The cost of fiscal subsidies to higher education students in South Africa: A comparison between 2000 and 2006

KEYWORDS: GOVERNMENT SUBSIDIES, NATIONAL GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURE, EDUCATION
JEL: H2, H5, I2

PIERRE DE VILLIERS
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS UNIVERSITY OF STELLENBOSCH

PRIVATE BAG X1, 7602
MATIELAND, SOUTH AFRICA
E-MAIL: APDV@SUN.AC.ZA

UNIVERSITEIT STELLENBOSCH UNIVERSITY

A WORKING PAPER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS AND THE BUREAU FOR ECONOMIC RESEARCH AT THE UNIVERSITY OF STELLENBOSCH

# The cost of fiscal subsidies to higher education students in South Africa: A comparison between 2000 and $2006^{1}$ 

PIERRE DE VILLIERS ${ }^{2}$


#### Abstract

In this analysis the expenditure (subsidy) on higher education institutions (HEIs) in South Africa is compared for 2000 and 2006. The analysis was done with headcounts of students as well as with full-time equivalent student numbers. A second method was followed where a distinction was made between the number of students enrolled in the social sciences and those enrolled in the natural sciences. It is found that Subsidies of the African, coloured and Indian students in general deteriorated slightly compared to the subsidy levels of whites. However, with the calculations for contact full-time equivalent students according to field of study it was found that either the other racial groups' relative situation improved over time or they received higher subsidies than the white group.
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## 1. Introduction

In this analysis the expenditure (subsidy) on higher education institutions (HEIs) in South Africa is compared for 2000 and 2006. In 2000 the HE sector was divided into 21 universities and 15 technikons, but after 2004 the number of HEIs was reduced to 23. This makes comparisons between 2000 and 2006 impossible if you want to compare the previous system with the one in 2006. Even comparisons between individual institutions in most cases do not make sense due to the mergers that took place in 2004 and left very few institutions unchanged. The best comparison one can make is to look at average subsidies for the whole system and to compare it between racial groups. This is what will be presented in this analysis.

## 2. Method of analysis

The analysis was done with headcounts of students as well as with full-time equivalent student numbers. Although headcounts can portray the overall picture, it may give the wrong impression. A full-time student taking the full complement of modules prescribed for an academic programme in a specific year will have a full-time equivalent (FE) value of one. If only one or two modules are followed the FE value will be much smaller than one. Students are subsidized on their FE-values and not headcounts. The first method assumed that all students received the same subsidy at a specific institution, irrespective of their field of study or racial group. The analysis is done for all institutions and distinguishes between racial groups.

A second method was followed where a distinction was made between the number of students enrolled in the social sciences and those enrolled in the natural sciences. This distinction is made because subsidies in natural sciences are much larger than those paid to students in the social sciences. Different fields of study are subdivided into 21 CESM (classification of educational subject matter) categories. These categories are subdivided into four funding groups with the ratio of the size of the subsidy between these funding groups being equal to $1: 1.5: 2.5: 3.5$, but the four funding groups are not strictly divided into social and natural sciences (See Diagram 1). A rule of thumb is that the subsidy of natural sciences is on average approximately 2.55 times the subsidy paid to a student in the social sciences. In this analysis it was thus assumed that the per capita subsidy of a student in natural sciences is 2.55 times as large as the subsidy paid to students in social sciences.

## Diagram 1

Classification of education subject matter (CESM) into funding groups

| Funding group | CESM categories included in funding group |
| :---: | :--- |
| 1 | 07 Education, 13 Law, 14 Librarianship, 20 Psychology, 21 Social <br> Services/Public Administration |
| 2 | 04 Business/Commerce, 05 Communication, 06 Computer Sciences, <br> 12 Languages, 18 Philosophy/Religion, 22 Social Sciences |
| 3 | 02 Architecture/Planning, 08 Engineering, 10 Home Economics, <br> 11 Industrial Arts, 16 Mathematical Sciences, 19 Physical Education |
| 4 | 01 Agriculture, 03 Fine and Performing Arts, 09 Health Sciences, 15 <br> Life and Physical Sciences |

In the last instance calculations were done for contact students only because distance students get a smaller subsidy than contact students. The assumptions made in the analysis will be presented as the results are discussed.

In 2000 an amount of R437 million was awarded by government for the National Student Financial Aid Scheme (NSFAS) to help needy students and in 2006 this amount increased to R926 million. In 2000 this amount was equal to $6.2 \%$ of the subsidies paid to HEIs and in 2006 it was equal to $8.2 \%$ of that amount. NSFAS awards were not included in this analysis, because these funds are not subsidies to HEIs but payments to help needy students to pay their debt at HEIs. Keep in mind that if these amounts are added to the subsidies paid to HEIs and because $85 \%$ of NSFAS awards are paid to African students, the average subsidy of African students would increase notably. However, because it is relative small amounts the overall results will not differ that much whether it is included or not. The government's subsidies paid to HEIs used in this report does not include NSFAS awards.

## 3. Analysis for 2000

In 2000 the Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in South Africa were still divided into universities and technikons. The subsidies paid to universities were substantially higher than those paid to technikons and the 21 universities received $72.6 \%$ of the funds paid to HEIs while the 15 technikons received the remaining $27.4 \%$. One must keep this in mind when the results of the analysis are evaluated because the HE playing field changed completely in 2004. The analysis will therefore be done for the whole HE system to make the results between 2000 and 2006 comparable.

Total Expenditure on Higher Education in South Africa was taken as the amount in Vote 15 of Estimates of National Expenditure, 2001 (2002: 302-303). An amount of R30 million was earmarked for restructuring, but because it could not be linked to a specific institution it was not included in the analysis. This amount was less than $0.5 \%$ of the funds paid to HEIs.

### 3.1 Headcount

Headcount numbers in HEIs were taken from Education at a Glance 2000 (2002: 24). These numbers are available according to the four main racial groups per institution. It was assumed that no distinction was made on racial grounds with regards to expenditure patterns at HEIs. Expenditure per student (irrespective of race) in each institution was therefore the same. The amount spent on a specific racial group at all institutions was added and the accumulated total was then divided by the total number of students of that racial group at all the HEIs.

There was not much difference between the per capita expenditure for the four racial groups, as can be seen in Table 1. Keep in mind that certain differences cannot be seen in the aggregate numbers. For example, the average per capita subsidy for a university student in 2000 was R11 652, while the corresponding figure for technikons was only R8 846. Throughout the analysis the whites will be used as the control group and their average per capita subsidy will be given an index value of 100 . This method is followed because whites were the dominant group in higher education in the past who received the most funds. Subsidies paid to Africans and whites are the most important because they represented more than $88 \%$ of the headcount students in 2000 and just under $88 \%$ of the subsidy expenditure was spent on them.

