

An investigation into student poverty and inequality within Institutions of higher learning in South Africa

M Mphahlele



orcid.org 0000-0001-6970-0310

Dissertation accepted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree *Master of Arts in Political Studies* at the North-West University

Supervisor: Dr JCM Venter

Graduation: April 2024

DECLARATION WITH REGARD TO INDEPENDENT WORK

I, Mogau Mphahlele, do hereby declare that this research submitted to the North-West University, for the Masters Degree in Political Science: “An Investigation into Student Poverty and Inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa,” is my own independent work and complies with the Code of Academic Integrity, as well as other relevant policies, procedures, rules and regulations of the North-West University. It furthermore has not been submitted before to any tertiary institution by myself or any other person in fullfilment (or partial fulfilment) of the requiements for the attianment of any qualification. The dissertation was also submitted to Turnitin and complies with the prescribed guidelines of the University in terms of the similarity index.

Acknowledgements

- I would like to thank God Almighty, through my Saviour, Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit, who at all times has made it possible for me to undertake this research. The love of God and His everlasting blessings upon me will forever be acknowledged through the presentation of this dissertation.
- To my inspiring and loving parents, family, and friends, your love, patience, and support have allowed me to accomplish one of my dreams. Thank You.
- To my inspiring and loving partner, thank you for being there with me from the start. Thank you for your words of encouragement.
- I would like to sincerely thank my research supervisor, Dr Jan Venter, who made this research project such a breeze. His willingness to help at any given time, his good constructive criticism and immediate responses were greatly appreciated. Without him, the completion of this dissertation would not have been possible. I would also like to give thanks for his persistent guidance and leadership and also having great faith in me.
- I would also like to give thanks to my language editor, Margaret Linstrom from the University of Free State for her persistence hard work in making sure that my dissertation had adequate grammar and style.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1: BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

1 BACKGROUND TO STUDY	11
2 PROBLEM STATEMENT	17
3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS	19
4 RESEARCH AIMS AND OBJECTIVES	19
5 CENTRAL THEORETICAL STATEMENT	19
6 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	25
6.1 Qualitative method.....	25
6.2 Literature review.....	27
Student funding	30
7 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY.....	33
8 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS.....	33
9 PRELIMINARY DEMARCATION OF THE STUDY	34

Chapter 2: SIGNIFICANT HISTORICAL ROOTS OF STUDENT POVERTY AND INEQUALITY WITHIN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING IN SOUTH AFRICA

2.1 INTRODUCTION	39
2.2 DEFINING STUDENT POVERTY AND INEQUALITY WITHIN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING IN SOUTH AFRICA	42
2.3 ORIGINS, PHILOSOPHIES AND METHODOLOGIES OF HISTORICAL ROOTS TOWARDS STUDENT POVERTY AND INEQUALITY WITHIN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING IN SOUTH AFRICA.....	44
2.3.1 The genesis of racial discrimination as a historical root towards student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa	45
2.4 LEGISLATION AND ACTS AS HISTORICAL ROOTS TOWARDS STUDENT POVERTY AND INEQUALITY WITHIN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING IN SOUTH AFRICA	46
2.4.1 The Bantu Education Act 47 of 1953	46
2.4.2 The Extension of University Act 45 of 1969	47
2.4.3 Medical University of South Africa Act 78 of 1976.....	47
2.4.4 Vista University Act 106 of 1981	47
2.5 ISSUES AND FACTORS CHARACTERISING HISTORICAL ROOTS TOWARDS THE HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEM AND INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING IN SOUTH AFRICA	48
2.5.1 Defying discriminatory education within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa ..	49
2.5.2 Education inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning.....	49
2.5.3 The language policy as a political instrument within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa.....	51

2.5.4 The medium of instruction	51
2.6 CONCLUSION	52
CHAPTER 3: SOCIAL JUSTICE AND EQUITY IN SOUTH AFRICA'S HIGHER EDUCATION AND ITS IMPACT ON INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING	
3.1 INTRODUCTION	53
3.2 SOUTH AFRICA'S HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEM AFTER 1994	56
3.2.1 Increased and Broadened Participation within Institutions of Higher Learning	57
3.2.2 Responsiveness to societal needs by Institutions of Higher Learning	57
3.2.3 Co-operation and governance by Institutions of Higher Learning.....	58
3.3 AN OVERVIEW ON SOCIAL JUSTICE AND EQUITY IN SOUTH AFRICA'S HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEM AND INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING.....	58
3.3.1 Equal and fair treatment within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa.....	60
3.3.2 Equal higher education opportunities within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa	61
3.4 CONCEPTUALISING THE TWO NOTIONS OF SOCIAL JUSTICE IN SOUTH AFRICA AND THEIR IMPACT ON INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING.....	63
3.4.1 An Investigation into Normative Social Justice and its influence on South Africa's Higher Education System and Institutions of Higher Learning to eradicate student poverty and inequality.....	65
3.4.2 Criticisms on Normative Social Justice in South Africa's Higher Education system and Institutions of Higher Learning	67
3.5.3 Higher educational adequacy within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa.....	68

3.5 AN OVERVIEW ON STUDENT POVERTY IN THE SOUTH AFRICAN HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEM.....	69
3.6 CONCLUSION	70
CHAPTER 4: THE ROLE OF PUBLIC POLICIES IN POST-APARTHEID HIGHER EDUCATION IN SOUTH AFRICA	
4.1 INTRODUCTION	72
4.2 SOUTH AFRICA’S HIGHER EDUCATION POLICY	74
4.3. PUBLIC POLICY IN HIGHER EDUCATION	75
4.3.1 Conceptualising public policy in Higher Education	75
4.3.2 South Africa’s public policy mainsprings in Higher Education	75
4.3.3 Implementing public policy in Higher Education	76
4.4 TRANSFORMATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION	77
4.4.1 Transformation of massification in Higher Education	78
4.4.2 Transformation of differentiation in Higher Education	78
4.4.3 Transformation of knowledge and culture in Higher Education	79
4.5 GOVERNMENT POLICY DISCOURSES IN HIGHER EDUCATION	80
4.5.1 The National Commission on Higher Education Act of 1996	80
4.5.2 The White Paper on Higher Education Act of 1997	81
4.5.3 The Higher Education Act 101 of 1997	82
4.5.4 The National Plan for Higher Education in South Africa	82
4.6 A POLICY GAP IN HIGHER EDUCATION	83

4.8 SOUTH AFRICA’S PRESIDENTIAL INFLUENCE ON POST-APARTHEID POLICIES THAT PAVED THE WAY FOR TRANSFORMATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION	84
4.8.1 Nelson Mandela in office	85
4.8.2 Thabo Mbeki in office	85
4.8.3 Jacob Zuma/Cyril Ramaphosa in office	86
4.9 CONCLUSION	88
CHAPTER 5: FREE HIGHER EDUCATION IN SOUTH AFRICA	
5.1 INTRODUCTION	90
5.2 THE CONSTITUTION OF THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA 1996	91
5.3 THE CONCEPT OF FREE HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE CONTEXT OF SOUTH AFRICA	91
5.4 ADDRESSING STUDENT POVERTY AND INEQUALITY (FUNDING FREE HIGHER EDUCATION)	93
5.5 THE COST OF FREE HIGHER EDUCATION IN SOUTH AFRICA	95
5.6 A MODEL FOR FUNDING FREE HIGHER EDUCATION (FUNDING EQUITY)....	97
5.7 CONCLUSION	99
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
6.1 INTRODUCTION	101
6.2 CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE STUDY.....	101

6.2.1 Methodological contribution	102
6.3 CONCLUSIONS OF THE STUDY	102
6.3.1 Conclusions from the literature review	102
6.3.2 Conclusions from Chapter 2	102
6.3.3 Conclusions from Chapter 3	103
6.3.4 Conclusions from Chapter 4	104
6.3.5 Conclusions from Chapter 5	106
6.4 RECOMMENDATIONS AND FINAL REMARKS	107

ABSTRACT

Students within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa continue to encounter challenges of unpaid historical tuition debt, lack of funding, and insufficient affordable student accommodation which have adverse impact on their academic performance. Due to their disadvantaged backgrounds, university students seem to experience difficulties when transitioning from their backgrounds, therefore needing comprehensive support structures that will assist in making adjustments to the high demands of higher education. The study investigates student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning with reference to the government's radical intervention. Seemingly, the reality of student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning has not yet been achieved despite students demands which fuelled serious student protests. Higher education in South Africa is a social variable that affect communities, individuals and their respective families. Social justice in South Africa's Institutions of Higher Learning has a focal point on institutional policy and efforts in eliminating student poverty and inequalities faced by disadvantaged students. Therefore, attention needs to be drawn to an investigation into student poverty and inequality since it has been an issue and area of concern.

Key words: Institutions of Higher Learning, Higher Education, Student Poverty and Inequality, Social Justice

CHAPTER 1: BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

1 Background to Study

It is pivotal to give definition of core concepts at the beginning of this chapter with aim of providing relevance and understanding. Sefoka (2019:1768) provided a definition for Institutions of Higher Learning to be universities, college, or any business school that caters post-secondary level academic instruction that has an aim of awarding a degree, or certificate or diploma. In addition, Sefoka (2019:1767) provided a definition for Higher Education to be “all types of studies, training or training for research at the post-secondary level provided by universities or other educational establishments that are approved as institutions of their education by the component state of authority”. According to Habib (2019:80) student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning are complexities of financing, equality of access, widening participation, the improvement of support and developmental services, effective use of technology (including distance learning), use of new and more flexible learning formats, student attainment of new skills and increased employability, and historical debt demolition. According to Makhubele (2016), social justice in South Africa is focused on how resources are distributed among the members of society. It is demarcated as the distribution of income, equal distribution of capital assets and creating equitable employment for all. For example, the distribution of income becomes fruitful to poor families, paving the way to uplift their standards of living and being able to afford higher education, the ownership of capital and other assets becomes evident when households have means of income, the access to opportunities such as employment and education, and lastly, services and benefits (Agarwal *et al.*, 2010:237). The majority of South African university students have been subjected to socioeconomic deprivations such as poverty, inequality, youth unemployment, unpaid historical tuition fees, language barrier, insufficient affordable student accommodation, lack of funding, insufficient budgets for transportation and data costs, and an unequal access to education for many years (De Wet, 2014:40). However, Tshiyoyo (2014:138) demarcated that since 1994, South Africa’s social, economic and political pact has become fractured, which resulted in the erosion of democratic and also social institutions. Furthermore, Tshiyoyo (2014:138) refers to the political pact as the Freedom Charter and the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa. According to Gumede (2015:227), the

African National Congress (ANC) inherited the role to govern in South Africa during the year 1994, which was the dawn of a new democracy. The dawn of democracy presented the Ministry of Education (2001:8) in the White Paper to state that “The principle of equity requires fair opportunities both to enter Institutions of Higher Learning programmes and to succeed in them”. The liberation movement encompassed a well-designed and well-structured plan for the post-apartheid government that scrapped socioeconomic oppression and socioeconomic marginalisation. Furthermore, Gumede (2015:227), elaborates the plans as follows: “to alleviate poverty and inequality in South Africa, curb corruption, stimulate economic growth, address youth unemployment, mediate the already divided higher education system which was deeply divided internally and marginalised from the international society of scholars, bridge the gap between Institutions of Higher Learning and government in order to promote a coherent and coordinated structure of governance”. According to Timmis (2021:55), student poverty and inequalities in South Africa is currently characterised by “mismanaged National Student Financial Aid Scheme policy (NSFAS), insufficient affordable student accommodation which results students making libraries and toilets their means of overnight accommodation, electrical power instability and loadshedding, difficulties of getting employment after obtaining qualification, historical student debts, poor infrastructure within universities, lack of affordability to purchase necessities, and political unrest”. In South Africa, a glimpse of hope was experienced when the transition from apartheid to democracy would bolster higher education, which will then raise new questions and possibilities allowing an examination of old problems from a new angle (Gumede, 2015:228). The biggest hurdle can be underfunding towards the Higher Education system. This element underpins student poverty in South Africa. Timmis (2021:70), depicts that the government has made great strides in dealing with the characteristics of student poverty and inequalities following the #FeesMustFall protests. Furthermore, these strides consisted of: effective policy implementation of the NSFAS policy that funded students, developments of a national higher education plan, benchmarks for higher education transformation, and an establishment of a planning dialogue that exists between the Department of Education (DOE) and Institutions of Higher Learning, allowing the implementation of restructuring strategies that will consist of programme level rationalisation (Timmis, 2021:72). These strides and efforts to eradicate student poverty and inequality will make a great impact towards students and their aspirations for a higher education but, there is still no plan for the “missing middle” students in higher education.

Students who do not qualify for any financial aid, but also can't afford tuition fees outright seem to a hurdle and challenge for the government. Higher education in South Africa is expensive. Few households do not have the necessary means of finance to pay tuition fees, because they cannot afford them. It is also important to understand who the "missing middle" is. According to Sefoka (2019:1769), the missing middle refers to those students who come from working-class households that do not qualify for funding from NSFAS, while at the same time, they cannot afford higher education. The missing middle currently refers to those students that come from households with incomes between R350 000 and R600 000 (Febraury, 2020). The missing middle in South Africa contribute to student poverty and inequality due to their inability to afford. It is inherently inequitable, differentiated along the horizons of 'race' and ethnicity when it comes to the "missing middle". According to the CRA-Socio-economic Survey of South Africa (2019), 60 percent of the population are chronically hungry and live-in chronic poverty. Chronic hunger and chronic poverty are two different concepts, but relatively constitute towards student poverty and inequality. According to CRA-Socio-economic Survey of South Africa (2019), chronic hunger is a consequence of a diet plan which is inadequate in terms of its quantity or quality. Furthermore, chronic poverty is referred to as the imbalance and inadequate of financial resources to maintain and uplift standards of living and living conditions. Students within Institutions of Higher Learning are deemed to experience chronic hunger and poverty in their own context due to a lack of financial resources, lack of capacity from government in terms of their inability to deliver allowances on time, and lack of political will from government in accordance to its NSFAS policy. According to Berg-Shlosser and Kersting (2003:3), the population of South Africa was subjected to extreme national poverty. In addition, the ANC had utilised the victory of political power to their advantage as they imposed affirmative action and black economic empowerment (BEE) as a disruptive mechanism focused on class reproductions of apartheid in order to mend and ensure that people living in South Africa are no longer prisoners of apartheid designed for poverty and inequality. According to Kraft and Furlong (2013:363), in South Africa, the previously disadvantaged have fewer assets and fewer skills, which results in lower wages, and the majority are unemployed. As a result of ongoing spatial apartheid, Wolpe (1990:30) contended that most of the black populace live far from economic midpoints and face challenges of restricted access to information and social networks tapped into mainstream economic life, sustainable employment, and inferior educational institutions.

According to Kraft and Furlong (2013:364), Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa are considered to be the most important foundations of economic emancipation and to satisfy a number of basic education goals. South Africa's higher education has a critical and central function in contributing to the development of an informed society, both in terms of skills development and research (Kraft & Furlong, 2013:364). Hay and Monnapula-Mapesela (2009:1) stated that the Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET) in South Africa advocates for an educated population, who will automatically stand a good chance of being productive.

In recent years, South Africa's universities have been plagued by student unrest, with reference to the 2015 #FeesMustFall orchestrated by students from the University of Witwatersrand (Mavunga 2019:90). According to Mavunga (2019:92), the 2015 #FeesMustFall protests were precipitated from a parallel motive of high tuition fees, poor University leadership, and a lack of funding from poor management in the NSFAS policy. These are existing inequalities within South Africa's Institutions of Higher Learning, being a product of a hierarchy of an institutional policy and practice based on poverty discrimination. According to Sefoka (2019:94), the institutional policy can be alluded as "a policy and framework promotes the development of an articulated flexible learning system, in unison with a diversity of institutional missions and programme mixes, and a system that improves the responsiveness of the higher education system to the present and future social and economic needs". This can accentuate other programmes of financial transformation with a view to redress. The Ministry of Education (2001:8) further stated that "such transformation involves not only abolishing all existing forms of unjust differentiation, but also the formation of measures of empowerment, including financial support to bring about equal opportunities for individuals and institutions".

Hay and Monnapula-Mapesela (2009:2) noted that the high cost of higher education has resulted in student protests, which has received intense attention in the mainstream media and has become an issue in South Africa. The dynamic of the cost in higher education is critical in South Africa because high tuition costs in universities hamper low-income families who may be unable to afford higher education (Chernick and Kalipa, 2016). Furthermore, Chernick and Kalipa (2016) stated that it can also affect students with high levels of debt that they need to settle after obtaining their qualifications. The costs of higher education are substantial and will continue to increase gradually and annually. Kraft and Furlong (2013:368) explained that over past years, tuition costs rise

on an annual rate. This rise is more rapid than the inflation rate in South Africa. Even though students in South Africa are academically eligible to study at an institution of higher learning, they cannot further their studies due to a lack of funds. In the past few years, the unemployment rate has also slowly and gradually been increasing.

According to Mutekwe (2020), the promise made in 1994 of “free education for all”, delivered by former state president Nelson Mandela is critical as many students come from poor backgrounds and most traditionally come from poor performing schools. Moreover, most students attending Institutions of Higher Learning depend on government subsidy and university bursary systems as they consider these interventions to be helpful. In addition, Mutekwe (2020) asserted that the government’s subsidy and bursary systems in South Africa highlight critical questions of equity, motivating the government to reform tertiary education so that it can reduce student poverty and inequality. The reform of tertiary education may therefore be analysed as the feasibility of free higher education in South Africa. According to Hull (2016:2), the ideation and proposal of “free higher education for all” can be deduced to be the worst kind of relative populism as it has been sold as a radical policy that would be progressive and be achieved without any negative consequences. Furthermore, free higher education in South Africa will be about assisting the disadvantaged students coming from poor backgrounds, reducing youth unemployment and possibly saving on social spending, and increasing access to university for students.

Social justice in South Africa has to do with distribution, but what does this mean precisely? Agarwal *et al.* (2010:240) maintains that the government is a mechanism which has the obligation of providing the outcome about justice or injustice in South Africa. It is known that communities and population groups narrowly think about how government policies intervene within the fortunes of different racial groups in society. This poses the question whether South Africa’s Institutions of Higher Learning concerns are much wider, encompassing all student poverty and inequalities that will determine the share of resources among students within the universities. According to Mathews (2017), social justice organisations such as Equal Education (EE), have displayed devotion in ensuring that students profit from the fruits of democracy under the guidance of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, which had goals of social justice after apartheid and with democracy. South Africa’s universities and education system tend to talk about social justice within Institutions of Higher Learning with the aim of eradicating student poverty

and inequalities, which is considered to be one of their main goals. With the present government making noteworthy progress with the provision of funding to students and broadening access to Institutions of Higher Learning, Makhubele (2016) states that the obligations of the South African Constitution pose critical queries of social justice in South Africa. Social justice also includes education, which intervenes with achieving equitable and quality education for all students within Institutions of Higher Learning.

Francis and Le Roux (2011:1) further argued that social justice in South Africa's Institutions of Higher Learning is considered to be education and both a process and a goal. One goal of social justice as an education is to have a focal point on the mass equal participation in all programmes of all students in higher education. This mutually moulds the student needs in higher education such as being awarded with funding to eradicate student poverty and inequality variables such as affording accommodation and having financial means to buy necessities. Social justice as an educational variable in higher education includes, a vision in which the distribution of monthly allowances, adequate and affordable student accommodation, proper infrastructure to enable learning remains fair, making all students to be physically and psychologically safe and secure. In essence, the South African government has a vision that includes fairness in all Institutions of Higher Learning which provides, protects and recognises the means and qualities students require to determine a conception of a suitable and comprehensive higher education.

2 Problem statement

The exclusion of students within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa post 1994 had an unprecedented change from educational marginalisation and exclusion to formal higher education inclusion and compatibility. Prior to 1994, social inclusiveness was not valued in most Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa.

South Africa has experienced an unprecedented political change from an authoritarian state to a liberal democracy. Accessibility in South Africa's universities are problematic and most often difficult to accommodate. According to Bunice (2017:1958), over 300 000 students each year stand to be financially excluded from higher education. Furthermore, Bunice (2017:1959) denoted that the notion of setting barriers of entry such as language barrier, medium of instruction, inadequate funding, and poor student accommodation to students within Institutions of Higher Learning due to poverty and inequality from a social justice standpoint, tends to accentuate the historical marginalities that were present under apartheid. The segregation policies under Apartheid South Africa's universities are plagued by profound inequalities such as student poverty and inequality as seen through #FeesMustFall movement protests. The influence of these respective inequalities poses barriers to many students from either having access to or participating in higher institutions of learning beyond matric level. Although efforts have been made to address inequalities in South Africa's universities through initiatives like the NSFAS bursary policy. Minimal effort has been exercised by the government and the private sector to remedy the inequalities associated with students in higher education. These shortfalls come in the form of mismanagement of policies, such as that of NSFAS.

