large and diverse community that wishes to go through university in Afrikaans". In addition, the language policy further states that, Afrikaans represents one of the stronger language communities in the country[16].

If we look at University B's standpoint, one wonders this university has room for black students from impoverished schools at all. For instance, the university policies speak of the preservation of the Afrikaans language, as well as looking out for the majority of people who still want to be taught in Afrikaans. This can be interpreted as the university not necessarily being eager to include a large contingent of black students, since Afrikaans is second or third language for most of them. Another exclusionary factor is that the language policy explicitly states that, "unless otherwise determined, Afrikaans applies automatically in all undergraduate modules. Any deviation in undergraduate modules from this default position will be allowed only after the

---

[16] Source: https://www.uct.ac.za/downloads/uct.ac.za/about/policies/admissions_policy_2012.pdf

reasons have been thoroughly considered"[17]. After all is said and done one could argue that this is a form of internal exclusion, as black students would eventually drop out if they cannot receive tuition in a language that they can master.

On the other hand, University B's language policy mentions the University's commitment to multilingualism. One wonders that, if University B claims to be committed to multilingualism, why is it that all languages are not given the same esteem? Also, if University B is that committed to multilingualism, it should commit to developing isiXhosa into an academic language like English and Afrikaans. By that I do not mean restricting isiXhosa to a particular course, or for situational communication, but developing isiXhosa to an extent that it enjoys the same reverence given to both English and Afrikaans.

5.3 Conclusion

This thesis is my attempt to explain that there might be a connection between the notions of excellence propagated by the historically advantaged institutions' policy structures, and their exclusion of black students from poor schools. My starting point for reaching this conclusion was to first understand the foundations on which the institutions in my study were founded. The history and traditions of these institutions gave me a broader understanding of the motivation behind the universities' policy frameworks. To explain the nature of the link, in Chapter 1 I first introduced the contextual outline of why I wanted to conduct this study. Chapter 1 also included my research question and its sub-questions, and a brief discussion of my conceptual framework, scope of study, methodology and limitations. The key question that this study responded to was:

---

[17] Source: http://www.sun.ac.za/english/policy/Documents/LangPolFinal2002.pdf#search=language%20policy
 Pages 2-3

Are black students internally excluded at historically advantaged institutions in the Western Cape? If not, what contributes to their (the students') internal exclusion? The methodological aspects relating to this study were interpretive and within a qualitative paradigm, which in a way focused on how the institutions manage their structures and how the students navigate their way within the university structures.

In Chapter 2 I proceeded to introduce my theoretical framework, which I conceived within the framework of critical theory perspectives. This means that I focused on the interpretation and explanation of the perspectives of Young, hooks, Fraser, Nussbaum and Rancière. These theorists' perspectives introduced me to varied approaches to practising the norms of inclusion. These perspectives also provided lenses to evaluate illegitimate practices of the norms of inclusion.

In Chapter 3 I mapped and described briefly the trajectory of higher education transformation in South Africa. This included the introduction of the Higher Education Act of 1997 (Department of Education 1997b), White Paper 3 of 1997 (Department of Education 1997a), and the National Plan for Higher Education and the New Funding Framework. These allowed me to put into perspective the tensions that exist within the higher education system.

Chapter 4 is based on my analysis of the policies of the two higher education institutions. I concentrated on the universities' admissions policies and some other polices developed to promote the inclusion of the historically marginalised. These policy documents gave me insight into how these institutions operate, that is their expectations of students when they enter their

systems, and what these institutions can offer. What emerged and was discussed broadly in Chapter 5 was that some of the aspects of the universities' policies indeed possess exclusionary features, especially the cornerstone of all the policies, which emphasises the virtue of excellence, which is benchmarked through the NSC, NBT assessment and FPS of students. This has proved beyond doubt that there is no room for a large number of black students who are from poor schools, since it is an open secret that their schooling places them at a disadvantage. Also, if some do make it into these institutions, the language challenges are likely to cause them to drop out, especially from the Afrikaans-medium institution. At the English-medium institution, the downgrading of students to extended programmes that were not part of the students' first choice can be regarded as exclusionary of students.

5.4 Implications and contribution

Above I have cited the notion of excellence as a concept that is exclusionary, especially for black students from impoverished schools. The language issue at University B may possibly be aligned with the notion of excellence, since it also safeguards the reverence that the University is held in. In my analysis I am not suggesting that University A and University B renounce their hard-earned esteem, but I am suggesting that they need to remove the stigma of exclusion attached to the notion of excellence. This means that these institutions need to find ways to include students from impoverished schools that are not antagonistic to the students. hooks (2003:42) says education is about healing and empowerment, hence I am suggesting that the two historically advantaged universities ought to look at their institutions as places that could undermine continuing discriminatory beliefs and practices, and therefore create policies that empower black students from impoverished schools, instead of policies that hold them back from gaining access to higher education.