## Table 1

Subsidy paid to Higher Education Institutions (all headcount students): 2000

|  | African | Indian | Coloured | White | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Enrollment \% | 60.9 | 6.6 | 5.3 | 27.2 | 100 |
| Subsidy \% | 61.2 | 6.9 | 5.5 | 26.4 | 100 |
| Per capita subsidy | R10 769 | R11 306 | R10 995 | R10 413 | R10 720 |
| Subsidy: Index value | 103.4 | 108.5 | 105.6 | 100.0 | 102.9 |

Included in Table 1 is the data for Unisa and Technikon South Africa that provided education almost exclusively to only distance students. Another calculation was done where these two institutions was omitted. The reason for this is that distance students receive only half the subsidy of contact students. By excluding these two institutions, student numbers decreased by 28.8\%
from 610131 to 434 712, but total expenditure only decreased by 10.6\% from R6 540 million to R5 844 million.

Table 2
Subsidy paid to Higher Education Institutions (excluding Unisa \& Technikon SA): 2000

|  | African | Indian | Coloured | White | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Enrollment \% | 63.4 | 5.7 | 5.3 | 25.6 | 100 |
| Subsidy \% | 62.0 | 6.7 | 5.5 | 25.8 | 100 |
| Per capita subsidy | R13 147 | R15 825 | R13 914 | R13 557 | R13 445 |
| Subsidy: Index value | 97.0 | 116.7 | 102.6 | 100.0 | 99.2 |

Except for Indians who received $17.7 \%$ more than the national average subsidy of R13 445 per student there was very little difference between the per capita expenditure for the other racial groups. This is to a large extent explained by the relative high subsidy per student that the University of Durban Westville received, as well as the fact that $41 \%$ of Indian students studied through Unisa (who received a relative small per student subsidy, but was excluded in this calculation). As expected the subsidy is also notably higher than the calculations done for all the students including Unisa and Technikon South Africa.

### 3.2 Full-time equivalent students

Like with the previous method, HE expenditure was taken as the amount in Vote 15 of Estimates of National Expenditure, 2001 (2002: 302-303). The full-time equivalent (FE) student numbers were taken from the Research Report by Steyn and De Villiers (2006: 184) for the Council of Higher Education - Higher Education Monitor No 4. It was then assumed that the racial composition of the FE student numbers was identical to the headcount numbers. In this way the total FE numbers could be converted to the number of students of each racial group at each institution. It was also assumed that the expenditure per student in each institution was identical irrespective of race. The amount spent on a specific racial group at all institutions was added and the grand total was then divided by the total number of students of that racial group at all the HEIs. In this way an average per capita subsidy per racial group could be calculated.

There is not much difference between the calculations with headcounts and this that was done with FE student numbers, because to a large extent FE students are a constant fraction of the headcounts. The subsidy per student between the four racial groups did not differ much (as can be seen in Table 3). For example, Africans received only 1\% less than the national average of R15 866 and Indians received 5\% more than this average. Once again the aggregate numbers disguise
certain differences between the individual HEIs. The subsidy in the university sector was R17 513 per student $-17.7 \%$ higher than the per capita average of R12 705 for the technikon sector.

Table 3
Subsidy paid to Higher Education Institutions (all FE students): 2000

|  | African | Indian | Coloured | White | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Enrollment \% | 61.8 | 6.6 | 5.4 | 26.1 | 100 |
| Subsidy \% | 61.2 | 6.9 | 5.5 | 26.4 | 100 |
| Per capita subsidy | R15 701 | R16 644 | R15 965 | R16 040 | R15 866 |
| Subsidy: Index value | 97.9 | 103.8 | 99.5 | 100.0 | 98.9 |

The analysis was repeated by excluding distance students and subtracting their subsidy from the total subsidy paid to HEIs. By excluding the distance students it is obvious that the average subsidy per student will increase. This is evident from Table 4.

Table 4
Subsidy paid to Higher Education Institutions (contact FE students): 2000

|  | African | Indian | Coloured | White | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Enrollment \% | 63.6 | 6.1 | 5.7 | 24.5 | 100 |
| Subsidy \% | 61.9 | 6.8 | 5.6 | 25.7 | 100 |
| Per capita subsidy | R19 002 | R21 625 | R19 168 | R20 532 | R19 548 |
| Subsidy: Index value | 92.6 | 105.3 | 93.4 | 100.0 | 95.2 |

The difference between the per capita expenditure per racial group is now larger but not substantial. Africans received $2.8 \%$ less than the national average of R19 548 per student while Indians on average received $10.6 \%$ more than this amount. Once again keep in mind that the per capita expenditure in the university sector was R22 043 per student, but only R15 068 in the technikon sector.

### 3.3 Full-time equivalent students per field of study (all students)

The expenditure on HE and the number of FE students is identical to the values used in section 3.2. The FE student numbers of both the university and technikon sector were converted to numbers according to race per field of study by means of the number of unduplicated student enrolments per race group at each institution (Department of Education website-Hemis data).

Table 5
Subsidy paid to Higher Education Institutions (all FE students): 2000

|  | African | Indian | Coloured | White | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Enrollment \% | 59.8 | 6.8 | 5.3 | 28.0 | 100 |
| Subsidy \% | 56.7 | 7.7 | 5.2 | 30.4 | 100 |
| Per capita subsidy | R15 041 | R17 992 | R15 523 | R17 178 | R15 867 |
| Subsidy: Index value | 87.6 | 104.7 | 90.4 | 100.0 | 92.4 |

The first analysis was done for all FE students. Indians received a per capita subsidy that was $13.4 \%$ higher than the national average of R15 867, while Africans received a subsidy that was $5.2 \%$ lower than this average. This is partly explained by the fact that $38.9 \%$ of Indians studied in the natural sciences, but only 26\% of Africans (See Table 6). Whites, who received a fairly high subsidy of R17 178 per student, had $35.5 \%$ of the students studying in the natural sciences with only $29.6 \%$ of Coloured students studying in the natural sciences. Except for the fairly high per capita subsidy per Indian student, there was not that much difference between the subsidies that the other racial groups received.

Table 6
Students studying in Social and Natural Sciences (all FE students): 2000

| Per cent of each racial group |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | African | Indian | Coloured | White | Total |
| Social Sciences | 74.0 | 61.1 | 70.4 | 64.5 | 70.3 |
| Natural Sciences | 26.0 | 38.9 | 29.6 | 35.5 | 29.7 |
| Per cent of total number of students |  |  |  |  |  |
| Social Sciences | 63.0 | 5.9 | 5.3 | 25.7 | 70.3 |
| Natural Sciences | 52.3 | 8.9 | 5.3 | 33.5 | 29.7 |
| Total | 59.8 | 6.8 | 5.3 | 28.0 | 100.0 |

As can clearly be seen from Table 7 there was a vast difference between the per capita subsidies paid to universities and technikons. The average subsidy (for studies in both natural and social sciences) paid to technikon students was only $73 \%$ of the value of the subsidy paid to university students. Note that Unisa and Technikon South Africa (with the majority of distance students) received much smaller per capita subsidies than the other universities and technikons respectively. The average subsidy for Unisa students was only $44 \%$ of the value of the average subsidy of university students, while the subsidy for students at Technikon South Africa was only $53 \%$ of the value of the average subsidy paid to technikon students. Differences between the different institutions and racial groups are also portrayed in Table 7.