The problem is a collective of students experience financial troubles and encounter threats of exclusion from universities due to their inability to afford tuition fees regardless of their performance academically. Seemingly, Institutions of Higher Learning have immense pressure into revisiting financial aspects in a more holistic approach to accommodate every student regardless of their racial and class status. What has been predominant is the financial hardships and threats of financial exclusion that has contributed to student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa. According to Moloi and Motaung (2014:370), Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa face challenges of priorities, and this results in funds not being redirected

to all student's financial obligations. A majority of students have been denied access to Institutions of Higher Learning due to a lack of funds and rejection of the NSFAS. The #FeesMustFall protests aimed in alleviating disadvantages of students and their financial needs. Therefore, this has called and accentuated the feasibility of free higher education in South Africa. According to the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (1996), "everyone has the right to basic education, and to further education in which the state through reasonable measures, must make progressively available and accessible". However, in order for a student to be allocated with funding, they need to follow the process of applying with the possibility of rejection once the basic requirements are not satisfied. It is for this reason that the plight for student poverty and inequality is evident as student funding has become a problem, and the process in allocating funds to students seemed to be flawed due to its discovery of being inefficient.

This dissertation therefore, discern higher education costs to be exceeding the standard general household income of families coming from poor backgrounds, even though the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa deems education to be fair. It is critical to acknowledge that South Africa is faced with serious affordability and rising demand for higher education. If the issue of student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning South Africa is not fixed, the country is yet to face more student unrests.

This study, therefore, attempts to answer the question regarding student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa.

3 Research questions

The research questions are the following:

- (1). What are the significant historical roots of student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa after the end of the apartheid era?
- (2). What role does social justice and equity play in student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa after the end of apartheid?
- (3). What is the role of public policies in post-apartheid higher education in South Africa?
- (4). Is free higher education feasible in South Africa?

:

4 Research aims and objectives

These questions therefore translate into the following study objectives

- (1) To determine the historical roots of student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning in South.
- (2) To investigate the role of social justice and equity on student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa.
- (3) To evaluate the public policies of the government in post-apartheid higher education in South Africa.
- (4) To examine the feasibility of free higher education in South Africa.

5 Central theoretical statement

This study benefits from the frameworks of two different, but contemporary theories namely the Keynesian theory and John Rawls theory of justice. According to Harvey (2007) the Keynesian theory allows the government to innovate public policies that will pave the way for state intervention to govern the economy. The Keynesian theory has an

objective of a successful transformation of high education and Institutions of Higher Learning. It is critical to acknowledge that higher education and Institutions of Higher Learning cannot solely be dependent on the market or market forces to eradicate student poverty and inequality due to a lack of trust. The government has an important role to play, considering that the mode of its participation requires careful scrutiny. According to Harvey (2007), the action and role of government needs to be predicted on a broad fundamental devotion and honest adherence to the traditional principles of academic freedom as a necessary composition for enhancing the contribution of South Africa's higher education to economic and social emancipation. Additionally, the government should constitute a mode for demand in higher education, construct cost and pricing of higher education, create a sustainable environment where government spending on higher education remains constant and intervene when tuition costs increase. These constitute as pillars of the Keynesian economics in the context of this dissertation as they enable higher education policy frameworks and adequate public funding. In addition, Harvey (2007) states that the Keynesian theory is a contemporary paradigm for economic theory and policy making. It tends to advocate for macro-economic policy-making that will remedy severe state regulations on the economy and emphasise stability in economic policy. This will result in a dynamic of the alleviation of abject poverty and inequality within universities. In context to this study, the Keynesian theory justifies the role of government in South Africa to construct and preserve a comprehensive institutional system that will foster inclusion and open the doors of learning for all Students (Harvey, 2007).

The Keynesian theory speaks to this study because it advocates for government policies and programmes to combat persistent poverty, profound inequalities, and issues on education. With the Keynesian theory being a central part of this study, it evaluates policies and regulations in which state intervention needs to comply with in order to redress accessibility and exclusions within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa, which result in student poverty and inequality. On Rawls theory of justice, a series of different kinds of fundamentals are said to be just and unjust in the sense that the state undertakes the fulfilment of social justice, something that is not implemented by the market (Allan, 2020). Rawl's theory of justice favours a strict reconciliation of equality and liberty which governs the basic structures of a society. Rawl's believed that justice is an etiquette in social justice due to the fact that every person should be treated with fairness and commends equal liberties, equal opportunities towards individuals, and offer the highest benefits to the less advantaged members of society. From a political philosophy

aspect, justice as fairness can be deduced as giving what is due to whom it is due to. In the context of South Africa's Higher Education system, higher education is due to all South Africans who are able and willing to participate in any Institution of Higher Learning (The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996). This narrative has been built on the premise of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa. Therefore, justice and fairness are pivotal because they intervene in the functioning of a just society. In relation to equality and inequality, Rawls stated that inequalities are allowed and evident in societies, if their absence does not infiltrate any harm than good. In terms of higher education in South Africa, equality and inequality coexist because students are deemed as equals when seeking education, but experience inequalities due to a lack of financial resources, hunger, access to universities, language barrier, and lack of funding. If there are inequalities such as the aforementioned, less fortunate students coming from poor backgrounds should not suffer the consequences solely for their absence of resources to eradicate them. In addition, this could be in relation to equity, access, and participation within Institutions of Higher Learning. Consequently, South African university students have taken the initiative to stand up against these inequalities through the avenues of participating in nationwide student unrest. These protests accentuated the plight of student poverty, which resulted in and engendered a vast amount of interest in the latter among policymakers, the media, and researchers. Although the government responded to the protest of students through reforms of student access to universities and funding policies, there were weaknesses evident in that regard. According to Greef et al., (2021:2), the administration of President Zuma in addressing the #FeesMustFall protests had the following weaknesses: dispatched law enforces in the form of the police to clash with students instead of conducting a cordial mediating process between Higher Education and students; response from government was delayed and presented without any logical and epistemological framework, delayed the academic year, and exposed the gaps in Higher Education policy discourses. Transformation within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa such as access to higher education can be considered as an indicator of social progress. Social progress aligns with a framework of an absolute reconditioning of social incubation and results occurred in meaningful social transition. Endeavours to reconstruct the policy in higher education and Institutions of Higher Learning did not pave the way for a translation of material advantages for the financially disadvantaged black university students in South African.

In the context of South Africa's Institutions of Higher Learning and the student unrests, it is not only based on laws and social systems, but significant litigations of many kinds, such as decision judgements and imputations that were made by students. According to Bird (2006:128), "Rawls's theory of justice is intended to identify two concepts of rules that re-examines utilitarianism". First, what exactly is 'utilitarianism' that Rawls is trying to examine. According to Allan (2020), utilitarianism is a kind of consequentialist theory that regards one kind of consequence to be intrinsically valuable. This could be concluded to be 'well-being', 'happiness' and 'preference satisfaction'. Therefore, these two concepts are summary rules and practice rules. According to Allan (2020), summary rules are defined as "rules of thumb" or "rules of convenience which represent a summary of past actions and decisions which were implemented at the direct application of basic reasoning. An example of a summary rule would be the idea that in order to complete your studies, all your modules should satisfy the mandatory module percentage. Furthermore, practice rules are defined as rules that are logical before the particular actions are governed by the rules. Seemingly, practice rules conjure up offices, give definition to specific actions, and specify the appropriateness and consequence of actions (Allan, 2020). According to Mutekwe (2017:145), the #FeesMustFall protests had consequences of malicious damage to institutional infrastructure, arson to state infrastructure and incarceration of student leaders. When the state and Institutions of Higher Learning consider punishment, and accept its existence as practice in the form of the aforementioned, it is no longer relevant to question whether or not it would be necessary to investigate the appropriateness of punishment of the students. Allan (2020) defined punishment as "a consequence of breaking the law". The rules of punishment need all instigators to be found guilty of breaking the law. This theory accentuates the basic structures of society, which analyse institutions in South Africa and the manner in which they issue rights and roles that will determine the division of advantages from a social cooperation perspective. In regard to institutions in South Africa, it is acknowledged that the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa and economic and social arrangements are pivotal mechanisms of implementing and setting up punishment.

Mavrozacharakis and Tzagkarakis (2018:25) concur with Bird (2006:128) by highlighting that the "economic, political, and social structure" of societies must include universities or tertiary education that will fairly distribute efficient education and financial resources that are important for ensuring equal opportunities. The importance of the theoretical framework of this study is aimed at the turmoil South Africa experienced had under

apartheid, while highlighting the policies it created to curb social milieus in higher education. Rawls, Mavrozacharakis and Tzagkarakis (2018:27) further highlighted that higher education and training should be bolstered. Within the context of universities in South Africa, it is necessary as this implements public investment resulting in the generation of public debt from government. This ultimately accentuates funding and any other form of government expenditure towards higher education.

The Keynesian theory tends to speak to the theory of justice by John Rawls. Thorsen (2010:202) points out that Milton Friedman recommends policies that are based upon conceptions of natural law. This, however, means that there will be a package of policies and economic practices that will be recommended because human beings are social by nature, and their social nature dictates a certain way of organising society. In addition, according to Thorsen (2010:202), Rawls' theory of justice begins uncompromisingly by linking the autonomy and awakening of the individual. Even so, the provision of the first redistributive principle of the equal distribution of freedom and civil rights on a broad scale will ultimately secure students regarding student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning from autocratic and paternalistic tendencies of the state. Both these theories respectively speak to the current status quo towards South Africa's Higher Education system and the current contributing factors towards student poverty and inequality within higher institutions of learning in the country.

Since the birth of democracy, South Africa is current struggling to tackle student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning. Ever since, South Africa seems to be plagued by inequalities. However, indicators demonstrate that poverty and inequality exist because of the limited options of access to higher education among the previously disadvantaged university students (Van Der Bank & Nkadameng, 2014:353). This study further accentuates that higher education fees are exorbitant which excludes many disadvantaged South Africans from pursuing their studies.

According to Bergdahl (2008:48), institutional transformation within higher education and Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa evolved in globalisation associated with a dominance of the concept of neoliberalism. Neoliberal rational and ideation have evolved to become hegemonic with the voluntary embracing or coercive disciplinary authority of financial institutions. This, however, asks for scrutiny of the differing ways and degrees the latter impacted on economic and social policies, practices, and institutions. It is critical to analyse the strides and development that has evolved and significantly cut economic growth and the gradual economic status quantified by indicators (Bergdahl, 2008:48).

These challenges by the study highlighted that it is critical to acknowledge student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning has not been addressed adequately. The government has made substantial progress in expanding and allowing access in higher education since 1995 for previously disadvantaged university students. This is mostly evident towards the construction and implementation of the National Student Financial Aid Scheme (NSFAS). In examining the significant theoretical theories of social justice by John Rawls and the Keynesian theory, a central theoretical framework is constructed. The theory of social justice towards student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning encompasses a chief characteristic that speaks to economic mobility. This study, therefore, considers why, 28 years post-1994, there still are huge strides that need special attention in order to realise the anticipated freedom of higher education for previously disadvantaged university students. A critical audit of the trajectory of all relevant theories on the South Africa's educational policy after apartheid is pivotal in the quest of speaking to the Keynesian theory. This, then paves the way for an educational order that will be predicated on social justice.

6 Research methodology

6.1 Qualitative method

According to Myers (2009:8), the utilisation of qualitative research helps researchers to acknowledge their population and the social cultural environment within which they act and live. Qualitative research can be considered as naturalistic as it aims to study people's everyday lives in their natural setting. Guest *et al.*, (2013:2) further stated that qualitative research is the kind of research which utilises methodologies such as case studies and participant observation to achieve narrating and describing of settings or practices. Merriam (2009:13) posited that the essence of qualitative researchers is to pay attention to the way people make sense of their world and their experiences within it.

This study has been qualitative in nature and follow a deductive orientation with a literature review as the method. By using qualitative inquiry, the researcher wishes to explore motivations for student poverty and the inequality thereof, as well as to acknowledge certain aspects such as higher education and how Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa provide access and implement social justice for all because qualitative research caters for a holistic and in-depth explanation of a complex social world. The Researcher furthermore sought to understand, explore, explain, discover, and clarify situations where student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa have become a major problem, as a consequence, motivating student unrests such as #FeesMustFall. Accessibility from Institutions of Higher Learning are often deemed as problematic and difficult to accommodate. Thus, the flexible, emergent, non-sequential and spontaneous nature of qualitative design was the most appropriate methodology to highlight the subject of student poverty and inequality within South African universities. Existing literature will act as a source of information and to collect data. The Researcher also utilised previously known theories, which encompass social justice as a theory by John Rawls and the Keynesian theory by John Menard Keynes, to study and analyse the nature and extent of student poverty and inequality within universities in South Africa. This was achieved primarily by analysing previously studied theoretical concepts against the evidence and material pertaining to student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa. In addition, the approach by the Researcher can also be perceived to be a testing theory as the results obtained from the study was influenced by the particular application of the deployed data collection skills. Furthermore, a robust research methodology that is

adopted in this study would be explanatory and deductive as it would examine previous descriptions of higher education and Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa to determine various concepts that would assist me to formulate answers to the research questions articulated in this study. Determining student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa may not be possible if attention is devoted to a holistic perspective on all Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa, but rather having a narrower examination of previous studies can facilitate in establishing a comprehensive and evidence-based study, which will effectively answer research questions and achieve research objectives. An application of a qualitative methodology is significant for this study because it will speak to the needs of this dissertation. The primary focus of a qualitative study of this magnitude, is that issues and dynamics such as inequality, poverty, social justice, multidimensional poverty and affirmative action are examined and studied by a single or a series of theories.

Creswell and Plano (2007) stated that in qualitative research, the epistemological assumption is observed to be that everyone has a different view of the world. The qualitative research methodology paves the way for the researcher to critically analyse a phenomenon utilising individual of the phenomena. Qualitative research paves the way for the researcher to rely on the observations of individuals within a natural setting. Creswell and Plano (2005) further highlighted that a researcher utilises observations to identify themes and patterns that will form an early hypothesis for further exploration. Soiferman (2010:6) defined qualitative research “as a study which is conducted in a natural setting and type of educational research in which the researcher relies on the view of participants, asks broad, general questions, collects data consisting largely of words (or texts) from participants, describes and analyses these words for themes, and conducts the inquiry in a subjective, biased manner”. In addition, this research methodology is a deductive research methodology approach, developing an analysis based on the theories of social justice by John Rawls and the Keynesian theory by John Maynard Keynes.

In addition, a deductive orientated approach will be embedded. Burnley and Saleem (2008) stated that a deductive approach to research is usually the one that most researchers associate themselves with in scientific investigations. This study will examine other comprehensive research studies compiled by other scholars, read existing theories, review the literature, and then test hypotheses that emerge from the existing theories.

The literature review would be utilised as a beacon of evidence for the study and to establish the underlying problem that the study addresses.

6.2 Literature review

A literature review is a logical inspection and blend of literature compiled by a scholar and groups of scholars pertaining to a distinct topic of interest. The review of literature is pivotal since the underlying purpose identify gaps where research is concerned. Burnley and Saleem (2008) further articulated the following four broad functions that the literature review serves:

- A literature review assists the researcher in the improvement and reformulation of research questions.
- A review of literature reveals the basic supposition behind the choice of a particular research phenomenon, as well as the research method, together with the value of study.
- It indicates that the researcher has vast knowledge pertaining to the related research on the subject under study.
- It indicates that the researcher has recognised gaps in preceding studies and that the current research has the potential to close those gaps and add value to the specific branch of knowledge.

South Africa has transitioned from the apartheid regime and minority rule towards democracy. This type of transition thus required a comprehensive practice of institutions and values that would be analysed and rethought pertaining to their health and facilitation capacity for the new era that was upon South Africa. Mzangwa and Dede (2019:4) highlight that one of the functions of Institutions of Higher Learning is to become agents of social justice and mobility. Moreover, higher education proves to play a critical impact on the social, cultural, and economic dynamics in the country. South Africa is still tackling various challenges of redressing past inequalities, transforming higher education, paving and allowing accessibility to students within Institutions of Higher Learning. The inequalities faced by university students build a new social order in pursuit of achieving daunting national needs and respond to modern realities present and evident in universities.

According to Badat and Sayed (2014:127), one conclusion to apartheid was met with great enthusiasm as the reign of a new government constructed national unity and this was spearheaded by Nelson Mandela as he called for a new democratic social order, encompassing social justice in and through higher education. Decades later, Badat and Sayed (2014:127) lament that “the formally desegregated yet class-based Institutions of Higher Learning” continue to form disparities and inequities on university students, as this results to poor academic achievements which are considered to be the pivotal feature of the contemporary educational order within universities. Boulton and Lucas (2008:5) provided a striking realisation in their paper “*What are Universities for*”, stating that the critical essence for Institutions of Higher Learning in the context of globalisation is to seek regulation and stimulation within institutions to pave the way to become instruments of social and economic public policy. Furthermore, Boulton and Lucas (2008:5) stated that public policy identifies Institutions of Higher Learning as vectors of contemporary skilling of a fluctuating segment of the populace of South Africa, as they provide innovation that can be translated into advantage at a rapid pace resulting in transformation of the global economic environment. Badat and Sayed (2014:127) agreed with Boulton and Lucas’s articulation but argued that the consequence of public policy to Institutions of Higher Learning remain firmly closed to the majority of disadvantaged university students coming from previously disadvantaged societies. This, however, identifies key indicators and strategies to advance social justice. Badat and Sayed (2014:127) states that the failure of government to act rationally and holistically to reform student poverty and inequalities and access for students to Institutions of Higher Learning will betray various constitutional ideals and neglect the systemic crises of education.

According to Mzangwa and Dede (2019:9), the virtual ideation of prohibiting access to university students from a social justice perspective suggests several inequalities and challenges associated with policies of segregation during apartheid. Nkomo, *et al.* (2007:399) identified change in the Higher Education system and universities as an indicator of social progress. With this narrative, Akoojee and Nkomo (2008:385) articulated that social progress as a variable of transformation refers to a framework existing of an overhaul of social innovation, which significantly paves the way for meaningful social transitions. Transformation in South Africa needs the government to remove any barriers to entry so that Institutions of Higher Learning become more inclusive achieving accessibility, good statistics, and outcomes of participation. With student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa being

considered as a failure in achieving social mobility, it is apparent that government has failed dismally in figuring out the primary stumbling block of addressing student poverty and inequality with institutional access within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa.

Research conducted has a laser focus on transformation in universities. According to Badat (2009:3) in his study on *“The Role of Higher Education in Society: Valuing Higher Education”* institutional reform within Higher Education systems and Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa evolved out of ideology of neoliberalism. Bergdahl (2008:48) gathered insight that speaks to Badat’s study in his research on *“Developed Universities and the Developing World: Opportunities and Obligations”* by stating that the neoliberal rationale and ideation have evolved to become hegemonic with a voluntarily embracing of financial institutions. This scrutinises heterogeneous ways and the degree to which the latter impacts the economic and social policies, practices of universities in South Africa. It is critical therefore to analyse the conception of development that has evolved significantly to reduce substantial economic growth and performance. (Badat, 2009:7). Bergdahl (2008:50) stated that economic growth, conjures up university goals, comprehensive policies, arrangements and actions that devote their attention primarily on growth promotion and reduction in hurdles to prosperity. The markets explain the sole purpose of Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa in terms of their functions in the economy (Bergdahl, 2008:50).

Student funding

The demand for university acceptance and funding for Institutions of Higher Learning exceeds the supply dramatically. In terms of access, Naidoo and McKay (2008:159) stated that the problem is fixed upon student numbers within higher education, which has increased drastically, spiking in numbers since 2011. Naidoo and McKay's (2008) study on "*Student funding and student success: a case study of a South African University*" provided interesting insights pertaining to the challenges, access and funding of students within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa. Their study highlights a series of challenges with the contemporary funding mechanisms employed by Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa to combat student poverty and inequalities. One pressing concern is that some university students are being given high value or multiple bursary funding that is unrelated to their academic performance. In addition, both scholars accentuate deep problems within Institutions of Higher Learning as many students who excel academically end up being neglected with funding. There is a plea that this kind of misconduct warrants further investigation as this increase's student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa. Critically, this study by Naidoo and McKay posed the question of an exception of funding that is significantly based upon academic excellence, which shows no relationship between the amount funded and the academic excellence of a student.