My contribution in this thesis is the idea that, if the norms of inclusion take multi-dimensional approaches, they could become effective. That is, if the implementation processes look beyond diversity approaches that lead to many universities adding a handful of black students to change colour, and introduce the notion of caring the processes might be able to empower and liberate in order to promote self-determination and national development. Also, it has been mentioned extensively in this study that black students from impoverished schools are lacking as far as academic capital is concerned, so to accommodate the students universities need to take into consideration that as a nation our needs and goals are different to the needs of the international communities and that our universities' responsibility lie within national needs. With that I mean the universities may still pursue their quest for recognition as universities that compete with other world universities, on the other side our universities still need to afford accessibility to those who were once deprived of higher education.

References

Bleiklie, I. 2011. Excellence, quality and the diversity of higher education system in Rostan, M & Vaira M. (eds), *Questioning excellence in higher education: Policies, experiences and challenges in national and comparative perspective*, 21–35.

Boughey, C. 2012. Social inclusion and exclusion in a changing higher education environment. *Multidisciplinary Journal of Educational Research,* 2(2): 131-151 [Online]. Available http://dxdoi.org/104471/remie.2012.07 Accessed 13 February 2014

CHE. 2004. *South African higher education in the first decade of democracy*. [On line] Available http://www.che.ac.za/sites/default/files/publications/SA_HE_10years_Nov2004.pdf Accessed 19 March 2014.

Department of Education. 1997a. *Education White Paper 3*: *Programme for the transformation of higher education*. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Department of Education. 1997b. *Higher Education Act 101 of 1997*. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Department of Education. 2001. *National Plan for Higher Education*. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Department of Education. 2014 *Education White Paper for Post-School Education and Training: Building an expanded, effective and integrated post-school system*. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Department of Higher Education. 2004. *A New Funding Framework: How government grants are allocated to higher education institutions* [Online]. Available http://www.dhet.gov.za/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=ZIpvOJ7GheM=&tabid=411&mid=1369 Accessed 19 March 2014.

Elder, GH Jr, Pavalko, EK & Clipp, EC. (eds) 1993. *Working with archival data studying lives: Quantitative Applications in the Social Science Series*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications Inc.

Fraser, N. 1997. *Justice interruptus: Critical reflections on the "postsocialist" condition*. New York: Routledge.

hooks, b. 2003. *Teaching community: A pedagogy of hope*. New York: Routledge.

Jansen, JD. 2002. Political symbolism as policy craft: explaining non-reform in South African education after apartheid*, Journal of Education Policy,* 17:2, 199-215.

Mdepa, W & Tshiwula, L. 2012. Student diversity in South African higher education. *Widening Participation and Lifelong Learning,* 13: 19-33.

Neuman, L. 1997. *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Third edition. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Nussbaum, MC. 2000. *Women and human development: The capabilities approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

OECD. 2008. *Review of national policies for education: South Africa* [Online]. Available http://www.education.gov.za/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=sKsxhYorWOk%3D&tabid=452&mid=1034 Accessed 13 March 2014.

Osler, A & Starkey, H. 2010. *Changing citizenship democracy and inclusion in education*. Berkshire: Open University Press.

Pampallis, J. 1991. *Foundations of the new South Africa*. Cape Town: Maskew Miller Longman (Pty) Ltd.

Rancière, J. 1991. *The ignorant schoolmaster: Five lessons in intellectual emancipation*. Redwood: Stanford University Press.

Ritchie, J & Lewis, J. 2003. *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers*. London: Sage Publications Inc.

Scott, G & Letseka, M. 2009. Student exclusion and exclusion at the University of Witwatersrand. [On line] Available http://www.hsrcpress.ac.za/file:///C:/Users/cngwenya/Downloads/Scott_G_and_Letseka__M__2010.__Chapter_3__Student_Iinclusion_and_Exclusion_at_the_University_of_the_Witwatersrand.pdf Accessed 25 May 2014.

Steyn, AGW & De Villiers, AP. 2005. *Public funding of higher education in South Africa by means of formulae*. Pretoria: Council on Higher Education.

Young, IM. 1990. *Justice and the politics of difference*. Oxfordshire: Princeton University Press.

Young, IM. 2000. *Inclusion and democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Waghid, Y. 2003. *Democratic education: Policy and praxis*. Stellenbosch: Stellenbosch University Printers.