Table 7
Average per capita subsidy according to field of study, racial group and institution (all FE students): 2000
Panel A

|  | Soc Sc | Nat Sc | Total | African | Indian | Coloured | White |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| UCT | 14592 | 37210 | 23798 | 24967 | 25497 | 22482 | 23307 |
| Durban W | 14476 | 36914 | 22005 | 20459 | 24468 | 23494 | 24994 |
| Fort Hare | 18989 | 48421 | 23842 | 23824 | n/a | n/a | 27982 |
| Free State | 13155 | 33544 | 20336 | 19143 | 20716 | 19516 | 21245 |
| Medunsa | 21104 | 53815 | 52950 | 52910 | 53609 | 52906 | 51515 |
| Natal | 13530 | 34501 | 20554 | 20152 | 20892 | 19254 | 21108 |
| The North | 15073 | 38437 | 22146 | 22121 | 29091 | 21749 | 26755 |
| North West | 12628 | 32202 | 18077 | 18082 | 16543 | 17898 | 17522 |
| UPE | 13442 | 34277 | 15601 | 14431 | 21226 | 19283 | 21389 |
| Potch | 11921 | 30399 | 16802 | 15987 | 16802 | 15362 | 17358 |
| Pretoria | 13631 | 34758 | 20814 | 16977 | 24730 | 19505 | 23884 |
| RAU | 14299 | 36461 | 17875 | 16096 | 18161 | 17151 | 19434 |
| Rhodes | 15090 | 38479 | 21623 | 20284 | 28255 | 19745 | 21530 |
| Stellenbosch | 13104 | 33415 | 20972 | 16263 | 26123 | 20778 | 21853 |
| Transkei | 21205 | 54073 | 29423 | 28895 | 50525 | n/a | 39465 |
| Unisa | 6418 | 16367 | 7430 | 7472 | 7461 | 7337 | 7386 |
| Venda | 9576 | 24419 | 14904 | 14920 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Vista | 12474 | 31808 | 14518 | 14521 | 13564 | 14882 | 13321 |
| UWC | 14530 | 37050 | 19365 | 18595 | 24329 | 19479 | 21034 |
| Wits | 14149 | 36079 | 25228 | 23401 | 28184 | 23277 | 25985 |
| Zululand | 15605 | 39793 | 21131 | 21242 | 17484 | 15605 | 20404 |
| Univ Tot | 11728 | 34183 | 17513 | 17068 | 18587 | 17088 | 18003 |
| Border Tech | 10743 | 27396 | 16654 | 16545 | 27396 | 23681 | 23392 |
| Cape Tech | 8724 | 22246 | 15507 | 14554 | 15786 | 14659 | 16580 |
| F S Tech | 9955 | 25386 | 14234 | 13004 | 16568 | 13920 | 16339 |
| Mango Tech | 9647 | 24600 | 17769 | 17755 | 20328 | 24600 | 21881 |
| ML Sultan | 8579 | 21877 | 15435 | 14405 | 17631 | 17434 | 15153 |
| Natal Tech | 9326 | 23782 | 16665 | 15082 | 19502 | 16664 | 19208 |
| N Gaut Tech | 9488 | 24195 | 14473 | 14473 | 13165 | 15371 | 13165 |
| Pen Tech | 9902 | 25251 | 16602 | 16083 | 19936 | 17392 | 18903 |
| PE Tech | 8891 | 22672 | 14907 | 14275 | 16133 | 14345 | 16314 |
| Pretoria | 7522 | 19182 | 11296 | 10303 | 14444 | 12058 | 14541 |
| Tech SA | 4874 | 12429 | 6700 | 6539 | 7477 | 6413 | 7267 |
| N West Tech | 10600 | 27030 | 14336 | 14341 | 10600 | 10600 | 10600 |
| E Cape Tech | 9488 | 24195 | 15239 | 15179 | 24195 | 22094 | 24195 |
| Vaal T Tech | 7806 | 19904 | 13352 | 13129 | 17299 | 12255 | 14736 |
| Wits Tech | 9522 | 24282 | 17280 | 16561 | 20109 | 16699 | 19791 |
| Tech Tot | 7706 | 21093 | 12706 | 12229 | 15713 | 13210 | 13887 |
| TOTAL | 10500 | 28522 | 15867 | 15041 | 17992 | 15523 | 17178 |
| Index value | - | - | 92.4 | 87.6 | 104.7 | 90.4 | 100.0 |

Table 7 (continued)
Panel B

|  | Social Sc | Index Value | Natural Sc | Index Value |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| African | 10577 | 101.4 | 27747 | 94.2 |
| Indian | 10076 | 96.6 | 30434 | 103.4 |
| Coloured | 10392 | 99.6 | 27976 | 94.1 |
| White | 10432 | 100.0 | 29445 | 100.0 |

### 3.4 Full-time equivalent per field of study of contact students

The last analysis was done for only full-time contact students (total number of students minus distance students). The FE student numbers were taken from a research report by Steyn and De Villiers (2006: 186-187). The subsidy paid to distance students was subtracted from the total subsidy each HEI received by taking into account that distance students only received half the subsidy of residential students. It was assumed that the split between natural and social sciences of distance students was the same as for the total number of students (as was assumed in Section 3.3). This analysis gives the best estimation of the subsidies paid to the contact students of the different racial groups. As expected the subsidy per contact student in Table 8 is higher than the subsidy per total FE student (that includes distance students) in Table 5.

## Table 8

Subsidy paid to Higher Education Institutions (FE contact students): 2000

|  | African | Indian | Coloured | White | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Enrollment \% | 61.9 | 6.2 | 5.6 | 26.3 | 100.0 |
| Subsidy \% | 57.4 | 7.6 | 5.3 | 29.7 | 100 |
| Per capita subsidy | R18 125 | R23 821 | R18 727 | R22 052 | R19 548 |
| Subsidy: Index value | 82.2 | 108.0 | 84.9 | 100.0 | 88.6 |

Once again the per capita expenditure on Indian students was the highest and they received $21.8 \%$ more than the national average of R19 548. African students, on the other hand received $7.3 \%$ less than this national average. As can be seen in Table 8 there is quite a difference in the per capita subsidy paid to the different racial groups, although the low value for Africans tends to indicate that they are more likely than the other groups to study part-time and thus receive a smaller subsidy.