Regarding NSFAS, the underlying factor of its value of funding lays inversely correlated with academic success. Naidoo and McKay (2008) further presupposed that students coming from low-income households are significantly underprepared for university study; and this limits their capacity for their studies to be productive. The early 1990's saw South Africa embark on a reform process that ushered in the new democracy. Since then, outstanding student debt has been a major problem and threat to Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa as this creates barriers for the academic calendar year succession for many previously disadvantaged students that come from marginalised backgrounds. With this, the government had to introduce some form of financial aid mechanism model that had the objective of assisting students coming from previously disadvantaged families to complete their higher education studies and to combat the plight of student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa. According to De Villiers (2017:4), in the study entitled "*The poor and access to*

higher education in South Africa: The NSFAS Contribution” providing financial support to university students is an effort to engineer equality and opportunities to eradicate the extreme racial imbalances evident within universities in South Africa.

Many scholars and researchers propose that a strategic well-thought-out, effective and efficient student model entails a significant potential in facilitating and assisting some social and economic dilemmas within South Africa. For example, the discussion on students from impoverished backgrounds and low-income households has resurfaced on an annual basis as they require resources in order to enrol and have access within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa (Walker & Mkwanaenzi, 2015). The number of students relatively overweighs the finance available for their studies. However, if higher education does not have a solid solution to remedy this problem, it will gradually pave the way for a destruction of students’ aspirations for those that come from difficult backgrounds (Nussbaum, 2001), which will result in missed opportunities for South Africa within the economic productivity sector (Walker & Mkwanaenzi, 2015:42). There are many students who have been excluded when it comes to funding, and a comprehensive student funding model will critically aid in alleviating the exclusion numbers of student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning. ‘Who’ and ‘why’, therefore, remain pivotal questions when one critiques student funding. A link to student funding is that Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa need to transform their governance and the nature of their internal composition in addressing the institutional and social inequalities. This also needs to be accommodated by recommendations for the future of the country’s economy.

Previous research conducted by Naidoo (2015) on “*Student Funding at a South African Institution of higher education*” found that South Africa has grappled to make higher education inclusive of the demographics of the institution to become consistent. In addition, Institutions of Higher Learning need to become more inclusive with their environment for students. With regards to student funding, it often tends to attempt addressing both areas of concern, but in most cases, with Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa, it determines nuanced problems that prevail in the form of social justice. In most instances, higher education in South Africa finds itself guilty of mis framing social justice in higher learning institutions. Moreover, the pressure on students keeps on mounting with regards to funding for their studies. Hence, many students have turned their desire for funding towards any form of funding. Other students turn their attention

towards part- time employment in pursuit of fulfilling their responsibilities (Steyn & De Villiers, 2007:136).

The prospect of student funding accompanied by student support to alleviate and dismantle student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher learning in South Africa remain two pivotal functions of South Africa's higher education sector, although there is not a forgone conclusion on its formal implementation. This sheds light on universities delivering multiple elements such as management support, academic support, economic benefit for institutions, networking, and promotion (Begicevic *et al.* 2010). Each of the above-mentioned elements significantly attribute to conflicting priorities, which depends on in which institution of higher learning a student is placed, which will then depend on his/her respective needs and time (Asif & Searcy, 2012).

While there is vast conclusion on an abundance of literature directed towards student funding, challenges, and trends of universities in South Africa, social justice in terms of post-1994 South African education, there is minimal literature pertaining student poverty and inequalities present within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa with reference to access as well as limited research in the utilisation of academic literacy and non-academic literacy criteria. This study contributes towards the plight of student poverty and inequality with institutional access within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa.

7 Significance of the study

The importance of an investigation into student poverty and inequality with institutional access within universities in South Africa critically highlights that the government's Higher Education system has not valued social inclusiveness. The perception of restricting access to students within Institutions of Higher Learning because of their social and economic background dynamics of poverty and inequality in the form of a lack of funding presupposes a severe diagnosis of profound inequalities within universities in South Africa. Transformation within Institutions of Higher Learning is therefore critically needed which will enable a construction of social progress, resulting in an automatic reconditioning of social thinking and meaningful social transition.

8 Ethical considerations

Ethical considerations can be identified as one of the most pivotal aspects of research. The premise of studying human-beings, associated with their behaviour, requires the logical consideration of ethics. The sole purpose of ethics is to protect the well-being of the research participants within a study.

Most often, people acknowledge ethics to be an extensive list negative rules and regulations resulting in sanctions should the research not adhere to the rules. When exploring the subject of ethics, terms that come to the fore are morals, values, principles, and a set of laws. Davis, Francis and Jupp (2011:283) highlighted that ethics are standards which ought to be applied to others when conducting research. "Standards" are considered as guidelines as to how researchers should conduct themselves in their pursuit of concealed issues of interest. This is pivotal if these issues involve human participants. It is, therefore, safe to say that research ethics should be a fundamental concern of all social science researchers within the planning, designing, implementing, and reporting of their research. Cognisant of the foregoing, the following standard ethical principles were taken into consideration:

1. No persons would be considered as direct respondents in this study.
2. This study would only encompass indirect sources for data collection.
3. This study would consist of a desktop study and a literature review.
4. The rules of the North-West University will be adhered to at all times.

9 Preliminary demarcation of the study

Chapter 1: Introduction and background of study

This chapter describes the research problem, the objectives of the study and the significance of the research. It also consists of the central theoretical framework of the study. Furthermore, this includes a background and an introduction for the study.

Chapter 2: Significant historical roots of student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa after apartheid?

Past inequities like the one of the apartheid systems is utilised to discriminate principles of social and economic dynamics which did not continue the legacy of social living and education standards of all university students in the country. These had highlighted racial segregation and racial marginalisation among university students pursuing higher education. Higher education and Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa form an intrinsic variable of social standards upliftment. This is also accompanied by the development of the country's economic, social and political dynamics. The economic, social and political variable highlighted that Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa are used for the advancement, societal advancement and regression purposes. After South Africa's first democratic elections in 1994, the Higher Education system was attacked by social, political, and economic demands. An assumption by many was that the sole proprietor for transformation should be government policies. These government policies most often are informed by participatory policy construction processes. South Africa and its civil society have undergone tremendous transformations. The resilience pertaining to policies and innovations destructive towards the immense frustration and anger in students within universities in South Africa. The capacity of government and its ability to transform historical roots within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa deemed to be complicated. This is due the nature and complexities of the transition of macro-economic policies associated with conceptions of globalisation, and cultures that seem to deracialise transformation within universities. The political freedoms ushered in

by the post-1994 transition was seen at that time as the basis for redressing long-standing social and economic deprivations within Institutions of Higher Learning by most students coming from disadvantaged backgrounds in South Africa.

As such, this chapter first intends to analyse the historical roots of student poverty and inequality by defining student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa. Secondly, this chapter highlights the origins, philosophies and methodologies of the historical roots. Thirdly, the chapter provides an analysis pertaining to the genesis of racial discrimination as a historical root of student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa, legislation, and Acts such as the 'Bantu Education Act 47 of 1954'; 'the Extension of University Act 45 of 1969'; 'the Medical University of South Africa Act 78 of 1976'; and 'the Vista University Act 106 of 1981'. In conclusion, this chapter scrutinizes on the issues and factors characterising the historical roots of student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa. These issues and factors are the following: defying discriminatory education, education inequality, and language policy as a political instrument.

Chapter 3: What role does the theoretical dimensions of social justice play in student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa?

An important assumption is that Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa are valuable mechanisms for social justice. Studies on the Higher Education system in South Africa and research on social justice have been conducted. It is important to take note that there is minimal research been executed out on the affair between the Higher Education policies and social justice. Since the 1994 democratic discourses, emphasis have been carried out on the need for social justice to communicate with government transformation variables as this is pivotal towards the linkage between the Higher Education policies and social justice. This, however, need to be further investigated in order to determine the degree social justice informs various government policies towards higher education. This chapter consequently showcases a critical investigation of the achievement of social justice and equity within South Africa's higher education system and Institutions of Higher Learning. This is measured and analysed against the policy expectations for social justice. Social justice, in this chapter, ultimately refers to which Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa project equity and democracy towards student poverty and inequality. Social justice in higher education also redresses respective university policies, goals, practices and programmes. Additionally, this

chapter, proceeds from the implementation of social justice as a reaction to government policy demands for university responsiveness. This university responsiveness speak to complex issues such as allowing university access to previously disadvantaged students and expanding university participation for marginalised students. Moreover, the chapter shares new and historical insights towards the limits of government policy frameworks which promises social justice but delivers little in real life.

Firstly, this chapter will provide a discussion on the South African higher education system since 1994 and the complexity of change and transformation on Institutions of Higher Learning. This will be supported by an analysis on the three pillars of transformation namely: “increased and broadened participation, responsiveness to societal needs, and co-operation and governance”. Secondly, the chapter provides an overview on social justice in South African higher education and its role on Institutions of Higher Learning. Thirdly, this chapter dissects and conceptualises the normative and substantive notions of social justice that take central stage in South Africa’s higher education systems and Institutions of Higher Learning. Fourthly, this chapter seeks to investigate normative social justice and its influence on South Africa’s higher education system to eradicate student poverty and inequality within institution of higher learning. In addition, an overview on the criticism of the normative notion of social justice and its impact on South Africa’s higher education system and Institutions of Higher Learning are given. In conclusion, this chapter provides an overview and detailed discussion on equity in South Africa’s higher education system and Institutions of Higher Learning. This is accommodated by definitions of equity and diversity respectively. In addition, there will be an evaluation and discussion on three reform strategies of equity that are utilised within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa, namely, equal treatment, equal educational opportunities, and educational adequacy.

Chapter 4: The role of public policies in post-apartheid higher education in South Africa

The conditions of policy transformation are provided in this chapter. Although government public policies within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa are a managerial tool for the benefit of the public, it is now widely accepted that it can be adapted successfully so that they can be transferred for utilisation in South Africa's Higher Education system. This chapter explores government public policies within Institutions of Higher Learning, the mainsprings of public policy in higher education, public policy implementation in higher education, the transformation of South Africa's Higher Education system, the transformation of massification in higher education, transformation of differentiation in higher education, the transformation of knowledge and culture in higher education, and various government public policies in higher education such as "the National Commission on Higher Education Act of 1996, the White Paper on Higher Education Act of 1997, the Higher Education Act 101 of 1997, and the National Plan for Higher Education in South Africa". These government policies are dissected in their different forms and applications in South Africa's higher education and training system and Institutions of Higher Learning. The role of this chapter is to intentionally highlight the most significant higher education public policies in South Africa in eradicating student poverty and inequalities within Institutions of Higher Learning. Issues relating to university access, social justice and equity weigh a lot and are intricately connected to transformation within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa.

Chapter 5: Free Higher Education Feasible in South Africa

Public discussions on higher education funding in South Africa have been beset by numerous misunderstandings since the #FeesMustFall Movement emerged in 2015. The debates encompassed myths or misconceptions pertaining to what free higher education would mean. This would range from implications of free higher education proposals for student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning to the feasibility of funding such proposals. This chapter, therefore, analyses the feasibility of free higher education in South Africa and overviews the political opportunism of the former President of South Africa and his advisors.

As this chapter unpacks the feasibility of free higher education, it also defends the free high education proposal from being the worst kind of populism and a radically progressive policy that can be achieved with no negative consequences. The main argument is constructed towards where government will source funds for free higher education or whether providing free higher education in South Africa is a solution to curb student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning.

Chapter 6: Conclusion and Recommendations

The aim of this study is to investigate student poverty and inequalities within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa. This chapter provides conclusions of every chapter within the study and the recommendations from the study.

The next chapter that follows advocates a critical review of the significant historical roots of student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning to fulfil the mandate of social justice. The chapter furthermore defines student poverty and analyses the origins, legislations and issues characterising student poverty and inequalities

CHAPTER 2: SIGNIFICANT HISTORICAL ROOTS OF STUDENT POVERTY AND INEQUALITY WITHIN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING IN SOUTH AFRICA

2.1 Introduction

The previous chapter presented the research questions and objectives of the dissertation. It also presented as problem statement, significance of the study, and central theoretical framework of the dissertation. Furthermore, the chapter also comprised of a literature review and presented an outline of the chapters in the dissertation.

As such, this chapter first intends to analyse the historical roots of student poverty and inequality by defining student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa. Secondly, this chapter will highlight origins, philosophies, and methodologies of the historical roots. Thirdly, it will provide an analysis pertaining to the genesis of racial discrimination as a historical root towards student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa, legislation, and Acts such as “the Bantu Education Act 47 of 1954; the Extension of University Act 45 of 1969; the Medical University of South Africa Act 78 of 1976; and the Vista University Act 106 of 1981”. Furthermore, issues and factors characterising historical roots towards the Higher Education system and Institutions of Higher Learning will be dissected. In conclusion, this chapter will scrutinize the issues and factors characterising the historical roots of student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa. The issues and factors to be examined are the following: defying discriminatory education, education inequality, and language policy as a political instrument.

According to Habib (2019:58), higher education associated with the integration of Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa have remained so volatile after apartheid due to variables of policy mismanagement which resulted in the erosion of student funding. According to Johnson, (2019:45), South Africa's first democratic election in 1994 threatened the higher education system with social, political, and economic demands. According to Habib (2019:68), the political freedoms ushered in by the post 1994 transition were seen at that time as the basis for redressing long-standing social and economic deprivations within institutions of higher learning by most students coming from disadvantaged backgrounds in South Africa. South Africa and its civil society after 1994 have undergone tremendous transformation. South Africa today has more than 20 years since it has transitioned into democracy. It is contradictory, perhaps to accentuate that a fraction of the education sector in South Africa has advanced and progressed most when it comes to implementing goals of quality, equity, and transformation set out by the Higher Education system. The contradiction is constituted by a lack of quality when it comes to the curriculum of certain Institutions of Higher Learning, disproportional distribution of resources to students to achieve equity, and lack of transformation in terms of the institutional culture of Institutions of Higher Learning. According to Monzo and Soohoo (2014:147), there is much that higher education and Institutions of Higher Learning can claim to have achieved. These achievements, according to Habib (2019:58) have been identified as follows:

- “the integration as a system from the fragmented past, an established quality assurance and advisory body within the higher education sector, a fundamentally altered institutional landscape;
- greater access and racial transformation in the demography of students; higher research outputs, and international recognition through large research projects;
- more attention paid to teaching and learning methods;
- curriculum and student support;
- the implementation of a governing framework for its educational offerings; and
- the allocation of financial support to many students through the National Student Financial Aid Scheme (NSFAS) within Institutions of Higher Learning”.

The resilience pertaining to outdated university policies and innovations remain fixated within institutions. These type of outdated university policies and innovations include: policies of the medium of instructions, policies of enrolment target that universities tend

to set, therefore closing the gates of university access before students are funded by NSFAS, and policies of student accommodation placement. This, however, brews the immense frustration and anger among students within universities in South Africa (Monzo & Soohoo, 2014:150). Furthermore, Wolhunter (2009:62-63) states that the most obvious historical root of student poverty and inequalities within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa is the dilemmas and trade-offs involved in achieving growth simultaneously with bettering the livelihoods of students and having the chance to succeed. However, this then solidifies the “equity versus quality” debate that is still present within inequality and poverty. Another issue is the dilemma of access to higher education institutions; this too was racialised. Moreover, historical roots should not be ignored within Institutions of Higher Learning as elements of protest were evident. The capacity of the government to transform the historical roots of origins, philosophies and methodology, legislations and Acts within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa has its complexities of transition, policies associated with globalisation, and different cultures that forfeit deracialising transformation within universities.

According to Wolhunter (2009:59), the reduction of student poverty, accessibility, institutional marginalisation, financial exclusion, and student inequalities in all their dimensions was the goal by Higher Education.

The role of Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa, according to Habib (2019:70-71), towards the destruction of the social order constructed by apartheid can be considered dubious. The apartheid social order cannot be answered in an abstract, causal manner or in any form of generalisable manner when trying to combat the challenges of South Africa’s Higher Education system (Habib, 2019:72). According to Monzo and Soohoo (2014:155), during the apartheid tenure, black university students constructed higher education to become a key terrain for student mobilisation. Furthermore, Habib (2019:74) highlights that South Africa’s Higher Education system was the most contested sites of struggle during the battle against apartheid and it continues to be so today, a “battleground” and a “turf war” with multiple dimensions and levels of sophistication. For example, the 1976 June 16 student riots and the 2015 Fees Must Fall movement, which was a student-led movement aimed at halting increases in student fees and increasing government funding of universities. Remains one of the most contested terrains in post-apartheid South Africa, spanning a broad spectrum of interests and imperatives. This has been the case for almost three decades after South Africa’s

peaceful transition to democracy. However, the South African education system and its Institutions of Higher Learning, like other aspects of the fabric of society, has transformed dramatically, but how it has changed and what underpins these changes still linger on. It is a fact that South Africa's Higher Education system has experienced challenges since apartheid has ended. This then, translates into its Institutions of Higher Learning, and affect students resulting in student poverty and inequality. Student poverty and inequality in South Africa devotes attention on a system of higher education, which is riddled with race, financial and gender imbalances in terms of the academic and support structures.

2.2 Defining Student Poverty and Inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa

Poverty is regarded as social problem. The term "poverty" is commonly utilised and has been a matter of debate for many years; however, there is no clear definition that is provided by the dissertation. Many people interpret and acknowledge poverty differently. There are different meanings that are attached to the jargon and its impact. According to Ramaphoma (2014:60), poverty is defined as "a common element of material insufficiency, where there is a lack of resources that are needed for survival". This means that poverty is an on-going difficulty of financial resources, social and political dimensions in order to maintain living standards. It is important to acknowledge that there are different types of poverty namely, situational and generational poverty. Ramaphoma (2012:65-66), elaborated situational poverty to be evident due to crises or losses that might have occurred and most often temporary. Generational poverty occurs due to two or more generations that have been born into the pockets of poverty (Ramaphoma, 2012:63). It can be concluded that students within Institutions of Higher Learning experience both types of poverty. In addition, Ramaphoma (2012:69) highlighted that poverty and inequality are closely linked, and should not be treated separately. Inequality refers to a comparison that exists between living standards and living conditions (Ramaphoma, 2012:69). Furthermore, inequality can be contextualised as an attainment of outcomes. Student poverty and inequality is when students experience elements of financial, social and political, resource insufficiency to fulfil their higher education dreams and aspirations. Student poverty and inequality is also considered as students leaving the university due to the inability to continue to fund their studies. This is evident that poverty and inequality are linked, for example, due to a poor background, a student who may not have qualified to get any form of loan, sponsorship or funding qualifies for exclusion from the university

because of their inability to fund their studies irrespective of their academic performance. Student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning is when unfunded and underfunded students attain misaligned students' needs which contribute to high non-completion rates and a high student debt crisis. Poverty and inequality are the main contributors to university students, and are very much familiar with both concepts. One common trend is that students who do not attain any form of funding are dependent on their parents for financial support and this results to parents applying for financial loans to finance the educational expenses. According to Bunice (2017:1978), most households and parents default payments on their financial loans they applied in order to settle fees for their children. This, however, becomes a problem because their names get blacklisted.

According to McLean and Walker (2012:585), the issue of student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning is a key issue that confronts the South African Higher Education system. Poverty and inequality carters an outline of a knowledge producing system, specifically, towards student accessibility, student marginalisation and exclusion, student funding, and student equity and equality within Institutions of Higher Learning, which have all become a challenge that is present and produced by the colonial eras of apartheid in South Africa. About 250 000 students are associated with generational and situational poverty in South Africa (Mutekwe, 2017:147). South Africa has been glorified to have intense debate on these issues. The South African government have also been intentional about eradicating all form of poverty types and inequalities evident within Institutions of Higher Learning. While these issues concerning higher education in South Africa, and the issues surrounding free education for all have been, and still remain, the subject and latter of conversation. In addition, Soudien (2016:229) highlighted the issue of access, as it is considered expensive due to high tuition fees. Tensions surrounding university students who are eligible to access an Institution of Higher Learning, but are unable to do so, due to variables of being underfunded contribute to student poverty and inequality still remaining active today in South Africa. Soudien (2016:230) further stated that financial difficulties and government intervention are pivotal in the developments of student poverty and inequality. Habib (2019:75) points to unfavourable and biased decisions adopted within the criteria utilised by Institutions of Higher Learning towards the management of eligibility, selection, accessibility, and admissions.