Table 9
Students studying in Social and Natural Sciences (FE contact students): 2000

| Per cent of each racial group |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | African | Indian | Coloured | White | Total |
| Social Sciences | 69.9 | 48.5 | 64.8 | 56.3 | 64.7 |
| Natural Sciences | 30.1 | 51.5 | 35.2 | 43.7 | 35.3 |
| Per cent of total number of students |  |  |  |  |  |
| Social Sciences | 66.9 | 4.7 | 5.6 | 22.9 | 64.7 |
| Natural Sciences | 52.7 | 9.1 | 5.5 | 32.6 | 35.3 |
| Total | 61.9 | 6.2 | 5.6 | 26.3 | 100.0 |

Table 10
Average per capita subsidy according to field of study, racial group and institution
(FE contact students): 2000
Panel A

|  | Soc Sc | Nat Sc | Total | African | Indian | Coloured | White |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| UCT | 14592 | 37210 | 23798 | 24967 | 25497 | 22482 | 23307 |
| Durban W | 14476 | 36914 | 22005 | 20459 | 24468 | 23494 | 24994 |
| Fort Hare | 18989 | 48421 | 23842 | 23824 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | 27982 |
| Free State | 13796 | 35180 | 21327 | 20076 | 21726 | 20467 | 22281 |
| Medunsa | 21104 | 53815 | 52950 | 52910 | 53609 | 52906 | 51515 |
| Natal | 14955 | 38136 | 22720 | 22276 | 23094 | 21283 | 23333 |
| The North | 15073 | 38437 | 22146 | 22121 | 29091 | 21749 | 26755 |
| North West | 12628 | 32202 | 18077 | 18082 | 16543 | 17898 | 17522 |
| UPE | 16393 | 41802 | 19027 | 17600 | 25886 | 23516 | 26085 |
| Potch | 13131 | 33484 | 18507 | 17610 | 18508 | 16921 | 19115 |
| Pretoria | 15294 | 39000 | 23354 | 19048 | 27747 | 21885 | 26799 |
| RAU | 16017 | 40844 | 20023 | 18030 | 20344 | 19212 | 21770 |
| Rhodes | 15090 | 38479 | 21623 | 20284 | 28255 | 19745 | 21530 |
| Stellenbosch | 13503 | 34434 | 21612 | 16759 | 26919 | 21411 | 22519 |
| Transkei | 21205 | 54073 | 29423 | 28895 | 50525 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | 39465 |
| Unisa | 12851 | 32769 | 14876 | 14961 | 14938 | 14689 | 14788 |
| Venda | 9576 | 24419 | 14904 | 14920 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| Vista | 15215 | 38798 | 17708 | 17712 | 16544 | 18152 | 16249 |
| UWC | 14530 | 37500 | 19365 | 18595 | 24329 | 19479 | 21034 |
| Wits | 14149 | 36079 | 25228 | 23401 | 28184 | 23277 | 25985 |
| Zululand | 15605 | 39793 | 21131 | 21242 | 17484 | 15605 | 20404 |
| Univ Tot | $\mathbf{1 4 8 0 5}$ | 37743 | 22043 | 20879 | 25680 | 20835 | 23400 |

Table 10 (continued)

|  | Soc Sc | Nat Sc | Total | African | Indian | Coloured | White |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Border Tech | 10743 | 27396 | 16654 | 16545 | 27396 | 23681 | 23392 |
| Cape Tech | 8740 | 22287 | 15535 | 14580 | 15815 | 14686 | 16610 |
| F S Tech | 9950 | 25373 | 14226 | 12997 | 16560 | 13913 | 16330 |
| Mango Tech | 9647 | 24600 | 17769 | 17755 | 20328 | 24600 | 21881 |
| ML Sultan | 8612 | 21959 | 15493 | 14460 | 17697 | 17499 | 15210 |
| Natal Tech | 9326 | 23782 | 16665 | 15082 | 19502 | 16664 | 19208 |
| N Gaut Tech | 9488 | 24195 | 14473 | 14473 | 13165 | 15371 | 13165 |
| Pen Tech | 9902 | 25251 | 16602 | 16083 | 19936 | 17392 | 18903 |
| PE Tech | 8891 | 22672 | 14907 | 14275 | 16133 | 14345 | 16314 |
| Pretoria | 8570 | 21853 | 12869 | 11737 | 16456 | 13738 | 16566 |
| Tech SA | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| N West Tech | 10600 | 27030 | 14336 | 14341 | 10600 | 10600 | 10600 |
| E Cape Tech | 9488 | 24195 | 15239 | 15179 | 24195 | 22094 | 24195 |
| Vaal T Tech | 7806 | 19904 | 13352 | 13129 | 17299 | 12255 | 14736 |
| Wits Tech | 9522 | 24282 | 17280 | 16561 | 20109 | 16699 | 19791 |
| Tech Tot | 9170 | 23201 | 15068 | 14426 | 18254 | 15701 | 16975 |
| TOTAL | 12999 | 31548 | 19548 | 18125 | 23821 | 18729 | 22052 |
| Index value | - | - | 88.6 | 82.2 | 108.0 | 84.9 | 100.0 |

Panel B

|  | Social Sc | Index Value | Natural Sc | Index Value |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| African | 12763 | 93.8 | 30581 | 92.9 |
| Indian | 13782 | 101.2 | 33269 | 101.1 |
| Coloured | 12651 | 92.9 | 29921 | 90.9 |
| White | 13612 | 100.0 | 32908 | 100.0 |

From Tables 8 and 9 it is clear that the higher per capita subsidy of Indians can be explained by the fact that although they represented only $6.2 \%$ of contact student numbers, they were responsible for $9.1 \%$ of all students studying in natural sciences. This can also be explained by the fact that $39.5 \%$ of Indian students in social sciences were studying at Unisa. The result was that $51.5 \%$ of contact Indian students were studying in natural sciences. Also with white students we see a high percentage studying in natural sciences. While only $27.1 \%$ and $34.2 \%$ of African and Coloured students respectively studied in natural sciences, no less than $43.7 \%$ and of white students studied in natural sciences.

Differences between individual institutions and racial groups are summarized in Table 10. Once again the difference between technikons and universities is clear with the size of the average subsidy of a technikon student equaling only $70 \%$ of the subsidy paid per university student. The average subsidies per student paid to Unisa and Venda is much lower than the other universities
and can be explained by the above-average percentage of their students that studied in social sciences. Pretoria Technikon received the smallest subsidy per student of the technikons, but it was not out of line with the other technikons.

## 4. Analysis for 2006

In 2004 the 21 universities and 15 technikons merged into 23 institutions (16 comprehensive universities, 6 universities of technology and one technikon). Therefore the results between 2000 and 2006 are not directly comparable - even for individual institutions due to the mergers that took place and left very few HEIs unchanged. An analysis was also done separately for the comprehensive universities and the universities of technology and the one technikon, but due to the mergers there was little difference between the results of these two types of institutions (except for the last calculations done with contact FE students according to field of study). Therefore the results will mainly be restricted to the total education sector and will not distinguish between the comprehensive universities and the rest of the education system.

Total expenditure on Higher Education was taken as the amount in Vote 14 of Estimates of National Expenditure, 2006 (2006: 271). An amount of R636.7 million was earmarked for restructuring or unallocated. This amount is less than $6 \%$ of total expenditure on HE institutions and because it could not be linked to a specific institution it was not taken into consideration for the analysis.

### 4.1 Headcounts

Headcounts in HEIs was taken from Education at a Glance 2006 (2007: 24). It was assumed that the expenditure per student in each institution was identical irrespective of race. The amount spent on a specific racial group at all institutions was added and then divided by the total number of students of that racial group at all the HEIs. The calculated amounts were also deflated by the CPI to 2000 prices to make it comparable to the analysis of 2000.

Table 11
Subsidy paid to Higher Education Institutions (all headcount students): 2006

|  | African | Indian | Coloured | White | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Enrollment \% | 60.9 | 7.4 | 6.6 | 25.1 | 100 |
| Subsidy \% | 59.7 | 7.4 | 7.0 | 25.9 | 100 |
| Per capita subsidy | R13 275 | R13 565 | R14 521 | R13 994 | R13 559 |
| [2000 prices] | $[R 9 ~ 914]$ | $[R 10$ 131] | [R10 845] | [R10 451] | [R10 126] |
| Subsidy: Index value | 94.9 | 96.9 | 103.8 | 100.0 | 96.9 |

From Table 11 it is evident that there was no big difference between the spending patterns on each of the four racial groups. The lowest per capita expenditure was on Africans with R13 275 per student and the highest expenditure was on coloureds at R14 521 per student. This boils down to the highest expenditure per student (on coloureds) that was only $8.6 \%$ higher than the lowest (on Africans).

The procedure was repeated for headcounts of contact students. The institutions with the most distance students were Unisa (226 769), North West University (10 819) and University of Pretoria (7584). By excluding the distance students the number of students decreased from 740 173 to 475033 . As one would expect the average subsidy paid to contact students was much higher than the ones calculated for contact and distance students - R18 391 compared to R13 559 (See Table 12). If one looks at the average subsidy per racial group, the subsidy for Indians was the highest while the subsidy for Africans was the lowest. In this case the difference is a more substantial $16.2 \%$.

## Table 12

Subsidy paid to Higher Education Institutions (headcount contact students): 2006

|  | African | Indian | Coloured | White | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Enrollment \% | 60.6 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 25.8 | 100 |
| Subsidy \% | 57.9 | 7.3 | 7.4 | 27.4 | 100 |
| Per capita subsidy | R17 557 | R20 947 | R19 048 | R19 525 | R18 391 |
| [2000 prices] | $[R 13$ 112] | $[R 15644]$ | $[R 14$ 225] | [R14 582] | [R13 735] |
| Subsidy: Index value | 89.9 | 107.3 | 97.6 | 100.0 | 94.2 |

### 4.2 Full-time equivalent students

With this analysis the FE students were taken from Education Statistics in South Africa 2006 (2007: 38) and it was then assumed that the racial composition of FE student numbers was identical to the headcount numbers (used in Section 4.1). In this way the racial breakdown of FE students could be calculated. The first calculation was done for all FE students (contact and distance students). The results as summarized in Table 13 show a remarkable consistency with a fairly small difference between the highest subsidy value of R21 208 (for Coloureds) and the lowest value of R19 463 (for Africans).

## Table 13

Subsidy paid to Higher Education Institutions (all FE students): 2006

|  | African | Indian | Coloured | White | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Enrollment \% | 61.2 | 7.2 | 6.7 | 24.9 | 100.00 |
| Subsidy \% | 59.7 | 7.4 | 7.0 | 25.9 | 100.0 |
| Per capita subsidy | R19 463 | R20 847 | R21 208 | R20 961 | R20 162 |
| [2000 prices] | [R14 670] | [R15 569] | [R15 839] | [R15 654] | [R15 058] |
| Subsidy: Index value | 93.7 | 99.5 | 101.2 | 100.0 | 96.2 |

The next calculation was done for FE contact students only. The amount spent on each institution was reduced by subtracting the amount paid to distance students. The results are shown in Table 14. From the table it is clear that the per capita subsidy for the racial groups did not differ that much. For example, Indians received 12\% more per student than the national average of R23 928 average while Africans received $4 \%$ less than this average.

Table 14
Subsidy paid to Higher Education Institutions (FE contact students): 2006

|  | African | Indian | Coloured | White | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Enrollment \% | 62.5 | 6.3 | 7.0 | 24.2 | 100.00 |
| Subsidy \% | 60.0 | 7.1 | 7.2 | 25.7 | 100.0 |
| Per capita subsidy | R22 961 | R26 837 | R24 740 | R25 426 | R23 928 |
| [2000 prices] | [R17 147] | [R20 043] | [R18 476] | [R18 989] | [R17 870] |
| Subsidy: Index value | 90.3 | 105.5 | 97.3 | 100.0 | 94.1 |

### 4.3 Full-time equivalent according to field of study (all students)

The headcount of unduplicated student enrolment per racial group and institution was taken from the website of the Department of Education under the Hemis comprehensive statistics. The breakdown between the students studying in social sciences and natural sciences is also given. The percentage of the total number of students taking natural and social sciences as represented by each racial group in each institution was then calculated. The full-time equivalent enrolments according to field of study for all HEIs were taken from Education Statistics in South Africa (2006: 38). These enrolments were not given according to racial group and it was assumed that the proportions of FE student numbers according to racial group were the same as those calculated from the headcounts (given in the website of the Department of Education). In this way it was calculated how many FE students of each racial group at each institution took social sciences and natural sciences.

It was assumed that the subsidy for natural sciences per student is 2.55 times the subsidy paid to students in social sciences. The next step was to calculate the size of the subsidy in each institution that was paid to natural sciences and social sciences. Using FE student numbers and by making the split between students in natural and social sciences is more accurate than the first method, especially if one takes into account that in $200629.9 \%$ of the total number of students studied courses in natural sciences and 70.1\% in social sciences.

As can be seen from Table 15 Africans received 58.6\% of the funds although they were $61.3 \%$ of the students. Conversely whites, for example, who represented $24.8 \%$ of the students, received $26.9 \%$ of the funds. This can be directly linked to the number of students studying in natural sciences (that received a higher subsidy). Only $27.7 \%$ of coloured and $28.1 \%$ of African students studied in natural sciences, while the corresponding figures for Indians and whites were 33.2\% and $33.8 \%$ respectfully. With this method Indians received the highest subsidy of R22 041 per student and Africans the lowest of R19 256 per student. The difference between the lowest and highest subsidy values was $12.6 \%$, slightly higher than the difference calculated with headcounts. Compared to the national average, the lowest value was $4.5 \%$ lower than that value and the highest subsidy was $9.3 \%$ higher than the national average.

Table 15
Subsidy paid to Higher Education Institutions (all FE students): 2006

|  | African | Indian | Coloured | White | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Enrollment \% | 61.3 | 7.2 | 6.7 | 24.8 | 100 |
| Subsidy \% | 58.6 | 7.8 | 6.7 | 26.9 | 100 |
| Per capita subsidy | R19 256 | R22 041 | R20 125 | R21 867 | R20 162 |
| [2000 prices] | $[R 14381]$ | $[R 16461]$ | $[R 15030]$ | $[R 16331]$ | [R15 058] |
| Subsidy: Index value | 88.1 | 100.8 | 92.0 | 100.0 | 92.2 |

In Table 16 it can clearly be seen that although Indian students were $7.2 \%$ of the total number of students they represented $8.0 \%$ of the students taking courses in natural sciences. Also whites who were $24.8 \%$ of the total number of students represented $28.1 \%$ of the students taking courses in natural sciences. This can be explained by the higher percentage of white and Indian students that took courses in the natural sciences.