The current complexion of higher education in South Africa presents student poverty and inequality with many challenges. The ever-changing role of poverty and inequality within

Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa has become more complex due to the diversity of age, ethnicity, academic background, and financial background of students (Tandwa, 2016). Habib (2019:80) provides a definition for student poverty and inequality:

Student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning are complexities of financing, equality of access, widening participation, the improvement of support and developmental services, effective use of technology (including distance learning), use of new and more flexible learning formats, student attainment of new skills and increased employability, and historical debt demolition.

2.3 Origins, Philosophies and Methodologies of Historical Roots towards Student Poverty and Inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa

South Africa's Higher Education system has a historic role to play that has been identified and accepted by all Institutions of Higher Learning. A powerful role is present that produces high level graduates, new knowledge, the development of critical, active students in our democracy and addresses the many legacies of apartheid. According to Habib (2019:82-83) one could highlight origins, features, and philosophies of historical roots towards student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa before the democratic elections in 1994. According to Habib (2019:83) there were "prominent racial segregation, inequality with regards to standards set for various racial groups, an outdated and inadequate education system, overcrowded lecture rooms, minimal resources, an imbalance in resource provision for students, mono-cultural, prescribed syllabuses and reading materials, and a lack of a culture of teaching and learning".

The former Minister of Higher Education, Prof. Kader Asmal, said that the second elections during the apartheid indicated a non-uniformed system of higher education (Hlokwa-la-tsela ntshebele, 1999). It is important to note that higher education in South Africa had been the gateway to achieve political objectives. During apartheid, higher education that was given to other racial university students including Whites, Indians and Coloureds was far better and inclusive compared to Blacks' higher education. The education of the black South African students in higher education was mostly affected by the historical roots of inequality, under provision and the limited distribution of learning resources (Hartshone, 1985:148). Apartheid in South Africa was built on the premise of

racial segregation that intended to work counterintuitive to the social aspects of politics and economics interests of black university students (Wolhunter, 2009:65).

2.3.1 The genesis of racial discrimination as a historical root towards student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa

There are various views pertaining to the origins of racial segregation as a historical root towards student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning. According to Joyce (1990:8) discrimination portrayed on race and class difference originated from the Dutch settlers when they made their entrance on South Africa's shores in April 1652. When highlighting schooling in South Africa, there is no conclusive evidence that segregation was infiltrated with the opening of the first school on 17 April 1658. Furthermore, the second construction of the school in 1663 which provided learning for European and Khoi learners respectively also showed no signs of racial divide (Mohlamme, 1990:10). Further, Mohlamme (1990:25) pointed out to the first attempt of segregation in schooling to originate from the dynamics of church in 1676. However, the governing of the National Party (NP) in 1948 intensified racial discrimination and separate schooling systems in South Africa's education policy (Dugard, 1978:29).

The NP also implemented a plan to promote apartheid (Barker *et al.*, 1988:367). This fundamentally included a careful treading around racial issues that would spark suspicions in white dominated communities. According to Barker et al (1988:368) these racial issues included "the demand for a republic and a proposal for separate development to regulate the relationship between different racial groups". Atkinson (1978:220) dissected Afrikaner supremacy that came into power with the NP's triumph in the national elections of May 1948, which saw the NP winning the majority of the seats. At the time, most Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa for black students were still under the authority of missionaries and churches. Taking everything into account, Shindler (1984:2) and Stonier (1998:210) shared congruent opinions pertaining to the NP inheriting an educational system for black university students preferably that already felt the effects of segregation. Ultimately, this paved the way for an inferiority complex to other racial groups in South Africa's universities.

The Bantu Education Act 47 of 1953 clearly indicated the sole mandate of education transformation in South Africa. This mandate was to: "to transform education for Natives in Bantu Education". According to Robertson (1973:159), "A Bantu pupil must obtain

knowledge and the necessary skills and attitudes, which would be useful and advantageous to him/her and at the same time beneficial to his/her community". Furthermore Robertson (1973:159) accentuated that "there is no place for him in the European community above the level of certain forms of labour". This indicated the South African's government position towards the education of black students. In addition, Robertson (1973:159) stated that the government went for a dominant racial and ethnic education system that was punctuated segregation in an attempt to avoid cultural interaction with black students within Institutions of Higher Learning.

According to Mohlamme (1990:29), Dr H.F. Verwoerd stated, "Bantu education should have its roots entirely in the Native areas and in the Native environment and in the Native community. The Bantu must be guided to serve his own community in all respects. There is no place for him in the European community above the level of certain forms of labour". Verwoerd's emphasis on previously disadvantaged Bantu students within universities should have been indoctrinated with European ideas and ways of life that would be aligned with their situation of life (Kandjou, 1985:65).

2.4 Legislation and Acts as historical roots towards student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa

Firstly, "the NP government legislated, the Bantu Education Act 47 of 1953, the Extension University Act 45 of 1959, the Medical University of South Africa Act 78 of 1976, and the Vista University Act 106 of 1981" will be dissected. It is understood that these Acts became the pillars of the historical roots and resulted in the student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa today. I will, therefore, highlight each Act and relatively denote their relevance respectively.

2.4.1 The Bantu Education Act 47 of 1953

Before the year 1953, missionaries cemented the majority of the education for black students. According to Habib (2019:85), segregated education was legislated. There is little doubt that education for black students was segregated and legislated by the Bantu Education Act 47 of 1953. It is worthwhile to take note to the activities of Bantu education which were controlled by the Minister of the Department of Native Affairs (Habib, 2019:86). According to South Africa (1953), from the commencement of the Act, the authority of the Bantu education needs to be positively invested in the government. To

achieve a thorough mission, the majority of educators and officers who worked for the Department were drafted to a new Department. This department, namely, the Department of Native Affairs would be a conducive environment for all educators and officers that would promote coerciveness (South Africa, 1953: Section 4 and 5). According to Van Zyl (1997:57), this Act was withdrawn prematurely.

2.4.2 The Extension of University Act 45 of 1969

According to Habib (2019:90), the Extension of University Act 45 of 1959 had the provision of establishing “non-white universities and empowered the Minister of Bantu Education to admit only members of specified Bantu ethnic groups to colleges or universities”. With respect to the Act, it potentially established non-European universities during the 1960s. According to Baker *et al.*, (1988:379), the University of Fort Hare was dominated by Xhosa- speaking students, while Turfloop, now called the University of Limpopo (UL), only gave admission to “Northern Sotho, Venda, and Tsonga-speaking students”. The University of Zululand, now named the University of KwaZulu-Natal only accommodated Zulu and Swazi-speaking students. The University of the Western Cape enrolled Coloured students and the University of Durban Westville, now part of the campuses for the University of KwaZulu-Natal, admitted Indian students Baker *et al.*, (1988:379). Behr (1988:192-194) stated that all Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa became autonomous between 1969 and 1971.

2.4.3 Medical University of South Africa Act 78 of 1976

According to Habib (2019:95), the Medical University of South Africa Act 78 of 1976 paved the way for the construction of the Medical University of South Africa (MEDUNSA). This was prevalent as black medical students were only permitted to train at MEDUNSA.

2.4.4 Vista University Act 106 of 1981

The Vista University Act 106 of 1981 upgraded its policy on racial education by allowing construction of campuses all over the country which were for black students only. Other Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa were enabled to register black students within their systems (Behr, 1988:194-195). After analysing the Act and Gratton-Guinness (1989:154), the introduction of Vista University Act 106 of 1981 was an ‘insurance’ strategy of the NP government to reinforce policies on racial segregation in higher

education. This has resulted in today's student poverty and inequality due to the elements of marginalisation, exclusion, lack of access, and lack of resources.

Moreover, the categorisation of university students in South Africa on the premise of race and ethnicity controlled every life dynamic of black students in South Africa (Gratton-Guinness 1989:158). It ultimately had an influence on the geographical location of where they resided, which university they attended, the people and social classes they interacted with, which social amenities they could access, and their political position and affiliation. Habib (2019:96) states that transitions of education and social dynamics were threaded intentionally and were governed by legislation. By legislating these acts, Habib (2019:96) dissects that "a complete and permanent separation of different racial groups in South Africa was achieved in the cultural, economic, social, political, biological, territorial, and educational sphere" resulting in student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa (Gratton-Guinness, 1989:154).

2.5 Issues and factors characterising historical roots towards the Higher Education system and Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa

According to Morrow (2009:35), higher education is the most complex and burdened service being offered within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa. It is the cornerstone of public-speaking and considered as an instrument for social reform. In South Africa, higher education fuels economic growth which results in facilitating equal opportunities for university students after the completion of their respective studies and facilitate social justice to deprived and marginalised university students (Son, 1986:172). To understand the dynamics of student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa today and its impact on social justice, it is pivotal that the ideology of "historical roots" is well taken care of within the context of South Africa's history of higher education. South Africa's universities have experienced a turbulent history of discrimination and inequality dynamics towards its students. According to Kandjou (1985:77), "racial discrimination enslaved and detribalised the African population". Sonn (1986:175) stated that an oppressive system of racial discrimination forced black university students into emotions of despair, furiousness, and rebellion, which paved the way for the rise of belief amongst many students that the Higher Education system potentially dehumanises them. Furthermore, university students in South Africa had believed that non-white and non-person were two positions in society that they belonged to. Fundamentally, racial justice and righteousness had been questioned in South Africa's

universities as this was necessary due to its capability of resulting in racial tension among. Barker *et al.*, (1988:440-442) further indicated the 1976 Soweto Uprising as an example as the aftermath of the demonstrations presented consequences of an unbalanced racial relationships.

Issues and factors related to the historical roots towards Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa can be characterised by the following issues: racial discrimination, education inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning and irrelevant language policies.

2.5.1 Defying discriminatory education within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa

Racial discrimination fundamentally had bitter consequences for students, as well as the education system. These perspectives are highlighted as consequences resulted by racial discrimination policies incorporated for higher education in South Africa. Morrow (2009:40) stated that racial discrimination had oppressed educational knowledge when strategies such as indoctrination and propaganda were implemented as teaching outcomes to accept the specific views pertaining to race uncertainty. Marginalisation of black university students was a racial discriminatory practice within Institutions of Higher Learning (Badat, 1989:107). According to Mohlamme (1990:29), marginalising black university students included educating them only up to a certain degree and strictly for certain forms of labour. Badat (1989:107) further states that those black students were given education that would confine them to low-paying jobs and manual labour after the completion of their studies. Cameron (1989:35) considered the marginalisation of black university students as a deliberate exercise because education has historically been considered as system of allocating individuals for specific economic positions, where inequality and differentiation among these economic positions themselves were inherent.

2.5.2 Education inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning

According to Kissack and Enslin (2003:36) the rollout of policies associated with racial segregation in universities resulted in student poverty and inequalities in all spheres of education and funnelled down to universities. These policies oppressed lecturer qualifications, the lecturer-learner ratio, funding, and resources such as building equipment, learning materials and facilities. All these elements mentioned provide

evidence that education within Institutions of Higher Learning was characterised by inequality (Kissack & Enslin, 2003:40).

Hence, educational inequality in South Africa resulted in racial and socio-political complications within Institutions of Higher Learning. On the other hand, the De Lange Commission of Inquiry of 1981 appealed and amalgamated for an equal distribution of education opportunities for every university student irrespective of their race (Behr, 1988:39).

According to Habib (2019:997-998), education inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning is also characterised by financial provision and compulsory education. The theme of government spending on higher education favoured white university student education, while black university student had an unequal education spending. Furthermore, this disadvantage meant that there was little financial support for black students. Consequently, the malapportionment in government expenditure on higher education for various university students had engineered solidification on the severe and absolute inequality and constricted educational opportunities for black university students (Habib, 2019: 99). Unterhalter and Wolpe (1989:2) stated that “the 1976 opposition to racially segregated education was a demand for better and quality education and better conditions”. The government, according to Murphy (1992:368), had generated a culture that paved the way for rebellion to become the eventual reaction. It is understood that since 1976, the government had an appetite for setting up equal education for equal opportunities within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa, but this attempt failed dismally (Unterhalter & Wolpe, 1989:76). According to Behr (1988:53), financial provision for universities was still determined and allocated according to racial categories. Lack of financial support also had a significant effect on the provision of lecturers and facilities. The facilitation of Black, Coloured and Indian Institutions of Higher Learning were inadequate (Behr, 1988:53).

While financial provision was not equal within Institutions of Higher Learning, mandatory higher education was not feasible for all black students. There were no mandatory and free education for black university students under apartheid, but for white university students, free and compulsory education was available (Kissack & Enslin, 2003:47). According to Morrow (2009:50), compulsory education was introduced for Coloured and Indian students, but not for black students.

Considering all the above, Squelch (1993:176-177) asserted that “the quality of education for white university students can be compared to that of other modern education systems, while black students’ education was characterised by poorly qualified lecturers, inadequate physical resources, over-crowded lecture rooms, high attrition rates, lack of funding, lack of access and student exclusion and marginalisation”. Inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning had an effect on the level of higher education and socialisation of black university students. This could be attributed to specific socio-political dynamics created by government policies during apartheid (Squelch, 1993:177). Moreover, Unterhalter and Wolpe (1987:79) stated that instead of the NP going for equal education, they opted for equal but separate education.

2.5.3 The language policy as a political instrument within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa

The language policy within Institutions of Higher Learning has created a power struggle among various racial groups of university students. According to Atkinson (1978:219), the medium of instruction in universities was created on the basic systems of language that were developed under the apartheid education system before 1994. Around 1948, Atkinson (1978:219) said that significant attention was deviated towards the Afrikaans language as white universities, due to issues of language identified the medium of instruction as system to achieve political agendas and objectives. From 1948 to 1975, the NP government opted for a comprehensive language policy in black universities which transitioned from English to Afrikaans. The Afrikaans language was the dominant medium of instruction (Lemmer, 1993:147).

2.5.4 The medium of instruction

The failure to accept the Afrikaans language as a compulsory medium of instruction resulted into a resistance of Bantu education. Black university students refused to accept the Afrikaans language because its association with the racist policy of governance was rife (Habib, 2019:100). The Afrikaans language became a widely accepted language of the oppressor. This was despite of its usefulness and claim of being an “African” language (Behr, 1988:103-104). Behr (1984:195-197) further stated that the 1976 student uprisings were conjured up by the negative attitudes expressed by students towards the Afrikaans language as the medium of instruction. The existing language barriers in various

Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa ultimately reduces the possibilities of success for most students.

2.6 Conclusion

The massive inequalities, and the challenges of quality, equity and transformation found and evident within Institutions of Higher Learning have been identified as historical roots. The vast apartheid legacies combined with the policies and legislation precluded and continue to preclude the institutional landscape that is necessary for racial transformation in the demographic of students.

The aim of this chapter was to explain and outline significant historical roots that are evident within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa. In order for this chapter to outline the historical roots, it was important that a definition of student poverty be provided. One of the most crucial aspects of the historical roots of student poverty and inequality was to identify the origins, philosophies and methodologies attached to them. The origins, philosophies and methodologies were in the form of racial discrimination, legislation, and acts that the government implemented that resulted into student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa today.

This chapter further highlighted the crippling issues that consequently paved the way for student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning. These issues were in the form of Bantu education, discriminatory education, education inequality, the language policy, and the medium of instruction. The respective roots that were discussed were motivated by the South African educational history. The weakness of the Higher Education system under the previous and present governments in South Africa was also accentuated.

The next chapter that follows advocates a critical review of the extent to which South Africa's Higher Education system and Institutions of Higher Learning fulfil the mandate of social justice. Further investigation will be done on the role social justice plays in higher education and student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning.

CHAPTER 3: SOCIAL JUSTICE AND EQUITY IN SOUTH AFRICA'S HIGHER EDUCATION AND ITS IMPACT ON INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING

3.1 Introduction

The previous chapter discussed significant historical root of student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa. The chapter presented definitions of poverty and inequality and how these two concepts link up to student within Institutions of Higher Learning. A thorough and precise definition was therefore given. The chapter also mapped out origins, philosophies and methodologies and issues characterising student poverty and inequality. The previous chapter connects to the current chapter due to the extent of poverty and inequality being alleviated in order to achieve social justice within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa.

This chapter presents a critical overview and investigation of the implementation and achievement of social justice and equity within South Africa's Higher Education system and Institutions of Higher Learning. This is measured and analysed against the policy expectations for social justice. Social justice, in this chapter, refers to which Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa projects commitments of equity, student poverty and inequality, and redress in their respective university policies, plans, practices and programmes (Bitzer, 2009:2). This chapter, therefore, will proceed from an assumption that the implementation of social justice within Institutions of Higher Learning is a stepping stone towards policy demands for university responsiveness pertaining to additional complex issues of social justice, such as increasing access of disadvantaged university students. Moreover, this chapter aims to share new insights of the policy frameworks that promised to achieve social justice but found the process a bit difficult.

Firstly, this chapter will provide a discussion on the South African Higher Education system after 1994 and the complexity of change and transformation in Institutions of Higher Learning. This will be supported by an analysis on three pillars of transformation, namely, “increased, and broadened participation, responsiveness to societal needs, and co-operation and governance”. Secondly, the chapter provides an overview on social justice in South African Higher Education and its impact on Institutions of Higher Learning. Thirdly, this chapter will dissect and conceptualise the normative and substantive notions of social justice that take central stage in South Africa’s Higher Education system and Institutions of Higher Learning. Fourthly, this chapter will seek to investigate normative social justice and its influence on South Africa’s Higher Education system to eradicate student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning. In addition, this will be associated with an overview on the criticism of the normative concept of social justice and its impact on South Africa’s Higher Education system and Institutions of Higher Learning. In conclusion, this chapter provides an overview and discussion on equity in South Africa’s Higher Education system and Institutions of Higher Learning. This is accommodated by definitions of equity and diversity, respectively. In addition, an evaluation and discussion will be provided on three reform strategies of equity that are utilised within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa, namely, equal treatment, equal educational opportunities, and educational adequacy.

Social Justice in this chapter is centred around the justice of redistribution, and justice of participation (Fraser, 2008:154). To understand social justice and equity in this chapter, it is pivotal to acknowledge and dissect the features to social justice and equity in South Africa’s Higher Education and Institutions of Higher Learning. According to Fraser (2008:155), the justice of redistribution is centred on the fair distribution or redistribution of resources and opportunities to all groups in society. In addition, the distribution of participation can be deduced as both an outcome of stringent administration of redistribution. In terms of the justice of redistribution in Higher Education and Institutions of Higher Learning, all students need to possess equal opportunities so that there can be an accessibility of educational resources and financial resources. The justice of participation in Higher Education and Institutions of Higher Learning accentuates determined and active formal education and participants from all spheres. This creates a healthy social construction of knowledge and knowledge for students. Social justice and

its existence is critical due to its essence of fairly distributing resources equally to societies. Social justice as a concept of fairness and equity fundamentally constitutes various political obligations in the higher education struggles in South Africa. The nationwide celebration of democracy in South Africa, however, ensured a debate pertaining to issues of social justice, especially in the context of higher education and institutions of higher learning in South Africa (Clark, 2006:272). In addition, Chishlom (1998:35) says that after 1994, the South African government appeared to have widely accepted and appreciate social justice as it has been reflected in South Africa's Higher Education policies. This was due to the promise of the democratic dispensation in South Africa that seemed to devote its attention to a more progressive implementation of policies. According to Clark (2006:278), social justice is a phenomenon that should be contained within the new Higher Education policies in South Africa. However, there is little evidence that such commitments have been exercised by the government within the Higher Education system policies. According to Apple, (1993:108) South Africa's Higher Education system is under immense pressure to be socially responsive to transformation within Institutions of Higher Learning. Universities in South Africa have an objective and aim to address social justice variables that seem to erode student poverty and inequality. These social justice variables can be deduced to be equity, university access and acceptance, success in terms of degree completion, and the creation of a culture that is democratic within universities. All these social justice variables are of importance to university students in South Africa. The most crucial aspect to do by the government is consider them in policy formulation and implementation stage. Various policy documents that were formulated post-1994 have been created and informed by the guidance of a democratic culture within universities that motivated transformation of the Higher Education system in South Africa. As a result, the intellectual capacity in South Africa's universities was fuelled with triumph due to defeating legacies of apartheid's injustices (Bawa, 2000:88). However, years after apartheid, the optimism and triumph has slowly evaporated, to a point of demotivation. Currently in South Africa, a transformation paralysis within our Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa seems to be evident. According to Bibbings (2006:74), the transformation paralysis pertains to issues of social justice that should have been dealt with 28 years ago.