The last table in this section (Table 17) summarises the differences between the different institutions, racial groups and field of study.

Table 16
Students studying in Social and Natural Sciences (all FE students): 2006

| Per cent of each racial group |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | African | Indian | Coloured | White | Total |
| Social Sciences | 71.9 | 66.8 | 72.3 | 66.2 | 70.1 |
| Natural sciences | 28.1 | 33.2 | 27.7 | 33.8 | 29.9 |
| Per cent of total number students |  |  |  |  |  |
| Social Sciences | 62.9 | 6.8 | 6.9 | 23.4 | 70.1 |
| Natural Sciences | 57.7 | 8.0 | 6.2 | 28.1 | 29.9 |
| Total | 61.3 | 7.2 | 6.7 | 24.8 | 100 |

Table 17
Average per capita subsidy according to field of study, racial group and institution (all FE students): 2006
Panel A

|  | Soc Sc | Nat Sc | Total | African | Indian | Coloured | White |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CAPUT | 12158 | 31002 | 20524 | 20712 | 21372 | 19610 | 21481 |
| UCT | 18180 | 46359 | 29699 | 31198 | 30439 | 28857 | 28880 |
| FS UT | 13157 | 33549 | 21452 | 20939 | 22948 | 20271 | 24069 |
| DUT | 14071 | 35880 | 23284 | 21968 | 26598 | 24435 | 27991 |
| UFH | 18005 | 45912 | 23696 | 24063 | 23326 | 19456 | 19724 |
| UFS | 16909 | 43119 | 25158 | 24239 | 23791 | 21049 | 27116 |
| UJ | 14216 | 36251 | 20765 | 21334 | 19847 | 18813 | 19790 |
| UKZN | 17830 | 45467 | 26888 | 26612 | 27868 | 23603 | 26184 |
| UL | 17154 | 43744 | 28305 | 27988 | 40188 | 39502 | 38233 |
| NMMU | 15666 | 39947 | 22996 | 22051 | 23072 | 22410 | 25485 |
| NWU | 13501 | 34427 | 18552 | 17518 | 17436 | 16997 | 20354 |
| UP | 15655 | 39919 | 25221 | 22549 | 28072 | 25186 | 27359 |
| RU | 18658 | 47577 | 25948 | 25631 | 33145 | 22746 | 25558 |
| UNISA | 7516 | 19166 | 8781 | 8828 | 8749 | 8524 | 8752 |
| US | 16898 | 43089 | 27384 | 25364 | 33760 | 27719 | 27451 |
| TUT | 14354 | 36603 | 22710 | 21874 | 25290 | 21228 | 28369 |
| UV | 12695 | 32371 | 18581 | 18588 | 17142 | $n / a$ | 15569 |
| VUT | 10987 | 28017 | 18586 | 18490 | 21040 | 14811 | 21298 |
| WSUT | 12573 | 32061 | 17825 | 17723 | 30747 | 26060 | 26889 |
| UWC | 17242 | 43967 | 26802 | 26936 | 31929 | 24626 | 39071 |
| UW | 18489 | 47148 | 31375 | 30728 | 32745 | 29337 | 31796 |
| UZ | 14796 | 37731 | 18217 | 18165 | 19881 | 18230 | 19899 |
| MTECH | 9821 | 25042 | 17480 | 17476 | 21510 | 19564 | 21510 |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{1 2 ~ 9 9 4}$ | $\mathbf{3 6 ~ 9 7 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 9} \mathbf{2 5 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 ~ 0 4 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 8 6 7}$ |
| 2000 prices | 9704 | 27613 | 15058 | $\mathbf{1 4 3 8 1}$ | 16461 | 15030 | 16331 |
| Index value | - | - | $\mathbf{9 2 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{8 8 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{9 2 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Table 17 (continued)
Panel B

|  | Social Sc | Index Value | Natural Sc | Index Value |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| African | 12844 [9 592]* | 96.8 | $35626[26607]$ | 92.1 |
| Indian | $13031[9732]$ | 98.2 | $40182[30009]$ | 103.9 |
| Coloured | $13403[10$ 009] | 101.0 | $37648[28117]$ | 97.3 |
| White | $13266[9907]$ | 100.0 | $38685[28891]$ | 100.0 |

* Values in brackets are in 2000 prices.


### 4.4 Full-time equivalent according to field of study of contact students

This method is identical to the previous method except that distance students were removed from the data. The data of full-time equivalent distance students was taken from Education Statistics in South Africa 2006 (2008: 38). These FE distance students were then deducted from the total FE student numbers that was used in Section 4.3. The FE contact students was then converted to racial numbers by once again assuming that their distribution was the same as the headcounts that were available according to racial group per institution.

Distance students are normally subsidized at $50 \%$ of the amount for contact students (except master and doctoral degrees). The subsidy paid to the different institutions was thus adjusted and the amount for distance students was subtracted from the total subsidy paid to each institution.

Table 18
Subsidy paid to Higher Education Institutions (FE contact students): 2006

|  | African | Indian | Coloured | White | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Enrollment \% | 62.4 | 6.3 | 6.9 | 24.4 | 100 |
| Subsidy \% | 58.5 | 7.6 | 6.8 | 27.1 | 100 |
| Per capita subsidy | R22 610 | R28 931 | R23 529 | R26 809 | R24 098 |
| [2000 prices] | $[R 16886]$ | $[R 21606]$ | $[R 17572]$ | $[R 20021]$ | [R17 997] |
| Subsidy: Index value | 84.3 | 107.9 | 87.8 | 100.0 | 89.9 |

With this method the subsidy per student ranges from R22 610 for Africans to R28 931 for Indians. There is thus a substantial difference of $21.8 \%$ between the lowest and the highest per capita subsidy. Africans received only $6.2 \%$ less than the national average of R24 098, while Indians received $20 \%$ more than the national average of R24 098. The difference in subsidy can
to a large extent be explained by the percentage of students studying in the natural sciences (as portrayed by Table 19).

Table 19
Students studying in Social and Natural Sciences (FE contact students): 2006

| Per cent of each racial group |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | African | Indian | Coloured | White | Total |
| Social Sciences | 66.1 | 54.9 | 66.5 | 57.3 | 63.3 |
| Natural Sciences | 33.9 | 45.1 | 33.5 | 42.7 | 36.7 |
| Per cent of total number students |  |  |  |  |  |
| Social Sciences | 65.1 | 5.5 | 7.3 | 22.1 | 63.3 |
| Natural Sciences | 57.6 | 7.8 | 6.3 | 28.3 | 36.7 |
| Total | 62.4 | 6.3 | 6.9 | 24.4 | 100.0 |

The biggest difference between this and the previous method is the distance students of Unisa (109 120 students out of the total of 127269 distance students) that was excluded from the calculations. The only other institution where a substantial number of distance students was excluded is North West University that had 5107 FE distance students.