Today, the need to address social justice in universities remain stagnated. Universities still remain treating student poverty and inequality in a symbolic level instead of treating this issue in a rhetorical level with limited implementation. What is more is that even those aspects that have been implemented by Institutions of Higher Learning fell short of showing a high degree of achievement in the social justice agenda. It is believed that the current democratic dispensation in South Africa seems to have inherited all the answers to adjudicate social justice dilemmas in universities; sadly, this is not the case.

Clark (2006:282) laments the lack of planning, lack of leadership, failing government policies and corruption in the country's Institutions of Higher Learning. This infiltrates to the Higher Education system reaching a level of stagnation, failing to come up with alternative solutions.

This seems to be a pivotal exercise that Institutions of Higher Learning need to account in order to meet the social justice imperatives and be socially responsive. There is little doubt that the transformation paralysis affecting South Africa's Higher Education system has ignored this important function, which trickles down to the creation of a culture. Hence, this chapter will accentuate the importance of justice and equity in the entire study.

3.2 South Africa's Higher Education system after 1994

South Africa's transformation to democracy in 1994 accommodated the creation for a new public policy system which Institutions of Higher Learning based themselves to promote the new democracy. Bitzer (2009:3) stated that after 1994, all reforms explicitly sought to make pivotal transformations within South Africa's Institutions of Higher Learning. These transformations mainly redressed apartheid and its legacies. The democratic government in South Africa played a crucial role in delivering social justice within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa. Indeed, there is little doubt that the new government attempted to incorporate a series of new public policies, specifically the Higher Education policies, that had embedded the language of social justice (De Clerq, 1997:66). According to the Department of Education (1997:4), the rhetorical commitments incorporated by the policies could be historically located in "the People's Education Movement of 1980 and the Broad Democratic Movement of 1990 named the (National Education Policy Investigation)". According to the Council of Higher Education Transformation (CHET) (2000:36-37), the 1997 White Paper on Higher Education Transformation provides clear guidelines on the reform towards student poverty and inequality. Moreover, the CHET re-

visited the principles of the White Paper of 1997 and constructed them into three transformation objectives for Higher Education. These goals were namely, “increased and broadened participation within Institutions of Higher Learning, responsiveness to social needs by Institutions of Higher Learning and co-operation and partnership in governance by Institutions of Higher Learning” (CHET, 2000:37). These goals were deemed as the three pillars of transformation in South Africa’s Higher Education system. Moreover, the Council of Higher Education provided these broad goals of transformation as a way of highlighting their importance and their role in offering a South African ideology on policy transformation in the Higher Education system.

These three pillars of transformation will be explained briefly below.

3.2.1 Increased and Broadened Participation within Institutions of Higher Learning

According to Cloete and Bunting (2000:4), the legacies of student poverty and inequality broken down into fragmentation, marginalisation and inefficiency within the Higher Education system needs to be addressed and defeated. This meant that a large number of university students need to be accommodated within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa. In addition, Cloete and Bunting (2000:4-5) further stated that Higher Education has made it mandatory to encourage and motivate students in into Institutions of Higher Learning, especially those who come from poor disadvantaged backgrounds. In essence, higher education needs to be a ground force for opportunities and social justice, and not for privilege. Institutions of Higher Learning need to make certain that increased and broadened participation is implemented.

3.2.2 Responsiveness to societal needs by Institutions of Higher Learning

According to Cloete and Bunting (2004:5), the Higher Education system and Institutions of Higher Learning need to compile research, build knowledge and train students in South Africa. By doing this, it creates a fertile ground for equipping university students with competitive skills so that they can compete and challenge successfully in this rapid changing economy, thus responding to societal needs.

3.2.3 Co-operation and governance by Institutions of Higher Learning

According to Cloete and Bunting (2000:5), there is a demand for an enabling environment within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa. Additionally, this environment needs to be sensitive and affirm diversity, have an enabling factor to promote reconciliation, and have respect for human life. In addition, Institutions of Higher Learning have the objective of protecting the dignity of students that come from poor and unprivileged backgrounds.

These three pillars of transformation in South Africa's Higher Education system discussed above were initiated by the government in the 1990s. In addition, these transformation goals provided a system for change towards South Africa's Higher Education system which was congruent to the democratic dispensation of 1994 (Bitzer, 2009:6).

3.3 An Overview on Social Justice and equity in South Africa's Higher Education system and Institutions of Higher Learning

According to Sefoka (2019:1767), Higher Education is "all types of studies, training or training for research at the post-secondary level provided by universities or other educational establishments that are approved as institutions of their education by the component state of authority". In addition, Sefoka (2019:1768) provided a definition for Institutions of Higher Learning to be universities, college, or any business school that carters post-secondary level academic instruction that has an aim of awarding a degree, or certificate or diploma. The accomplishment of social justice poses as a challenge in South Africa. Higher Education is identified as a mechanism for achieving its respective obligations to relegate inequality and poverty within Institutions of Higher Learning and other societal problems (Van der Westhuizen, 2008:553). It is important to consider the construction of a democratic government in South Africa which played a significant role in laying the building blocks of social justice (Tjabane, 2010:01). According to Mafumo (2011:1553), the new government that came into power in 1994 was ready to govern, incorporating enormous transformation changes, which took place within South Africa's Higher Education system in particular.

It is understood that one of the roles, responsibilities, and objectives of transforming South Africa's Higher Education system and Institutions of Higher Learning was to redress past inequities or inequalities (imbalances). Moreover, Mafumo (2011:1553) stated that the redressing of these inequities/inequalities were aimed at improving and increasing equity

in university access and increase the success rates of students primarily marginalised and disadvantaged during apartheid. Based on this, Mafumo (2011:1554) stated that policies such as “the Education White Paper 3: A programme for the transformation of Higher Education of 1997; Higher Education Institutional Plans: An overview of the first Planning Phase 1999/2001; Higher Education Institutional Phase of 2000/2001; National and Institutional Planning Framework for the Higher Education system of 1998; Higher Education Act of the Republic of South Africa, No. 101 of 1997; and the National Plan for Higher Education (NPHE) of 2001” paved the way for meaningful inclusion of black students in South Africa’s Higher Education and Institutions of Higher Learning. According to Miller (1991:01), social justice focuses on how the good and advantages or bad and disadvantages in life, for example educational opportunities, are to be distributed among the members of society. Gerwitz (1998:469-470) stated that social justice primarily highlights the “disadvantaged” and “excluded” in that their access to education is more equally distributed. In addition, Sabbagh, (2003:256-257) emphasised that the concept of equal distribution requires Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa to treat students of all racial groups equally. It goes without saying that the emphasis is not so much on equalisation, but rather on the equitable distribution of opportunities. Frattura and Tropinka (2006:327-328) asserted that social justice within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa implies to the willing participation of all students of race in an education system that is mutually moulded to aggregate the needs of all students, irrespective of their culture, race, language, gender, financial background, or political affiliation.

Equity and diversity have become part of the dialogue, debate, policy, and scholarship within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa. These dynamics are evident through the transformation agendas at universities which has a central focus on a series of different issues, namely, student poverty and inequality, student university access and development, educational equity, and the institutional climate and culture (Calderwood, 2010:301). In addition, the past decade has seen unprecedented transformations within South Africa’s Higher Education landscape. According to Cloete *et al.*, (2002:45), these unprecedented changes come from the policies of the democratic government that had a central focus on reshaping South Africa’s Higher Education system to meet goals of equity, democratisation, responsiveness, and efficiency. Moreover, equity and diversity are concepts that are derived from legislation that significantly attempts to redress the imbalances embedded in South Africa’s historical past, especially in the Higher Education space. Furthermore, Calderwood (2010:310) said the concept of equity refers to the

utilisation of coherent systems, solid tools, and fluid mechanisms that promotes a balance of opportunities (both in the context of equality in university access by students, as well as equality in career outcomes) by ensuring unbiased treatment of all students. In addition, Calderwood (2010:315) said the concept of diversity is about acknowledging and managing differences to attain multicultural Institutions of Higher Learning in which no form of discrimination is exercised. What is more is that equity and diversity feature in policies and their implementation within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa more particularly through the transformation agendas.

An evaluation of South Africa's Higher Education transformation strategies and plans was made by utilising three broad guidelines of equality within Institutions of Higher learning in South Africa. These broad guidelines are; equal and fair treatment, equal higher education opportunities, and higher education adequacy. These higher education ideologies are derived from a wealthy philosophical standard of tradition. Although South Africa's Higher Education policies and debates seldomly highlight equity in its traditional form, these policies tend to use a comprehensive framework for analysing South Africa's growth towards an equitable Higher Education landscape or system.

3.3.1 Equal and fair treatment within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa

Equal and fair treatment within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa may also be deemed as "race-blindness". No student should fall victim of ill-treatment, particularly due to their race (Nkomo, 2012:24). An equitable Higher Education system in South Africa means that there should not be any racial influence towards the decision-making of a university's recruiting management. According to Fiske and Ladd (2004:6), equal and fair treatment relegates racially discriminatory university admission policies, which would require stringent funding formulas that should not make distinctions based on students and their race. This system of approach is congruent to philosopher John Rawls's principle and ideology of justice. Rawls (2001:35) adds to this element by "saying that each person has an equal right to a fully adequate scheme of equal basic liberties where basic liberty in this context includes the right to be treated as an individual, rather than as a member of a racial group". In South Africa, considering its malicious history of racial discrimination against black students within Institutions of Higher Learning, it is understood that there is a need to appeal and reject 'race-blind' standards for Higher Education in South Africa. Dowd and Bensimon (2015:65) add that the Constitution of the

Republic of South Africa was adopted in its interim form in 1993 rests upon the pillars of equality. According to the Constitution (Chapter 2: Section 9), “Everyone is equal before the law and has the right to equal protection and benefit of the law”. Equality is embedded in “the full and equal enjoyment of all rights and freedoms” (Marginson, 2011:23). According to Fiske and Ladd (2004:07), South Africa’s Higher Education landscape is amongst the above-mentioned rights. The inheritance of race-blinded systems that will send higher education clear signals pertaining to racial differentiation that was a centre piece of an apartheid system that incorporated devastating consequences for black students within Institutions of Higher Learning.

From another perspective, however, Nkomo (2012:25) said this procedural principle is deemed morally insufficient. A further spotlight is on racial groups in South Africa that started on an uneven playing field in 1994, which would not go far at all. This is due to poor investment in educational facilities and quality of lecturers. This fundamentally does not provide homogenous educational opportunities for black students as for white students (Fiske and Ladd, 2004:07-08). Nkomo (2012:26) states that admission policies within Institutions of Higher Learning do not discriminate against students on the basis of their race any longer. Black university students may experience different exclusion from Institutions of Higher Learning due to their English language proficiency being under par, their family’s economies of scales resulting in failure to pay tuition fees, transportation fees, and prohibitive day-to-day living expenses that accentuate all these variables to student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning. Thus, equity that is taken as equal and fair treatment is pivotal, although this may only be for symbolic reasons in South Africa’s Higher Education landscape.

3.3.2 Equal higher education opportunities within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa

Equal higher education opportunities are broader traditional standards that magnifies the ideology of equal and fair treatment within Institutions of Higher Learning. This ideology of equity is parallel to Rawls’s second ideology of justice. According to Rawls (2001:36) “There should be fair equality of opportunity for social and economic advancement”. This concept, therefore, safeguards the probability for transformation to exist, particularly with everyone having a chance of attaining it. Taking into consideration the disparities evident

in higher education financing by the race card in South Africa, equity standards require all educational policies to be race-aware (Ashwin & Case, 2018:65). This standard of equity summons strict affirmative actions in South Africa's Higher Education policymakers, redress, in order to counter past educational disadvantages (Wilson-Strydom, 2016:145). Such an exercise would find an endorsement in the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa. According to the Constitution, (Chapter 2, Section 9(2)), "Equality includes the full and equal enjoyment of all rights and freedoms, in order to promote the achievement of equality, legislative and other measures designed to protect or advance persons, or categories of persons, disadvantaged by unfair discrimination may be taken". In conclusion, Marginson (2011:25) states that policies might be explicitly aimed at Institutions of Higher Learning based on their racial building-blocs during apartheid. For example, it's important to look at capital funds and higher education funding. Besides, comparable dynamics could be attained without laying out specific racial criteria's, especially by considering variables that are in unison to race and higher education disadvantage respectively, such as student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning. Furthermore, Wilson-Strydom (2016:149) refers to the appeal of such an approach to not violate the standard of race-blindness in South Africa's Higher Education landscape. This allows for a narrow opportunity to have access to a particular Institution of Higher Learning in South Africa, or to be presented with a certain criterion of standard, which will accentuate equal higher education opportunities not to be achievable in South Africa's Institutions of Higher Learning. A more diverse interpretation is necessary, especially in the sense of a student's life chances in getting equal higher education opportunities. Ashwin and Case (2018:67) assert that higher education opportunity would be far too demanding. This is due to the requirement that Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa would offload all the students, including their family dilemmas that significantly poses a threat for black students than for white students in regard to success.

Moreover, Marginson (2011:26) makes us aware of the racial differences within family finances and incomes, including their educational advancements that was populated by colonialism and apartheid. Having expectations on the government and Higher Education Department sector to address everything alone seems too far-fetched. Non-education policy documents are needed for intervention. Ashwin and Case (2018:70) stated that the evaluation for equal higher education opportunities would not be measured according to

their systems but, rather assemble equal higher education outcomes for university students coming from all racial groups. It will also measure the capability of relegating racial differences in higher education opportunities for students, where higher education opportunities would be determined by the pedigree of education. For that reason, equal and fair treatment and equal higher education opportunity within Institutions of Higher Learning are both distributional standards respectively that defines equity by placing connection on the opportunities according to their availability to students of different racial groups.

3.4 Conceptualising the two notions of Social Justice in South Africa and their impact on Institutions of Higher Learning

Normative and substantive notions of social justice are currently taking centre stage in the main debates and discourses on and about South Africa's Higher Education system and Institutions of Higher Learning. The normative notion of social justice was introduced by Miller (1999:05), who focused on the promotion of government legislation and policies that would fulfil equity stipulations without compensating the majority who were short-changed in any particular manner in the past. According to Miller (1999:05) the notion of social justice contains a socialist element, which suggests that "everyone is supposed to benefit equally from participation in the socio-economic activities and social institutions of a society; hence, the move towards the redistribution of social wealth and other amenities, and a more equitable economic system". This emphasis the majority being able to participate as equals in South Africa's Higher Education system. Furthermore, the majority who were short-changed in the past needed to be compensated in order for them to be brought to the level of those who were advantaged in one way or another. According to Mafumo (2011:1554), the majority of black university students who are to be compensated will have an opportunity to participate and compete as equals; hence Institutions of Higher Learning should treat them as equals.

The secondary theory or concept of social justice is known as substantive social justice, which is promoted by Sabbagh (2003:259) and Spreen and Vally (2006:352). This version of social justice goes beyond fulfilling policy requirements in pursuit of combating equity dilemmas (redressing past imbalances). Substantive social justice further evaluates what else Institutions of Higher Learning are developing so that students who enrol in Higher Education can succeed fairly and participate as equals. According to Spreen and Valley (2006:353-354), substantive social justice promotes equality, known as civic equality. By

this, there is little doubt that Spreen and Valley is referring to the ideation of educational adequacy for a democratic society like South Africa, whereby all citizens are equal in participation access, success, competency, efficiency, quality, and knowledge. South Africa's Institutions of Higher Learning have a system that separates students from poor backgrounds and minorities from those from the wealthy and middle class. This is evident in the fact that institutions do not create favourable conditions for students to participate as equals within educational opportunities. In addition, Mafumo (2011:1555) argues that equal education opportunities within Institutions of Higher Education in South Africa should entail significant resources, support and attention, resulting in a channel that leads to the least advantaged students, so that they can participate as equals.

According to Sabbagh (2003:262) and Spreen and Valley (2006:357), Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa have the ability and capacity to combat and alleviate student poverty and inequalities by allocating resources such as funding support (i.e., meal allowances, monthly allowances, book allowances, accommodation etc.) to disadvantaged students and by providing support to them in pursuit of promoting competence, knowledge, efficiency and quality (the threshold level of knowledge and competence) to address the significant inequalities attached to student poverty and inequality. The substantive notion of social justice defines equitable education opportunities as the compensatory distribution of resources, or an equal distribution of resources. Sabbagh (2003:264) states that the compensatory conception of equal opportunities should favour those students who suffered from any sort of handicap in the past. Moreover, substantive social justice can be considered as compatible due to the significant inequalities above the specified threshold of opportunities as prescribed by the normative notion of social justice.

Considering the above, Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa seem to be promoting the normative notion of social justice. The section that follows unpacks the tenets of normative social justice and its influence and impact towards on South Africa's Higher Education system and Institutions of Higher Learning.

3.4.1 An Investigation into Normative Social Justice and its influence on South Africa's Higher Education System and Institutions of Higher Learning to eradicate student poverty and inequality

Concerns of social justice in South Africa's Higher Education system, parallel with normative social justice, reconciles with the political independence currently evident. This makes emphasis on the unpacking of apartheid and its influence on the Higher Education system. South Africa's Higher Education system raised its hand when coming to reconciliation in universities so that it can promote nation-building (Gerwitz, 1998:470).

Social justice, which has become an important beacon for Higher Education and Training, can be located in the National Education Policy Investigation (NEPI). This policy plan was informed by philosophy which was progressive and aggressive towards education and reform in higher education. According to CHET (2000:37), the South African government had envisaged a policy named "the Education Renewal Strategy (ERS)", which had the claim of addressing the injustices present in South Africa. It is important to take note that the ER and the NEPI are completely different. Furthermore, CHET (2000:38) stated that the NEPI framework was "an attempt to democratise education policy formulation; whereas, the ERS did not have the intentions of fundamentally addressing the question of social justice and it could be considered as autocratic".

The trends and challenges that still plague Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa in the context of student poverty and inequality reveal processes of production in terms of policies that seemed to be easy and exemplary due to its promotion of principles that were democratic. According to Gornitza, Kyvik and Stensaker (2005:35), the implementation or paralysis and overload of the normative social justice can be blamed on the government of South Africa. This is reflected in policy inconsistencies and contradictions.

However, one factor that has attributed towards the implementation of normative social justice is the annual government budget allocated to Higher Education in South Africa (UNDP, 2005:56-57). Among various challenges encountered by Institutions of Higher Learning, transformation goals such as equity, access, student poverty and inequality still pop up as issues that need serious attention. Moreover, the constrained implementation these goals of transformation within Institutions of Higher Learning will further illustrate those systemic transformations within the Institutions are complex, and to some extent,

paradoxical due to the contradictory position pertaining to change (Meister-Sheytt & Sheytt, 2005:97). The position of normative social justice in South Africa's Higher Education system embarked on a symbolic policy which had the objective to dismantle the apartheid legacy.

The trends and challenges that South Africa's Higher Education system faces are evident in Institutions of Higher Learning. Moreover, the evidence is highlighted in South Africa's Higher Education system as it still pursues equal higher educational opportunities for all university students in the context of equity, access, and participation for all. However, social and economic realities still hamper the contributions to national development by the Department of Higher Education. Gerwitz *et al.*, (2001:36) stated that normative social justice and its impact and influence is evident in several ways, the main being through the policies of the Growth, Employment, and Redistribution (GEAR) strategy, which profoundly influenced public educational decisions taken based on austerity. Secondary impact in relation to the reconstruction of Institutions of Higher Learning focuses on market-driven concerns. According to Waghid (2000:101), this is a major social hazard towards nurturing the new democracy in South Africa.

The normative social justice collides with the sentiments of government policies. Normative social justice should change the framework and role of Institutions of Higher Learning. Boultan and Lucas (2008:2508) stated that the traditional role of Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa is to serve and promote the idea of a homogenous national culture. The overarching factor that has promoted normative social justice is the GEAR policy, as discussed earlier. According to Boultan and Lucas (2008:2510) Institutions of Higher Learning play two fundamental roles. First, they overarch entrepreneurial positions in outlook, research, and curriculum content. Secondly, Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa tend to produce human capital which significantly renders South Africa's Higher Education system to be globally competitive.

Moreover, Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa are the custodians of normative social justice (Reading, 1996:20). According to Motala and Singh (2001:55), they are considered as the 'Hercules' of democracy, benefiting most university students coming from disadvantaged families rather than the privileged families. According to Waghid (2002:105), Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa that promote normative social justice will humanise and promote equal distribution of resources and equal higher educational opportunities in the context of equity, access and participation,

marginalisation, eradicate of student poverty and inequality, eradicate the injustices of the past, alleviate socio-economic inequalities, and advance democracy. It has to be noted that the logic of normative social justice will not automatically decrease equity, access and participation, marginalisation, student poverty and inequality, the injustices of the past, and socio-economic inequalities within Institutions of Higher Learning and advance democracy in South Africa's Higher Education system. Nevertheless, normative social justice poses a real threat to Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa that still allow the injustices of the past and the legacies of apartheid to dictate their institutional landscape.