While less than $34 \%$ of African and Coloured students studied in the natural sciences, the percentages for white and Indian students are 42.7 and 45.1 per cent respectfully. Because the subsidy per student in the natural sciences is more than $2 \frac{1}{2}$ times the subsidy of students in social sciences, it is obvious that the per capita subsidy per student for White and Indian students will be higher than for the other two racial groups. Another factor is the number of students studying at universities of technology and the only remaining technikon who received a smaller subsidy per student than the comprehensive universities. With this last analysis of contact students the average subsidy paid to students at comprehensive universities was $21.4 \%$ higher than the subsidy paid to the other students (and was consistently higher for all racial groups). As was mentioned earlier, this was not the case with the other calculations.

Table 20 summarises the differences between the different institutions, racial groups and field of study.

## Table 20

Average per capita subsidy according to field of study, racial group and institution
( FE contact students): 2006
Panel A

|  | Soc Sc | Nat Sc | Total | African | Indian | Coloured | White |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CAPUT | 12169 | 31031 | 20530 | 20745 | 21504 | 19493 | 21630 |
| UCT | 18180 | 46359 | 29699 | 31394 | 30533 | 28757 | 28782 |
| FS UT | 13243 | 33768 | 21733 | 21108 | 23587 | 20301 | 25007 |
| DUT | 14071 | 35880 | 23284 | 21609 | 27760 | 24795 | 29761 |
| UFH | 18347 | 46785 | 24447 | 24764 | 24124 | 20611 | 20863 |
| UFS | 17311 | 44143 | 26265 | 25401 | 24975 | 22306 | 28067 |
| UJ | 14302 | 36471 | 20962 | 21609 | 19927 | 18773 | 19864 |
| UKZN | 18530 | 47251 | 28836 | 28564 | 29792 | 25520 | 28140 |
| UL | 17154 | 43744 | 28305 | 27956 | 42028 | 41202 | 39684 |
| NMMU | 16390 | 41794 | 25151 | 24086 | 25235 | 24492 | 27874 |
| NWU | 14574 | 37163 | 20877 | 19745 | 19653 | 19162 | 22775 |
| UP | 16118 | 41100 | 26971 | 24142 | 29865 | 26935 | 29153 |
| RU | 18734 | 47771 | 26137 | 25848 | 32529 | 23169 | 25781 |
| UNISA | 14963 | n/a | 14963 | 14963 | 14963 | 14963 | 14963 |
| US | 16898 | 43089 | 27384 | 25287 | 34087 | 27733 | 27454 |
| TUT | 14611 | 37257 | 23592 | 22688 | 26360 | 21987 | 29617 |
| UV | 12695 | 32371 | 18581 | 18591 | 16608 | $n / a$ | 14587 |
| VUT | 10987 | 28017 | 18586 | 18471 | 21619 | 14224 | 21948 |
| WSUT | 12692 | 32365 | 18139 | 18037 | 30453 | 26112 | 26890 |
| UWC | 17273 | 44046 | 26813 | 26922 | 30902 | 24995 | 36184 |
| UW | 18489 | 47148 | 31375 | 30632 | 32965 | 29049 | 31862 |
| UZ | 14796 | 37731 | 18217 | 18160 | 20052 | 18231 | 20072 |
| MTECH | 9821 | 25042 | 17480 | 17474 | 25042 | 21103 | 25042 |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{1 5 ~ 3 7 4}$ | $\mathbf{3 9 1 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 4} \mathbf{0 9 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 6 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 9 3 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 5 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 8 0 9}$ |
| 2000 prices | 11482 | 29212 | 17997 | 16886 | 21606 | 17572 | 20021 |
| Index value | - | - | $\mathbf{8 9 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{8 4 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 7 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{8 7 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

## Panel B

|  | Social Sc | Index Value | Natural Sc | Index Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African | $\begin{aligned} & 14 \quad 896 \quad[11 \\ & 125] * \end{aligned}$ | 91.7 | 37629 [28 102] | 91.8 |
| Indian | 17198 [12 844] | 105.9 | 43191 [32 256] | 105.3 |
| Coloured | 15636 [11 677] | 96.3 | 39206 [29 280] | 95.6 |
| White | 16245 [12 132] | 100.0 | 40999 [30 619] | 100.0 |

[^1]
## 5. Concluding remarks

The results of this analysis are summarized in Tables 21 to 23. Table 21 gives an indication how average subsidies of the different racial groups compared to that of whites (because they are used as the control group with an index value of 100), Table 22 portrays the total subsidy amounts paid to the different racial groups, while Table 23 gives an indication whether the average subsidies kept up with inflation.

Table 21
Index of average subsidy according to racial group

|  | Method used |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Headcoun <br> $\mathbf{t}$ | Headcoun <br> t (contact) | FE | FE <br> (contact) | FE <br> (Ns\&Ss) | FE <br> (Ns\&Ss <br> contact) |
| African 2000 | 103.4 | 97.0 | 97.9 | 92.6 | 87.6 | 82.2 |
| African 2006 | 94.9 | 89.9 | 93.7 | 90.3 | 88.1 | 84.3 |
| Indian 2000 | 108.5 | 116.7 | 103.8 | 105.3 | 104.7 | 108.0 |
| Indian 2006 | 96.9 | 107.3 | 99.5 | 105.5 | 100.8 | 107.9 |
| Coloured 2000 | 105.6 | 102.6 | 99.5 | 93.4 | 90.4 | 84.9 |
| Coloured 2006 | 103.8 | 97.6 | 101.2 | 97.3 | 92.0 | 87.8 |
| White 2000 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| White 2006 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Total 2000 | 102.9 | 99.2 | 98.9 | 95.2 | 92.4 | 88.6 |
| Total 2006 | 96.9 | 94.2 | 96.2 | 94.1 | 92.2 | 89.9 |

The overall picture of Table 21 is that the subsidies of the African, coloureds and Indian students in general deteriorated slightly compared to the subsidy levels of whites. However, with the calculations for contact FE students according to field of study (last column in Table 21) it was found that either the other racial groups' relative situation improved over time or they received higher subsidies than the white group. The same conclusion can be made for all FE students according to field of study. With the calculations for contact students the results indicate that Indian students in general received the highest subsidies, but never more than $8 \%$ above the subsidies of whites. White and Indian students received the highest subsidies when field of study is taken into consideration. Too a large extent this can be explained by a larger percentage of these two racial groups that took programmes in natural sciences who received a subsidy $21 / 2$ times that of students in social sciences. With these calculations it was also found that Africans on average received the lowest subsidies, slightly lower than those of coloureds. The biggest
difference between African and white subsidies (FE contact students with field of study incorporated) was the $17.8 \%$ in 2000 , but that gap decreased to $15.7 \%$ in 2006 . Another explanation for the difference in subsidies received by the respective racial groups can be found in the higher subsidies that were paid to universities relative to technikons in 2000. In the new education setup the different subsidies paid to the comprehensive universities and the universities of technology and the remaining technikon did not play as an important role although it was significant in the calculation of the subsidies of contact FE students according to field of study.