3.4.2 Criticisms on Normative Social Justice in South Africa's Higher Education system and Institutions of Higher Learning

The normative notion of social justice oversees an agenda in South Africa due to the historical legacy that the country possess. In addition, the breadth and scope of normative social justice illustrates its inclusiveness and accommodative stance. However, Motala and Singh (2001:55) criticised normative social justice for being "utopian". Its position on Higher Education in South Africa resulted in major criticism towards the adoption of an "inclusive emancipatory and political stance" that produced 'a cadre' of university students who do not acquire adequate skills and knowledge for the marketplace. Kose (2009:628) stated that the proposal of full inclusion within normative social justice has been criticised because it lowers the educational standards of Institutions of Higher Learning by the burden of students coming from disadvantaged educational backgrounds. Another criticism of normative social justice would stem from the postmodernist scholars. Furthermore, Kose (2009:645) highlighted that postmodernist scholars criticise normative social justice because of its stance on a totalising the meta-narrative of knowledge which ultimately excludes other forms of knowledge.

Despite all the criticisms, normative social justice has a good chance of promoting a social and equitable Higher Education and Training system due to its socialist and redistributive variable. The tenets of normative social justice, such as equal distribution of benefits for all under government policies, far outweigh the issues of the marketable skills graduates acquire at a South African University.

In the context of narrowing the higher education policy, the movement of policy alliances in universities and its ambiguities, this chapter believes that the pursuit of social justice is

critical. The researcher's argument after reviewing research concerned with social justice issues in South Africa's Higher Education system and Institutions of Higher Learning is that the national policy documents appear to serve and legitimatise the current socio-economic context. In principle, the social justice agenda is expressed by the recurring focus on equity, redress and social responsiveness, and democratic and inclusive education.

3.5.3 Higher educational adequacy within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa

South Africa's Higher Education system includes a specific criterion of higher education adequacy that moves outcomes towards a minimum or acceptable adequate level of higher education. Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa are catering for education, and this highlight the standard of equity that would not be able to surpass (North, 2006:507). According to Lee and Manzon (2014:823), this standard of equity has a challenge in defining the threshold level of adequate education that cater to university students, which consequently results in on one central question: What is adequate higher education for? To answer this, the researcher incorporates the Rawlsian concept of primary goods. According to Rawls (2001:86) "Every student should attain a minimum set of educational outcomes connected to his or her long-term life chances". In addition to the Rawlsian concept of primary goods, the researcher analysed and added Coates's (2007:571) concept of democratic threshold. Coates (2007:572) emphasised that "the primary role of higher education is to promote a democratic society which will be characterised by educational characteristics of deliberative and collective decision-making". Hence, the threshold of a university student is the level at which they can participate effectively in the democratic and economic process. A combination of these two views paves the way for an inheritance of higher education adequacy in South Africa's Higher Education system. This can be analysed as the level that is mandatory for a student to possess in order for them to participate fully in the economy of South Africa (Lee & Manzon, 2014:826). Although it is not simple to measure in practice, North (2006:515) stated that higher education adequacy will be aware of the threshold levels that are specific to universities. According to Coates (2007:580), during apartheid, Africans had no form of representation in South Africa's Parliament. This resulted in Verwoerd accentuating in his 1953 speech, "this body was not required to advance

beyond the level of labourer”. By this equity, “the white rulers concluded that a low level of education for Africans was adequate” (Coates, 2007:580).

Moreover, South Africa’s dependence on economic and social vitalities in order to be crucially competitive in a globally knowledge-based economy, therefore, requires students graduating from an Institution of Higher Learning in South Africa to attain a higher pedigree of standard in education in comparison to the past (Lee & Manzon, 2014:825). The ideology of “higher education adequacy” is unorthodox in a South African dialogue or context. In South Africa, the governance of the constitution guarantees higher education in universities, which ultimately runs parallel with “higher education adequacy”. Although higher education adequacy seems complex to quantify by its own standard, the level of educational outcomes of South Africa’s Higher Education system would then be declared as acceptable for black students during apartheid in comparison to today’s standards whereby higher education outcomes are clearly inadequate. Furthermore, the trend in higher education outcome in universities significantly determines historically disadvantaged students from different racial groups. This process would allow the students to accentuate the progress and strides made by South Africa’s Higher Education system made in this regard (Coates, 2007:591). From my point of view, institutional inputs such as facilities, learning materials, and quality lecturers within Institutions of Higher Learning who serve as a point of reference to previously disadvantaged students who would provide important information of progress. Indeed, the adequacy of higher education outcomes is mutually exclusive to the quantity of students, the nature of education and knowledge that is provided in universities, and value of resources (such as that of learning materials and educational support guidance through consultation and supervision), but also on the efficiency with which those inputs are utilised (North, 2006:535).

3.5 An Overview on student poverty in the South African Higher Education system

Student poverty in the South African Higher Education system has seen gradual improvements in aspects of providing funding to students, allocating affordable student accommodation, increasing access to Institutions of Higher Learning, removing language barriers, and effective benchmarks for higher education. According to Lee and Manzon, (2014:825), the South African Higher Education system was inherently inequitable. Furthermore, several Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa showcased strong

points of their own resulting in efficient higher education contributions. The South African Higher Education had sustained and consolidated progress towards student poverty and inequality in terms of opportunities, re-visiting the institutional culture, reviewing cost-effective educational outcomes.

It is important to implement a continuous and effective monitoring and evaluation of South Africa's Higher Education system in accordance to intensive transformation goals, efficient educational instruments and mechanisms.

3.6 Conclusion

This chapter firstly attempted to paint a picture of various difficulties of evolution and transformation in South Africa's Higher Education system. This was exercised by examining the potency of South Africa's Institutions of Higher Learning. Furthermore, this examination was with reference to three transformational pillars in higher education. There is clear evidence that highlights gradual progress in constructing these transformational pillars. Although, South Africa's Higher Education system still needs to be aggressive in addressing student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa. This chapter also accentuated the difficulty of accomplishing social justice in South Africa, while education is identified as a vehicle for the achievement of eliminating social problems in the country.

The chapter also provided an overview on social justice in South Africa's Higher Education system. In addition, the core of this chapter provided a conceptualisation of two notions of social justice in South Africa, namely normative and substantive social justice, and their impact on Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa. In South Africa, it is apparent that efforts are being made to integrate social justice into legislative and policy framework. However, there is no clear evidence whether this was sufficiently addressed at the level of formulation or even at the implementation stage. This chapter further significantly determined the length to which normative social justice is moderated at both levels respectively. It is important to acknowledge that normative social justice is an ideology that has been inherited to monitor the dispatch of benefits that hail from institutions, in this context, being South Africa's Higher Education system and Institutions of Higher Learning. Normative social justice advocates for a society that is relatively utopian. This utopian society contributes to the dynamics of marginalisation. With

reference to South Africa's Higher Education system and Institutions of Higher Learning, normative social justice is utilised to teach comprehensive education policies, that is, the Growth, Employment and Redistribution Policy which advocates for "education for all, and, to inform the move towards massification with the emphasis on access, equity, and the inculcation of a democratic culture", which will imply equal participation in South Africa's Higher Education system. The nurturing of equality in regard to higher education and socio-economic variables within Institutions of Higher Learning bulks up the theoretical system of this study. Therefore, this has accentuated normative social justice issues in South Africa's Higher Education being parallel to the tradition of universities, which is to pursue and promote teaching and research, while equipping students with necessary skills and knowledge enabling them to compete in the global market. Furthermore, the intention of this chapter has been to illuminate the attempts, through the three reform strategies implemented by the South African Higher Education and universities to combat social justice concerns such as inequality, discrimination, marginalization and student poverty, and it pointed to the inadequacies that were not effectively developed with an institutional capacity that will affect the institutional culture that already exists.

The next chapter represents a critical overview of government policies, resulting from policy amendment, in which South Africa's Higher Education system fulfils its roles and objectives of social justice. This amendment of government policies in higher education is critical. As observed in this chapter, Higher Education policies during apartheid were being marginalised, which invites a re-visit of policies by the South African Higher Education system.

CHAPTER 4: THE ROLE OF PUBLIC POLICIES IN POST-APARTHEID HIGHER EDUCATION IN SOUTH AFRICA

4.1 Introduction

The previous chapter dissected social justice and equity in South Africa's Higher Education and Institutions of Higher Learning. There was a presentation South Africa's Higher Education system after 1994, an overview on social justice and equity in South Africa's Higher Education system and Institutions of Higher Learning, two notions of social justice, and concluded with an overview on student poverty in the South African Higher Education system. In order to achieve social justice, public policies need to present. This chapter, therefore presents the role of public policies in post-apartheid Higher Education in South Africa.

Although government public policies within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa are a managerial tool for the benefit of the public, it is now widely accepted that they can be adapted successfully so that they can be transferred for utilisation in South Africa's Higher Education system. This chapter provides an overview on government public policies within Institutions of Higher Learning in their different forms and applications in South Africa's Higher Education and Training space and within Institutions of Higher Learning. Firstly, this chapter defines the basic theoretical concepts as a point of departure, which automatically moves into a discussion focusing on the South African Higher Education policy context. Secondly, specific attention will be paid to government policies, such as public policy and its integration within South Africa's Higher Education system. Thirdly, this chapter will focus on altering conceptualisations of transformation in South Africa's Higher Education context and on the extent to which government policies amalgamated to empower Institutions of Higher Learning, which will significantly build goals of inclusiveness with social and economic development. Furthermore, I will amalgamate policy discourses and policy moments in higher education by providing a detailed synopsis of government policies. Additionally, I will discuss government policy gaps in South Africa's Higher Education system and inclusive development considered to be a primary component of the public good. In order to better understand the function of policies in post-apartheid higher education in South Africa, I will periodise South Africa's political landscape associated with the economy by binding the country's activities

in three different presidential administrations; hence the Nelson Mandela, Thabo Mbeki, and Jacob Zuma/Cyril Ramaphosa presidential tenures will conclude the chapter.

Chapter 2 of this dissertation analysed and discussed historical roots of student poverty and inequalities within Institutions of Higher Learning which will be addressed by public policies in South Africa. The presidential era of Nelson Mandela had the vision of dismantling and redressing past inequities present within Institutions of Higher Learning. During apartheid, there were government policies that facilitated Higher Education in South Africa. These policies were the National Commission on Higher Education Framework of 1996 (NCHE), the Higher Education Act No. 10 of 1997, and the White Paper on Education and Training, which supplemented clear and specific bearings for the construction of South Africa's Higher Education system (Ashwin & Case, 2018:16). These policies significantly achieved discrimination, inequality and made possible of the implementation in language policies within Institutions of Higher Learning.

According to Cloete *et al.*, (2002:45), the early years of Nelson Mandela's presidential era saw a significant emphasis on the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) policy. This policy aimed to attain social justice and to redress the apartheid social dynamics, and to achieve redress for past inequities.

The South African Higher Education system possesses a key transformative principle, which accentuates the transformation of demographics, particularly in the student body, with reference to race, disability, gender, and age (Department of Higher Education, 1997). Furthermore, the Council on Higher Education (2016) refers to certain discourses associated with transformation, which are intricately linked to key policies in South African Higher Education. This paved the way for an integration of a skewed racially divided system of a nationwide Higher Education. According to Baijnath (2016:106), institutional governance bodies systems that were relevant, and quality research within Institutions of Higher Learning, proved successful. Furthermore, great strides were made with the implementation of a higher education financial aid provider, called The National Financial Aid Scheme (NSFAS). However, there is a historical higher education system, which is riddled with segregation, inadequate funding models, student poverty and inequality, and student unrests. However, referring to the successes, national policymakers, institutional administrators and students, staff and institutional leaders should be acknowledged because this would have materialised if it were not for their commitment, vision and hard work.

4.2 South Africa's Higher Education Policy

The evolution in Higher Education in a South African context snowballed into a controversial topic, widely associated with the historical roots of the apartheid struggles (Naidoo & Ranchod, 2018:10). Institutions of Higher Learning have experienced their fair share of 'ugliness' in recent years. The 'ugliness' came in the form of extreme student poverty and inequality mapped in various forms across institutional landscapes. It is however important not to allow South Africa's history to continue shaping South Africa today.

Institutions of Higher Learning find themselves in the broader socio-economic environment. This environment contains high rates of unemployment and joblessness in South Africa. According to the CRA-Socio-economic Survey of South Africa (2023), the national unemployment rate stands at 32,7 percent, with youth unemployment recorded at 64.4 per cent. A vast majority of the South African populace are not involved in the economy, education and training, or employment. Further, the CRA-Socio-economic Survey of South Africa (2023) sheds light on many young individuals who have poor schooling outcomes, even when regional comparisons are utilised as data variables - albeit independent and dependent variables for data collection in schooling outcomes. Hence, schooling outcomes are a major barrier for accessibility to higher education in South Africa.

According to Ashwin and Case (2018:5), due diligence to transform institutional inclusion accentuates South Africa's Higher Education sector that consists of 26 public Institutions of Higher Learning, which are strictly selected by the Department of Higher Education and Training as traditional universities. The latter category has provisional objectives of offering diplomas and degrees. Returning to the research objectives of this chapter, it accentuates the backdrop of student protests that shocked the South African Higher Education system. At the spine of student protests, namely, #RhodesMustFall (RMF) and #FeesMustFall (FMF), students had the key role of being whistle-blowers on the fractured and skewed institutional policy and its role in higher education. Institutional policy navigates social mobility and redresses the realities that face students within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa. According to Booysen (2016:23), student protests in South Africa exposed the institutional framework of academic and financial exclusion

derived from historical debt for students who had gained placement within the Higher Education system. Furthermore, Ndlovu (2017:42) referred to the key tensions that are evident among South Africa's university dropouts and the relevance of undergraduate and post-graduate higher education. Booysen (2016:25) and Ndlovu (2017:46) stated that public funding did not grow congruent to high demands of the Higher Education sector. This has seen an increasing share of expenses and costs that become the sole responsibility of students and families, which accentuates the plight of student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning. Booysen (2016:25) and Ndlovu (2017:46) further highlighted the second tension, which focuses on specific divisions of the Higher Education system, and diverse massification associated with South Africa's Higher Education. Firstly, acknowledging stratification within Institutions of Higher Learning causes restrictions on the quality of higher education and its capacity to become the embodiment of social mobility. This is due to difficulties in access to most universities, which provide the highest form of social and economic return. On the other hand, students do not have the opportunity to complete their studies or degrees. This causes friction as there is substantial debt in comparison with the return of engagement students expect from higher education.

4.3. Public Policy in Higher Education

4.3.1 Conceptualising public policy in Higher Education

To understand public policy, there needs to be abstract thinking. Policy is not discernible unless written or contained in a document. Even then, it can be argued that it is not policy, which can be seen or evaluated, but merely the written word or the document (Manganyi, 2001:25). The definition of policy as a function should be considered in more concrete terms. According to Dye (1995:4), "Public policy is whatever government chooses to do or not to do". For Fox and Meyer (1995:107), public policy in higher education is defined as "authoritative statements made by legitimate Institutions of Higher Learning about the way in which they propose to deal with policy problems".

4.3.2 South Africa's public policy mainsprings in Higher Education

Transformation in South Africa's Higher Education system perpetuates transformation goals, aspirations and objectives that links them to South Africa's social good. Being aware of South Africa's public policy mainsprings will provide questions that will enact

this chapter to locate probable answers. According to Manganyi (2001:27), the DNA of public policies, in its development phase and implementation in higher education, develops critical features in giving definition to democratic societies that are slowly in transition. Cloete and Mmakola (2018:105) further stated that the accepted role of government in society is to protect, regulate, develop, maintain, and sustain its citizens. In a democracy such as South Africa, public policy is executed in higher education for rebuilding purposes. It allows the governing party to establish its political ideas (De Coning *et al.*, 2018:202). In addition, Manganyi (2001:28) stated that public policies and legislations set the norms and traditional standards in higher education. This process is seen as regulatory, enabling Institutions of Higher Learning to understand public policy and its symbolic representation towards social institutions. South Africa's Higher Education system is rich with public policy ideations. This is in combination with the progressive constitution, the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (1996). The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa led to an abundance of public policy ideas, such as "free education for all". This might have assisted the transformation of higher education and might have moulded certain policies (De Coning *et al.*, 2018:202-203).

4.3.3 Implementing public policy in Higher Education

Policy failures often arise from a variety of factors. According to De Coning *et al.*, (2018:203), endogenous and exogenous factors of policy failure coexist, and most often policy implementation could be unsuccessful because of poor development. Furthermore, De Coning *et al.*, (2018:203) highlight an absence of resources that fundamentally support public policy implementation in higher education; this advocates an operation of endogenous variables. This makes sense considering the transition to democracy in South Africa. Implementing endogenous and exogenous factors determined the success of public policy in higher education.

According to Gwaindepi (2014:105-108), post-liberation allowed South Africa's Higher Education system to create several Institutions of Higher Learning, both private and public. Gwaindepi (2014:105-108) further pointed out that Institutions of Higher Learning mediate between the government and delivering higher education to students of all races. Furthermore, Kraak and Young (2001:56) stated that the expectations of Institutions of Higher Learning add substance to public policy outputs. Moreover, South Africa consists of separation of powers, which plays a fundamental role in legitimising and guiding the principles of institutions, such as the Council of Higher Education and the South African

Qualifications Authority. What is more, extraordinary circumstances demand extraordinary measures. Arnolds *et al.*, (2013:175) explained this by stating that the transformation in higher education should concede and reconcile with profound evils of apartheid. Institutions of Higher Learning have developed new public policies and legislation for the transformation of higher education; this led to a profound alienation for university students rooting from previously disadvantaged families. According to Arnolds *et al.*, (2013:180-189), the implementation of public policy in higher education meant the following:

- combating student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning as many families are on the receiving end of high tuition fees, study material, accommodation and living costs;
- monitor and evaluate higher education organisations and management who will lead the delivery of education within Institutions of Higher Learning;
- control government engagement in reconstruction, development and fiscal stabilisation so that a significant monetary injection can occur in the Higher Education sector;
- relegate inequities and inequalities in higher education by providing material conditions and professional capacity;
- re-visit education delivery within Institutions of Higher Learning regarding higher education administration and governance; and
- create a new organisational, public policy and legislative environment that will pave the way for radical improvement in higher education and the quality of higher education in universities.

4.4 Transformation in Higher Education

An analysis of the constitutive relationship aligning the government and higher education is extremely important and necessary. According to Ranchod and Naidoo (2018:15), many tensions still exist relating to government's hostilities and friction with transformation. This mirrors the government's relationship with higher education, notwithstanding the government's coordination of higher education and responses from Institutions of Higher Learning. According to Edigheji (2007), a key feature of South Africa is to give bearings to the diverse segments of the Higher Education system to promote efficient policy formulation and coherent policy implementation. Moreover, Cloete

(2002:44-45) described higher education in South Africa as the Council of Higher Education (CHE), which is a coordinating delegation that links Institutions of Higher Learning and the government's Department of Higher Education and Training. Furthermore, this delegation is a "cooperative governance" system under the supervision of the government or "conditional autonomy". Lepori and Naidoo (2017) added insight by referring to the changing of alliances, which will accommodate or resist the government's steering, and is reliant on the histories of hierarchies in higher education and Institutions of Higher Learning connections, which will dominate factions internally within the institutional political domain.

An analysis needs to be conducted on the changes within higher education, focusing on transformation and the post-apartheid history of South Africa. Jansen (2001:202) and Jansen (2002:201) referred to the establishment of the bureaucracy of the government, specifically after apartheid, which needed an efficient discourse pertaining to the evolution of higher education, which accentuated coherent implementation.

4.4.1 Transformation of massification in Higher Education

Compensation for the past, particularly for apartheid, with reference to access to undergraduate studies, commanded the agenda post-apartheid. According to Cloete (2014:2), appropriate redress strategies were suggested. One strategy was that a funding mechanism, sourced from the government, should be awarded to students enrolled at Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa. Badat, Barends and Wolpe (2014) stated that there are concepts, closely affiliated to transformation, which focus on institutional equalisation, as opposed to student redress. In addition, the main objective for the government was to nurture funding frameworks that would transform the massification in higher education.