## Table 22

Total subsidy paid to racial groups

|  | Method used |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Headcount | Headcount <br> (contact) | FE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FE } \\ & \text { (contact) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FE } \\ & \text { (Ns\&Ss) } \end{aligned}$ | FE (Ns\&Ss contact) |
| African 2000 | 4001926070 | 3623717599 | 4001926070 | 3428662165 | 3709984902 | 3180586682 |
| African 2006 [2000 prices] | $\begin{array}{r} 5988674845 \\ 4472498018 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5054131111 \\ & 3774556468 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5988674845 \\ 4472498018 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5315217685 \\ 3969542707 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5877771665 \\ & 4389672632 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5223764662 \\ & 3901243213 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Indian 2000 | 454265275 | 392581436 | 454265275 | 377079574 | 504890689 | 421611678 |
| Indian 2006 <br> [2000 prices] | $\begin{array}{r} 744164206 \\ 555761170 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 648219741 \\ 484107349 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 744164206 \\ 555761170 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 630883026 \\ 471159840 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 786050088 \\ 587042635 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 679413397 \\ 507403582 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Coloured 2000 | 358412545 | 320766110 | 358412545 | 311752678 | 340052570 | 295132562 |
| Coloured 2006 <br> [2000 prices] | $\begin{array}{r} 704834510 \\ 526388730 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 638041427 \\ 476505920 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 704834510 \\ 526388730 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 637054980 \\ 475769216 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 668665524 \\ & 499376791 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 603770881 \\ & 450911785 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| White 2000 | 1725893110 | 1507831855 | 1725893110 | 1425837833 | 1985568839 | 1646001328 |
| White 2006 <br> [2000 prices] | $\begin{aligned} & 2598229438 \\ & 1940425271 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2395966820 \\ & 1789370291 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2598229438 \\ & 1940425271 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2281861912 \\ 1740153780 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2703415733 \\ 2018981130 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2420964353 \\ 1808039098 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Total 2000 | 6540497000 | 5844897000 | 6540497000 | 5543332250 | 6540497000 | 5554332250 |
| Total 2006 [2000 prices] | $\begin{array}{r} 10035903000 \\ 7495073189 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8736359099 \\ & 6524540029 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 10035903000 7495073189 | 8865017602 6620625543 | 10035903000 7495073189 | $\begin{aligned} & 8927913292 \\ & 6667597679 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |

As stated above, Table 22 gives the total subsidies that were paid to the different racial groups with the different calculation methods used. The figures in 2006 are also given in 2000 prices to make it directly comparable with the values calculated for 2000 . When the data for 2000 and 2006 (in constant 2000 prices) are compared it is clear that in real terms the education subsidy for all racial groups increased during this time period. This may give the impression that the relative financial position of students improved over time. This, however, overlooks the important issue of what happened with student numbers during this same period.

This variable is incorporated in Table 23 where the average subsidy per racial group for the two years is portrayed. Values for 2006 are given in constant 2000 prices. The general message from Table 22 is that in real terms subsidies per student decreased almost across the board. Although there are a few exceptions, subsidies to students at HEIs in South Africa did not keep up with inflation. This had the effect that, in order to balance their books, HEIs in South Africa increased tuition fees by more than the inflation rate (see research report by Steyn and De Villiers, 2006). This makes access to and the affordability of higher education for the poor a contentious issue. Although this issue falls outside the scope of this report, it is not something that can be ignored.

## Table 23

Value of average subsidy according to racial group (in constant 2000 prices)

|  | Method used |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Headcoun <br> $\mathbf{t}$ | Headcoun <br> $\mathbf{t}$ (contact) | FE | FE <br> (contact) | FE <br> (Ns\&Ss) | FE <br> (Ns\&Ss <br> contact) |
| African 2000 | 10769 | 13147 | 15701 | 19002 | 15041 | 18125 |
| African 2006 | 9914 | 13112 | 14670 | 17148 | 14381 | 16886 |
| Indian 2000 | 11306 | 15825 | 16644 | 21625 | 17992 | 23821 |
| Indian 2006 | 10131 | 15644 | 15569 | 20043 | 16461 | 21606 |
| Coloured 2000 | 10995 | 13914 | 15965 | 19168 | 15523 | 18727 |
| Coloured 2006 | 10845 | 14225 | 15839 | 18476 | 15030 | 17572 |
| White 2000 | 10413 | 13557 | 16040 | 20532 | 17178 | 22052 |
| White 2006 | 10451 | 14582 | 15654 | 18989 | 16331 | 20021 |
| Total 2000 | 10720 | 13445 | 15866 | 19548 | 15867 | 19548 |
| Total 2006 | 10126 | 13735 | 15058 | 17870 | 15058 | 17997 |

The overall picture is that white and Indian students received in general higher subsidies than African or coloured students. It can, however, to a large extend be explained by field of study and if more African and coloured students study in natural sciences the subsidy levels will move even closer to each other. What we see here in higher education is too a large extent a result of what is happening in the school system. Not enough African and coloured learners takes mathematics and science to qualify to study courses in natural sciences. Before this issue is not corrected at school level, average subsidies of Indian and white students will stay higher than that of African and coloured students.

## Appendix A

Number of students per racial group

|  | Method used |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Headcoun <br> $\mathbf{t}$ | Headcoun <br> t (contact) | FE | FE <br> (contact) | FE <br> (Ns\&Ss) | FE <br> (Ns\&Ss <br> contact) |
| African 2000 | 371618 | 275630 | 254884 | 180434 | 246662 | 175480 |
| African 2006 | 451108 | 287878 | 304875 | 231487 | 305243 | 231039 |
| Indian 2000 | 40179 | 24808 | 27294 | 16264 | 28061 | 17699 |
| Indian 2006 | 54859 | 30946 | 35696 | 23508 | 35663 | 23484 |
| Coloured 2000 | 32597 | 23054 | 22449 | 17437 | 21906 | 15758 |
| Coloured 2006 | 48538 | 33497 | 33234 | 25751 | 33225 | 25660 |
| White 2000 | 165737 | 111220 | 107600 | 69445 | 115586 | 74642 |
| White 2006 | 185668 | 122712 | 123955 | 89744 | 123628 | 90305 |
| Total 2000 | 610131 | 434712 | 412227 | 283581 | 412216 | 283580 |
| Total 2006 | 740173 | 475033 | 497759 | 370489 | 497759 | 370488 |


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ This study was undertaken as part of a fiscal incidence study conducted by Prof. Servaas van der Berg on behalf of the National Treasury. The paper is also available on the website of the National Treasury: http://www.treasury.gov.za/publications/other/Fiscal\%20Incidence\%20Study/default.aspx
    ${ }^{2}$ Economics Department, University of Stellenbosch; apdv@sun.ac.za

[^1]:    * Values in brackets are in 2000 prices.