4.4.2 Transformation of differentiation in Higher Education

According to the DOE (2005:5), the National Development Plan (NDP) benchmarked an objective of a 35 percent contribution to higher education, which called for differentiation, with checks and balances of quality and robust evaluations. This policy document strongly correlated with the CHE commissioned report entitled, "*Towards a new higher education landscape*". The CHE commissioned report portrayed higher education as congruent with the universities public good, which amalgamated change and creating a diverse and

differentiated culture in higher education. Additionally, Jansen (2015:8) stated that a system that included a market-orientated branch, a hybrid of research-led Institutions of Higher Learning, undergraduate tutoring, and a student-led institutional culture was proposed. Moreover, a comprehensive funding framework devised by the DOE proposed a wide range of student enrolments that would facilitate the coercive implementation of the funding framework formula (DOE, 2005:8). The DOE (2005:10) further stipulated that the government's argument was aimed at maintaining a funding mechanism for each student which would improve auxiliary student expenses and tuition fees and accelerate output levels in the completion of degrees.

4.4.3 Transformation of knowledge and culture in Higher Education

Goh and Gopinathan (2008:15) stated that South Africa has made great strides in culture, which permeated higher education as well as the curriculum shaped by African standards. However, there was a widespread notion that elements of the apartheid regime remained in, the curricula and cultures in Institutions of Higher Learning. These institutional ills of the past continued to marginalise and alienate disadvantaged students from poor households. According to Griffin (2016:58), proposals for transformation were made to eradicate the remaining institutional ills of apartheid and to modernise the institutional culture at universities in South Africa.

Rhodes University experienced protests enforced by a student-led movement in which they demanded a revisit of the colonised higher education curriculum and abolish symbols of key apartheid figures, such as the Cecil John Rhodes statue. This accentuated the need for transformation at all Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa. This action was aimed at defeating racism and patriarchy, which were believed to be 'rife'.

According to the CHE (2016), the Ministerial Committee Report on Transformation and Social Cohesion of 2008 had the sole responsibility to place issues of transformation of cultures within institutions on the agenda. This paved the way for the evolution of a new nation-wide policy which focused on social cohesion. In addition, the CHE (2016) pointed to the Higher Education system in South Africa that should have started a project that facilitated the Integrated Transformation Plan. This process paved the way for a nuanced acknowledgement of reconstructing diversity, inclusiveness, institutional culture, and redress.

Collins (1998:126) proposed that selective knowledge had always been evident and was painted by specific interests and power struggles, which meant that most of curricula within South Africa's Institutions of Higher Learning were seen as the custodians of an ideological component for safe-guarding privilege. Moreover, Muller (2000:87) cautioned that there would be grave consequences associated with the acceptance of students who were not familiar with traditional cultures and knowledge in South Africa's Higher Education Institutions.

4.5 Government policy discourses in Higher Education

This chapter also focuses on unpacking higher education policy discourses over the 28-year period from 1994. There is little doubt that the policy discourse has migrated from a formidable driven focus of alignment with government's macro development (Fataar, 2003:34). South Africa's Higher Education system adopted a specific dimension and character within the context of aligning the policy discourse. The post-1994 policy-making period elicited discernible policy moments as represented by four key policy documents, namely, the National Commission on Higher Education Act of 1996, the White Paper on Higher Education Act of 1997, the Higher Education Act 101 of 1997, and the National Plan for Higher Education in South Africa of 2001. Acknowledging the key conceptual continuities and discontinuities among the documents significantly reveals a shifting discursive trajectory within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa. It is imperative that these policies have achieved the following: defied discrimination of inequality and poverty, implemented language policies that were a barrier to entry for most students, implemented the NSFAS policy in order to achieve provision of funds and eradicating student poverty and inequality, increased participation and responded to societal needs of students and bridged the gap between Higher Education and Institutions of Higher Learning. This, however, compliments social justice as a concept as the distribution of educational resources are distributed fairly amongst students coming from poor disadvantaged families.

4.5.1 The National Commission on Higher Education Act of 1996

According to the National Commission on Higher Education (NCHE) (1996:3), the implementation of this policy in 1996 post the publication of the first White Paper on Education and Training was a significant policy moment in higher education policymaking. According to Fataar (2004:34), the Centre of Education Policy Development (CEPD),

which was an ANC-aligned policy outfit, constructed the NCHE document. Majola and Hayward (2000:338) asserted that the old bureaucrats originating from the previous government challenged the brief on the settlement of inclusion of cultural differences and the protection of minorities. The NCHE policy was underpinned by formidable equity considerations namely, “equity in the allocation of resources, the redress of historical inequalities, cooperative governance, a balanced approach to material and human resources, and exacting standards of quality” (NCHE, 1996:5). In addition, Fataar (2004:34) highlighted the key features of the policy to be “increased participation, greater responsiveness, and increased cooperation and partnerships”. It is important to note that the policy summonsed expanded access within financial limits, the development of a single coordinated system, and a free role for distance learning education. According to the NCHE (1996:85), the policy was to be developed on a three-year basis making it mandatory for Institutions of Higher Learning to submit a three-year plan with a programme that was aligned with emerging national and regional needs.

4.5.2 The White Paper on Higher Education Act of 1997

“The White Paper on Higher Education was a hybrid of investigation and consultation that was initiated with the establishment of the NCHE” (Department of Education, 1997). According to Fataar (2003:35), the White Paper on Higher Education has the objective of emphasising efficiencies, albeit relegating goals of previous policies. Moreover, the policy was designed by a World Bank policymaker who aligned higher education policies with the Growth, Employment and Redistribution (GEAR). Majola and Hayward (2000:345-352) stated that the policy omitted pivotal recommendations for conquering the legacies of apartheid, and significantly failing to provide substantial evidence on transformation. According to the Department of Education (1997), the purpose of the White Paper on Higher Education policy was “to meet the learning needs and aspirations of individuals through the development of their intellectual abilities and aptitudes throughout their lives; to address the developmental needs of society and to provide the labour market in a knowledge-driven and knowledge-dependent society with an ever-changing high modern economy; to contribute to the socialisation of enlightened, responsible and constructively critical citizens; and, to contribute to the creation, sharing and evaluation of knowledge”.

4.5.3 The Higher Education Act 101 of 1997

The Higher Education Act 101 of 1997 was published in tandem with the White Paper during 1997 with the objective of having to meet the parliamentary legislative deadline. According to Fataar (2000:19), the legislation documented meant that there was an endorsement for a vision of redressing the inequities of apartheid, which would significantly meet the fundamentally transformed economic goals of South Africa. In addition, the Department of Education (2001) stated that the Higher Education policy had a new integrated and coordinated unitary structure, which was driven by a programme-based institutional approach that was to be built into the institutional plans, which should correspond with the overall national plan. The Department of Education (2001) further stated that the Higher Education Act 101 of 1997 would have the following intentions:

- “to regulate higher education, to provide for the establishment, composition and functions of a Council on Higher Education,
- to provide for the establishment, governance and funding of public higher education institutions,
- to provide for the appointment and functions of an independent assessor,
- to provide for the registration of private higher education institutions,
- to provide for quality assurance and quality promotion in higher education,
- to provide for transitional arrangements and the repeal of certain laws, and
- to provide for matters connected therewith”.

4.5.4 The National Plan for Higher Education in South Africa

The National Plan for Higher Education in South Africa was considered the ultimate step in implementing the aims of the White Paper, which significantly raised more questions than answers. According to Ntshoe (2002:7), there were concerns which were related to the preparation of the rhetoric of the White Paper in implementing earmarked funding in pursuit of empowering historically disadvantaged institutions through the avenue of institutional and individual redress. In addition, Ntshoe (2002:9) pointed to the size and shape of the document, and how robust it was in achieving equity redress and inclusion, but how disappointing it was due to the sterile strategies proposed to achieve the outcomes. According to the Ministry of Education (2001), “the National Plan was built on the policy framework and the goals, values and principles that underpinned the

framework, which was outlined in the White Paper”. These goals according to Ministry of Education (2001) were intended to develop a Higher Education system that would:

- “promote equity access and fair chances of success to all who are seeking to realise their potential through higher education, while eradicating all forms of unfair discrimination and advancing redress for past inequities,
- meet, through well-planned and co-ordinated teaching, learning and research programmes, national development needs, including the high-skilled employment needs presented by a growing economy operating in a global environment,
- support a democratic ethos and culture of human rights through educational programmes and practices conducive to critical discourse and creative thinking, cultural tolerance, and a common commitment to a humane, non-racist and non-sexist social order,
- contribute to the advancement of all forms of knowledge and scholarship, and in particular address the diverse problems and demands of the local, national, Southern African and African contexts; and
- uphold rigorous standards of academic quality”.

4.6 A policy gap in Higher Education

The analysis in this chapter is extended by discussing the policy gap that is evident in South Africa’s Higher Education system. The policy gap in higher education reflects numerous mismatches between policy intention on the goals and objectives, policy practices on systems and frameworks, and policy effects on eradicating student poverty and inequality in South Africa’s Higher Education system. Brennan *et al.*, (2004:108) assert that the policy gap relates to difficulties and challenges South Africa’s Higher Education system encountered between 1994 and 1999 in binding policy intentions with outcomes. According to Cloete *et al.*, (2004:96), higher education policies in South Africa involved the historical dynamics that were associated with implementation, securing a clean triumph in student poverty and inequality.

Public policy intention and public policy evaluation are often critiqued, which enables an analytical distinction between the nexus of conceptual critique and implementation, which requires time. Badat *et al.*, (1994:59) referred to the bureaucracy perspective, saying that higher education in South Africa has one goal of building frameworks for transformation. However, public policy implementation has issues of constructing frameworks of change

and functioning systems on higher education. Badat *et al.*, (1994:61-62) pointed to the immediate priority of Institutions of Higher Learning post-1994, which was to merge functioning systems that would tailor a favourable climate for institutional transformation and thus focus on the policy gap and its inability to be divorced from understating contextual realities. Jansen (2001:201) stated that the notion of a policy gap in South Africa's Higher Education raised sharp questions on public policy borrowing. Public policy borrowing in South Africa's Higher Education is the borrowing of statutory higher education systems and processes from other higher education polices in South Africa that align with comprehensive goals and objectives for transformation. Public policy borrowing, therefore, generated a policy gap in higher education. A policy gap, however, cannot be acknowledged nor figured out without thorough contextualising of different policy phases. According to Brennan (2004:110), one critical priority through contextualising a policy gap in higher education is to streamline the operation of a new higher education system, and simultaneously overcome the traditional inheritance of the apartheid higher education system. This priority was achievable. The greatest challenge of contextualising a policy gap in higher education is adjusting to modern realities in respect to previous agreements that would ensure modern Higher Education systems to be operational considering standard infrastructural resources belonging to universities. Cloete *et al.*, (2004:103-105) suggested that the reason for a policy gap in South Africa's Higher Education system came from a plethora of policy conferences and discussions from the government. These policy conferences and discussions devoted their time towards creating a modern blueprint for the Higher Education system. A modern blueprint for South Africa's Higher Education system was pivotal in trying to generate a hegemonic platform for transformation in regard to trust and bind policy behaviour.

4.8 South Africa's presidential influence on post-apartheid policies that paved the way for transformation in Higher Education

Leading transformation is not for the faint hearted or lily-livered. Apartheid and government failures have destroyed many South Africans' bond with their land. Unemployment, corruption, dismal service delivery, racial tension, social imbalance, student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning, and nation-wide poverty have made many citizens understandably despondent and angry at the realisation that the country is broken. The accentuation of this ugliness masks the immense beauty and good deeds in the country. It hides the spirit of South Africans that

infuses its society; for, while those on the poles seek to tear it apart and those who were in power and still hold the presidential seat have transformed the status-quo of South Africa. South Africa might have its own issues, but we are still making great strides in continuing the task of nation-building and creating the prosperous society and economy it envisioned in 1994.

4.8.1 Nelson Mandela in office

According to Naidoo (2017:23), during the Nelson Mandela presidential term, there was a decision to create a state infiltrated with policies wherein South Africa supported a review of policies which had the objective of reconstructing an inclusive state apparatus. As a country coming from apartheid and oppression, there was an awareness present that had to respond to the public commands and pressures of the post-apartheid country. Bond (2004) in his book titled *Talk left, walk right*, criticised the African National Congress (ANC) and Nelson Mandela's presidency in regard to its duplicity, which resulted in the implementation of the corporatist Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP). This policy was substituted by the GEAR policy in 1996. According to Seeking and Nattrass (2016:219), the inheritance of GEAR accentuated the social and economic ills in South Africa. This had the prescription of a traditionalist set of mechanisms that halted public spending and increased social transfers and welfare grants for households, which were pivotal buffers against deepening poverty. In addition, Burger (2014:178-180) highlighted that this provisioning rolled out the carpet for a universal transfer of a developmental system, as well as a welfare system that the governing party was reluctant to implement, and it has proven to be redistributive over the years. Broadly, South Africa has gradually preserved the welfare provision to collude with individual emancipation, which will engineer a fertile environment that will be associated with competence enhancement and will conjure up a multiplying reliance on welfare that will eradicate poverty and inequality.

4.8.2 Thabo Mbeki in office

According to Booysen (2011:50), the second presidential administration spearheaded by Thabo Mbeki did not harness any tremendous change within government. Instead, Mbeki's presidential administration was labelled as a 'configuration' of the current construction of the country that had focused on centralisation on decision-making, functions, and cohesiveness. In addition, Naidoo (2017:26) stated that transforming to a

new government approach had the aim of engineering a more functional and integrated country, which could be better managed from the spine of government, which would place greater emphasis on the building blocks of implementation in the country and possibly, the capability to dispatch the mandate of a developmental approach. According to Booysen (2011:51), GEAR maintains its reputation in government and economic policy through market-friendly economic policy framework. Seekings and Nattrass (2016:219) detailed that the interaction between South Africa and the global markets was more nuanced, meaning that the country was market-friendly, which diminished the essence of a business-friendly country.

While adhering and leaning towards Scandinavian corporatist-style interventions, Seekings and Nattrass (2016:220) lamented that South Africa had incorporated measures within corporate governance via the creation of Black Economic Empowerment (BEE) and affirmative action (employment equity) policies. For Thabo Mbeki, a framework needed to be implemented to support black business in order to create a competitive economic sector. The framework was implemented through constituency policies. Furthermore, Seekings and Nattrass (2016:200) further stated that the capability of South Africa was uneven in policy development and implementation. While South Africa succeeded in the distribution of social welfare and taxation reserves, it continuously failed in economic growth. Burger (2014:173) pointed to the development of the transfer welfare state that had been labelled as a default setting meaning that South Africa's inefficient policy implementation within key areas of education and health would cause problems; hence defeating the prospect of households attaining human capital to avoid living conditions dependent on welfare. Further, Bhorat *et al.*, (2013:108) added that the quandaries to human capital development remained astute when taking into consideration the forever changing nature of South Africa's economy.

4.8.3 Jacob Zuma/Cyril Ramaphosa in office

Jacob Zuma's presidential term provided some stimulus to a developing country. South Africa had grown, and several new ministerial departments had succeeded within their presidential terms and there was a vast improvement in achieving critical policy implementation in key areas. According to Naidoo (2017:30), dirty politics were however used during the presidential tenure of Jacob Zuma, which paved the way for the duplication of departments and poor policy selection, which ultimately created skewed policy goals that were envisioned for growth and development in the country. Southall

(2016:73-74) stated that Zuma's presidential period was disrupted by a lack of policy crispness and transparency, while the National Development Plan (NDP) had an overarching vision. It had the key role and objective of providing a framework for South Africa's developmental goals as there had not been any substantial progress on the respective goals. Cameron (2010:700) juxtaposed this by accentuating South Africa's shortfalls in leadership capacity and the scarcity of theoretical knowledge and skills to supervise social, political, administrative, and economic variables that were required to sustain growth and prosperity. This was associated with an accelerated approach of politicisation. This meant that there were consequences for development due to the bureaucracy.

By 2018, a transformation in traditional leadership saw Cyril Ramaphosa being elevated to the presidency of South Africa. According to The Presidency (2018), this inauguration was labelled as an "opportunity to fix past mistakes" as Ramaphosa had the domestic mandate of turning around failing and fractured state-owned enterprises (SOEs), improving governance within state institutions, alleviating poverty and inequality, stimulating the economy through employment creation, building a capable and corruption-free state, increasing investment domestically, and accelerating growth on industrialisation. Furthermore, to Zuma's expansionary state, the Presidency (2018) stated that South Africa had symptoms of development and growth, which included policies that were market based and strict measures that aimed to improve equity. However, Seeking and Nattrass (2016:230) argued that these features were uneven as there were several challenges evident in South Africa's public polices in achieving a developmental Higher Education system.

It is understood that South Africa has executed a wide range of comprehensive public policies, aimed at economic growth; however, the mixture of poverty, inequality, and unemployment has created a potent social mix which led to catastrophe. Seeking and Nattrass (2016:230) stated that a lack of policy focus hindered social mobilisation in South Africa.

4.9 Conclusion

South Africa had enacted a wide range of public policies after the apartheid era. This pursuit was to achieve economic growth, social justice, equilibrium in the Higher Education system, and eradicating poverty and inequality. The affair that the government had created with the Higher Education system boasted cooperative governance in accordance with government provision. This meant that Institutions of Higher Learning have at times encountered the government proposing academic resolutions without any negotiations or consultation. Simultaneously, some potential is evident for institutional leadership to impose on the autonomy of universities, which protect student interests, while suggesting government intervention has colonised their ability to execute their powers when it comes to conflict between students in higher education.

Moreover, robust policy discourses are evident in South Africa. The shift in policy discourses impacted negatively on policy activity by the government. Transformation in South Africa's Higher Education system enhances university access for students in order to overcome structural student poverty and inequality. The initial strong equity and redress thrust was replaced by a preponderance of higher education in economic growth and human resource advancement. In addition, scrapping of institutional redress for Institutions of Higher Learning suggested the predominance for an efficiency discourse, and signalled these institutions as highly dysfunctional, inefficient, and in need of public policy intervention.

Moreover, deliberation on funding and public policy and its ability to construct the affair between Institutions of Higher Learning to build capacity is critical. An important consideration to make should focus on the breadth and width of public policies and their ability to foster competition. The shaping of the Higher Education landscape had confounded policy expectations, examples of which were the proliferation of private sector provision by Institutions of Higher Learning, and the continuing mismatch between relevant research and labour supply and higher education supply.

In addition, Institutions of Higher Learning conduct research on critical functionality of the Higher Education system. This research will facilitate in acknowledging which systems have to be funded and safeguarded. It is also critical to acknowledge that regulation is fully operational via a set of rules and demotion. Thus, an analysis needs to be conducted of certain incentives, allowing Institutions of Higher Learning to supply towards

developmental objectives. Without a doubt, the South African government has made it mandatory to respond to critics by imposing frameworks that will unlock higher education expansion and materialise strong relationships. There is, however, South African public policy rhetoric. It is evident in all spheres of government and in the education system. This has created doubt in the relationship between finance and performance gifts and the crucial ability to provide public goods. Most public policy outcomes have indirectly pointed to, on the one hand, the inability of the public policy and public policy levers to effect change in a difficult policy force field, and, on the other hand, to the ineffectual nature of a one-size-fit-all policy approach. What has been intended as policy to direct higher education forces to serve uniform normative goals has ended up being interpreted in variable ways by different Institutions of Higher Learning and players, depending on their historically conditioned institutional vision and capacity.

Finally, the South African Higher Education system needs a revision on the comprehensive strategies and public policies that will collaborate national, provincial, and local development strategies towards higher education public policies.

The next chapter represents a critical overview on the feasibility of free higher education in South Africa. This in-depth analysis of the next chapter is needed because due to the marginalisation of South Africa's Higher Education policies and reforms, which advocate social justice. This, then questions the feasibility and possibility of free higher education in South Africa.

CHAPTER 5: FREE HIGHER EDUCATION IN SOUTH AFRICA

5.1 Introduction

According to Badat (2016:71), South Africa's Higher Education system contains of certain likelihoods of reconciling social and economic growth, social equity, and democratic citizenship; however, the realities have not materialised. Waghid (2002:457) and Shrivastava and Shrivastava (2014:809) blamed South Africa's disproportion of inequalities seen during apartheid, which damaged the Higher Education system, which ultimately resulted in uneven university access, differentiated success rates and output for different university students as determined by variables such as gender, class, race, region, and as well as skewed employment opportunities in South Africa. Additionally, unequal staffing resources had accentuated the plight of student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning. A series of these variables, in liaison to the main goal of insisting the feasibility of free higher education in South Africa, paved the way for the mass student protests. This happened in 2015. The #FeesMustFall protests were witnessed by South Africa in 2015 and was led by a plethora of enthusiastic university students who demanded the eradication of student poverty and inequality, and the provision of free higher education (Cloete, 2016). According to Ndaliso (2017:1), the 2015 student demonstrations led the former President, Jacob Zuma, to launch a fees commission in January 2016, chaired by Justice Jonathan Arthur Heher. The Presidency (2017) stated that "the mandate of the Commission had a focal point of investigating, assemble findings, account on and make recommendations on the feasibility of making higher education free in South Africa, with regards to the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, all relevant higher and basic education legislation, all findings and recommendations of the various presidential and ministerial task teams as well as all relevant educational policies, reports and guidelines; the multiple facets of financial sustainability, analysing and assessing the role of government in association with its agencies, students, institutions, business sector and employers in funding higher education and training; and the institutional independence and autonomy which occur like the financial funding model". These investigations are deemed to have differed in their scope of origin, as some investigations were being enacted internally and externally by the government. Moreover, Maliovich (2018:2) stated that the debacle of free higher education in South Africa has lifted the eyebrows of heterogenous sectors throughout the political dominions, business sector and the media. Although these business sectors

undoubtedly rolled the carpet to the idea of free higher education provision, the argument aims its attention at finding comprehensive and cost-effective methods to finance free higher education and deduce whether the idea and provision of free higher education in South Africa is feasible.

The major purpose of this chapter is aimed at examining the feasibility of free higher education in South Africa. This chapter commences by unpacking and debrief the concept 'free education' in the South African context, although taking into consideration that the concept or jargon is new. Furthermore, the chapter has the objective of evaluating the possibility of the South African economy funding and facilitating sustainable and free higher education.

5.2 The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa 1996

The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa 1996 underpins the right to elementary education, consisting of the right to adult elementary education. According to the Constitution (Section 29:15-16):

- (1) "Everyone has the right –
 - (a) To a basic education, including adult basic education; and
 - (b) To further education, which the state, through reasonable measures, must make progressively available and accessible".
- (2) "Everyone has the right to receive education in the official language or languages of their choice in public educational institutions where that education is reasonably practicable. To ensure the effective access to, and implementation of, this right, the state must consider all reasonable educational alternatives, including single medium institutions, taking into account –
 - (a) equity;
 - (b) practicability; and
 - (c) the need to redress the results of past racially discriminatory laws and practices".

5.3 The concept of free higher education in the context of South Africa

Muller (2018:2) pointed to the political debates in South Africa that reacted to the ideology "free higher education". This led political parties, especially the ANC, to dilute the term and its importance to ensure progress of the previously disadvantaged groups to

potentially address student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa. However, Masuku (2017:1) stated that a plethora of political and economic analysts decided to question the true motive and objective, including the economic ability to achieve, of the ideation leading to a crop of political and economic analysts to dismiss it as “a political mechanism utilised to lure in young university students who are believed to have been failed perpetually by the South African higher education funding mechanism”. Furthermore, Muller (2018:2-3) stated that the ideology of free higher education accord with politicians paving the way for disadvantaged families to equally compete and challenge with previously advantaged families in gaining access to universities.

Debatably, this could curb and alleviate student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa. At the apex of all, the question remains on who will fund the model of free higher education, what will be the economic implications, and will it be a successful policy implementation by government? Glen and Castle (2018:10-11) responded to the questions by stating that “someone, somewhere, somehow, has to finance education because there is a common belief that it is impossible to provide efficient and quality education to students without any fee attachment”. Moreover, Glen and Castle (2018:10-11) asserted that “If students do not take full responsibility of paying university fees, the responsibility will thus be channelled to the taxpayers who will pay and contribute through substantial grants and scholarship programmes”. In addition, Ayeni (2001:20) stated that the critical issue of free higher education was aimed at resembling basic service delivery. These services included “free primary and secondary education, the provision of law enforcement, low-cost housing, and health services that is, services provided in clinics and state hospitals” (Ayeni, 2001:20-21).

According to The Freedom Charter (1955), “The Doors of Learning and Culture Shall be Opened”. It is understood that the Freedom Charter emphasised that education should “be free, compulsory, universal and equal for all children” and “higher education and technical training should be accessible to all by government allowances and scholarship provisions, based on merit”. Parker (2014:4) emphasised “free” and “compulsory”, which refers to “basic education and higher education, and technical training” that should “be open to everyone” by making financial support resources readily available. This underlying matter might be viewed differently by most citizens in opposition to what the Freedom Charter stipulates. Gumede (2018:7) stated that the Freedom Charter became

the founder for free education in South Africa's basic education domain and ultimately has sustained the current juncture of free higher education being demanded within universities due to student poverty and inequality.

According to Business Tech (2016), the concept of free higher education in South Africa gained momentum after the #FeesMustFall. These protests had detrimental implications for university infrastructure and resources, which resulted in buildings being vandalised and destroyed. The vandalism of university infrastructure took the whole country by storm. This also paved the way for opposition parties in the Parliament to swerve away from their #ZumaMustFall agenda and explore the new avenue of #FreeEducationForAll. Booysen (2016:27) stated that student protestors were heavily encouraged by the incarceration of university student leaders such as Mcebo Dlamini then enrolled at Wits University and Bongumusa Khanyile then enrolled at Durban University of Technology (DUT). In addition, Booysen (2016:28-29) opined that today, first-time university students enjoy the fruits of protestors' scars and pain caused by police brutality. This can be attributed to government intervention who reacted to the pleas of the students in a positive. According to Fourie (2018:03), analysts and journalists, economists and authors however questioned where the finance for free higher education would come from. This initially compelled the establishment of the fees commission to investigate and probe the possibility and probability of whether free higher education was feasible in South Africa. Consequently, Booysen (2016:32-33) stated that the then President of South Africa, Jacob Zuma had announced at the December ANC national conference that free higher education to all first-year students from 2018 would be feasible and doable. This further meant that by the end of 2022, free higher education would be available to university level.

5.4 Addressing Student Poverty and Inequality (Funding free Higher Education)

According to Cloete (2016:4). South Africa's discourse consists of a differentiation between the concepts of "free education for the poor", "fee-free education for all", and "free education". By this, one can deduce that 'free education for the poor' will need a social policy change by government, that will require a demand for immediate free higher education for the poor, instead of 'free higher education for all' who need it. "Fee-free education" for all would also be a strange demand for South African higher education

context as the majority of the beneficiaries will come from the wealthy and middle class. 'Free education' requires a fundamental rethinking of and transformation of societal goals, policies, and priorities. Taking these factors into consideration, it is important to take note that, not implementing the modifications would be difficult to negate the provision of the various concepts and jargon mentioned above. Furthermore, Cloete (2016:4-5) argued that South Africa as a developing country should be labelling the jargon to "affordable higher education for all", which would make it easier for people to understand that affordable denotes different costs for various social groups. The public financing that Institutions of Higher Learning receives from the government does not cover all their running costs. Mostly Institutions of Higher Learning rely on tuition and residents' fees from students, research, and other external activities to maintain themselves. For Motala (2016), there should be an expansion for providing free education to the poor that would pave the way for a definition society constitutes 'the poor'. However, Whitehead (2017:149) and Mngomezulu et al., (2017:131) alluded to fee remission as a critical equity gain within universities, which will be punctuated by extreme high levels of student poverty and inequality. Moreover, Oxfam (2016) stated that the variables of "free higher education for all" propose modern systems, which cluster income from different household groups and exercise tests, which are flawed due to their ability to accentuate elevated levels of indebtedness, reduce savings plans, and compromise standards of living for the students coming from disadvantaged backgrounds.

When questioning the source of finance for free higher education to address student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa, Glen and Castle (2018) suggested that the government should increase taxes, but simultaneously they lament the fact that increasing taxes to fund free higher education potentially reduces personal freedoms for students coming from disadvantaged families and backgrounds. Furthermore, economic freedom is mutually exclusive and congruent with personal freedoms and reducing personal disposable incomes through increasing taxation reduces options disposable to families. There is a broad debate that adopting free higher education would make Institutions of Higher Learning easy to access by a vast majority of students; however, Glen and Castle (2018) disagreed with this narrative. According to Glen and Castle (2018), even though South Africa Higher Education is not free, this should not exclude students from accessing higher education within Institutions of Higher Learning. Jones *et al.*, (2008:55) pointed out that most students who have received student funding and loans, and bursaries due to merit, finance their tuition and fund their

maintenance. Furthermore, Jones *et al.*, (2008:57-58) imply that such narratives are debatable on the premise that all previously disadvantaged students do not qualify or are not eligible for funding and loans, even those of NSFAS, which is deemed to be government funded.

5.5 The cost of free Higher Education in South Africa

Calculations on the cost of higher education in South Africa have been drawn on examples from developed countries. According to Motala (2017:21), early post-independence in Africa in accordance with providing free higher education closely associates with limited numbers, and this was deemed unrealistic. Data adopted from the African continent and Latin America argues vehemently that free education significantly profits those that are rich, which extends the gap for the poor. This is due to university students coming out of wealthier family backgrounds and are slightly in a better position to rub shoulders, and who gain access to various and selected institutions of higher learning; meanwhile, students rooting from poorer family backgrounds seem to be excluded to public universities of low quality. Moreover, Oketch (2003:88) referred to a formidable distributional difficulty in higher education funding in sub-Saharan Africa, while Archer (2005:2) argued that distributional problems are regressive in that poor students tend to subsidise rich students. Moreover, Barr (2004:264) pointed out that higher education in OECD countries are subsidies in Institutions of Higher Learning which predominantly benefit students from wealthier social backgrounds.

The cost of free higher education has sparked a debate by many in South Africa. The government of South Africa, however, stuck to the narrative of introducing free higher education; meanwhile, also posing questions of funding, implementation and sustainability, which are questions that remain unanswered. According to Booysen (2016:35), it is not only the government of South Africa that is experiencing fiscal constraints, but also governments across the African continent due to uncertainties in the financial markets around the globe and local economies that are weak, which automatically makes funding for higher education in South Africa to become constrained. However, Teferra (2016:82) questioned whether South Africa's free higher education policy will be successful, also questioning the availability of funding in the long run for students. It is asserted, according to Booysen (2016:37), that the contribution to higher education funding in South Africa has increased from R11-billion in 2006 to R26-billion in 2013. Mokone (2018) added that in the Minister of Finance, Malusi Gigaba's Budget

Speech it was announced that R57-billion would be injected into free higher education, but that this amount would only finance first-year students. This was part of a five-year plan of the then government. The concerns expressed by analysts were that the then Minister of Higher Education and Training, Hlengiwe Mkhize stated “The funding for higher education will be available for the next upcoming five years”; alluding that the government had no road map to follow there-after (ANN7, 2018). One might assume and debate from the minister’s statement that the government had not executed any oversight, nor complied any feasibility study to assess, monitor and evaluate the costs and long-term sustainability with regards to providing free higher education.

Free higher education is a positive development because it encourages young South African university students to enrol for higher education; also, this paves the way for many previously disadvantaged students to have access to universities (Barr, 2004:268). However, there was major concerns and uncertainty according to Motala (2017:23) as policymakers and analysts pointed out that South Africa was plagued by sluggish economic growth rates, rampant corruption within state departments, high youth and general unemployment rates, and maladministration, which cements the questions marks surrounding the issue where the necessary finance required for free higher education would be generated and how it would affect South Africa’s economic growth. According to Donnelly *et al.* (2017:1), South Africa was achieving an average growth rate annually since the 2008 monetary crisis and considering free higher education and its costs in its initial phase, which was estimated to cost about R60-million, it was a matter of concern. South Africa, considering its economic situation, there would be challenges posed, enabling free higher education considering the costs involved. In addition, Donnelly (2017:1-2) proposed a solution by stating that the government should aim to cut spending and in order to reduce costs in other state departments. This will make it possible to achieve the required capital to finance free higher education, but Oxfam (2016) stated that this exercise would further strain the South African economy considering that the country had already experienced a R50-billion taxation shortfall, a declining economic growth and sky-high unemployment rates. Furthermore, Oxfam (2016) asserted that the reduction of funds by government in other state departments would fracture public service delivery in the country, while Dung and Mncayi (2016:309) argued that the government should consider increasing its partnerships with private organisations in pursuit of funding higher education. In addition, according to OECD (2012), the South African government

should opt for free higher education at various levels and spheres linked to provide free higher education in its entirety.

5.6 A Model for funding free Higher Education (funding equity)

According to Pienaar (2016), if higher education was to become “free” in South Africa, it was apparent that a substantial funding model was required. A series of models were suggested and presented, envisaging different scenario plannings and their likelihood of impacting South Africa’s economic growth (Wangenge-Ouma, 2010:481). There were questions being asked pertaining to the funding models for free higher education. Additionally, South Africa as a developing country would struggle to attain free higher (Simkins, 2016:39). According to Wangenge-Ouma (2008:906), there were various systems for distributing student finance that were under intense scrutiny and investigation. Wangenge-Ouma (2010:482) stated that free higher education in South Africa needed an equitable finance model that would cater for the higher education sector and one that would be comprehensive, inclusive, and viable. This narrative therefore accentuated the relationship between student poverty and inequality, societal transformation, and accessing quality higher education, which were considered as systemic issues. Motala (2017:25) referred to the substantive proposals of funding models that were reviewed. Among those funding models reviewed and investigated were, NSFAS, graduate taxation, an increase in taxation, wealth taxation, a national loan scheme payable on employment, and an increase in the skills levy. An agreement on a finance model was brewing. This finance model which was newly constructed had been engineered on the premise of a social justice approach; hence, shedding light on the narrative that academically achieving and deserving students within an institution of higher learning not to be excluded and marginalised due to the inability to afford any tertiary fees (Whitehead, 2017:155). Furthermore, Whitehead (2017:156) asserted that there were certain key principles that had been agreed on, potentially moving the discourse of full cost provisions for students coming from previously disadvantaged backgrounds which must include food, and books and accommodation costs, which would reduce student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning. This was supported through the premise that students who were on the verge of the NSFAS should be supported and facilitated through a hybrid of funding and grants, which would guarantee their access, and would potentially allow the government to revisit and revise the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of South Africa (Whitehead, 2017:157).

The exponential growth and emergence of South Africa's national financial aid schemes need to elaborate more, at least in part, to the reasons why there is an exclusion on the premise of affordability. According to Moja and Hayward (2005:31), congruent with strategies to redress student poverty and inequality in higher education, the year 1994, R20-million was delegated by the then Minister of Education in pursuit of assisting students that were under-resourced in financing their higher education desires. The national funding amount allocated for under-privileged university students in funding their higher education had increased to R300-million in 1996. According to the Department of Higher Education and Training (2011:26), the finance scheme ballooned exponentially and was known as the National Student Financial Scheme (NSFAS) in 1999. The NSFAS finance model gradually increased, and by 2004, an estimated amount of R900-million was allocated to students based on their qualification for the scheme. It is noteworthy that Bunting (2006:95) pointed out that the construction of the NSFAS finance model had a sole objective of assisting and mediating students from poor and poverty-stricken backgrounds which resulted in student poverty and inequalities within Institutions of Higher Learning to being minimised and enabling more students to be able to gain a higher education qualification. However, the Department of Higher Education and Training (2011:28) limited the national strategies, which were implemented in provision of higher education opportunities, to those students who were from poor financed backgrounds and families. Considering the consistent annual increase in the NSFAS finance model, the Department of Higher Education (2011:30) illustrated one pervasive assumption that was in place, which addressed student poverty and inequality and pave the way for meaningful learning and engagement to take place and for students to successfully complete their respective undergraduate degrees. According to Bunting (2006:98-100), NSFAS's budget increased rapidly on an annual basis; however, it was evident as early as 1998 that signs of inadequate levels of funding started to trickle in as the amount of finance distributed to university students were not sufficient to cover all the costs associated to higher education. Bunting (2006:101) and Koen *et al.*, (2006:404) stated that the NSFAS finance model was becoming insufficient to finance the annual increasing number of students enrolling in Higher Education Institutions. Decreasing NSFAS funding resulted in widespread student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning, which first emerged in 1998 and continued to be apparent, resulting in many students not being able to settle their higher education debts and fees. Jones *et al.*, (2008:60) lamented the fact that NSFAS funding had been compromised by

maladministration, which resulted in students only receiving their living allowances at a later date or at the end of the term. Badat (2016:85) also raised concerns in respect of students who came from previously disadvantaged backgrounds and who were called “the missing middle”. This was due to their inability of receiving NSFAS. According to Badat (2016:87) and Wangenge-Ouma (2008:912), the annual increase in the number of students in universities, rejection of funding to certain university students, state financing models as a proportion of higher education budget cuts, and the annual increase in tuition fees had an influence on student poverty and inequality within institutions of higher learning in South Africa. In the years prior to the #FeesMustFall campaign by university students, higher education studies voiced their concerns pertaining to tertiary education tuition fees increasing at an exponential rate, higher than the NSFAS finance cap. This significantly constructed a robust and comprehensive redistributive fee model or mechanism that would propel the provision for poor students to be able to access higher education (Badat 2016:88; Wangenge-Ouma, 2008:912).

Students within Institutions of Higher Learning accentuated the poverty and inequalities in higher education, which allowed them to demonstrate their deep frustration and burdens with various funding investigation processes attached to wastage, poor institutional governance, lack of leadership and corruption. Simultaneously, the student movement appeared to be fragmented, making its objectives dull and inconclusive. To end the impasse, higher education in South Africa needs a firm and achievable funding model that will fulfil its commitments to curb student poverty and inequalities within Institutions of Higher Learning.

5.7 Conclusion

The 2015 to 2016 student protests were a clear indication of the unresolved issues in universities around South Africa. These unresolved student grievances included a shortage of government funds, student debt, the annual increases in tuition fees and the achievable mandate of free higher education. Badat (2016:90) referred to higher education as a discipline of study and practice. Higher education is an educational platform in which students display their hope and belief of attaining employment which will pay good salaries allowing them to achieve higher standards of living. Granting free higher education in South Africa, Van Der Merwe (2016:8) believed that it might be the way out for students who experience poverty and inequalities within Institutions of Higher Learning. The genesis of this chapter highlighted Justice Jonathan Arthur Heher’s fee

commission on higher education. Chabalala (2017) stated that the report investigated the government's lack of financial capacity to university students. Questions still linger whether South Africa, considering its economic situation, will sustain free higher education. Teffera (2016:88) reminded one that not everyone will have the means and resources to access higher education. Considering accessibility, Hull (2016) maintained that the funding systems in South Africa's higher education domain needs fairness, and the provision of free higher education automatically conjures difficulty to remedy the solution.

This chapter devoted its attention to the feasibility of free higher education in South Africa. Additionally, South Africa's current political and economic system and its relevance for the challenges encountered by higher education, such as student poverty and inequality are worth consideration. The ramifications of student poverty and inequality accentuates the high cost associated with higher education and the instant shift to families rooting from poor financial backgrounds; thus, benefiting the social elite disproportionately. Moreover, student poverty and the inequalities experienced by students in higher education and Institutions of Higher Learning have come to light because of the #FeesMustFall movement. Studies on higher education seem to devote more serious attention to student poverty and inequality. University students have several demands that need to be heard. Considering student poverty and inequality, it has become necessary to investigate and probe the exclusion that comes from the affordability of university tuition fees; thus, expanding, one's views of what exclusion refers to and how students experience it. At the crux of it all, exclusion can no longer be based on the premise of academic barriers and epistemological issues in higher education. Hence, it can be said that free higher education will not be possible in South Africa considering the crippling economy we have.

The following chapter presents the conclusion and recommendation of the dissertation.

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Introduction

The goal of the study has been to investigate student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa. This was achieved through addressing the current study objectives as follows:

The first objective of this current study was to conduct an in-depth analysis of the historical roots associated with student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa after apartheid. This was achieved in Chapter 2.

The second study objective was to ascertain the extent of social justice and equity in South Africa's Higher Education system and its impact on Institutions of Higher Learning. This was achieved through observing South Africa's Higher Education system in its entirety and investigating the presence of social justice and equity. Such was achieved in Chapter 3.

The third study objective was to establish the role of public policies in post-apartheid higher education in South Africa. This was achieved in Chapter 4 of the study. This chapter presented a comprehensive study on South Africa's public policies in higher education and their mainsprings.

The fourth study objective was to comprehensively construe the feasibility of free higher education in South Africa. This has been an ongoing debate in South Africa, and this chapter examined and probed the dynamic, implications, and probability of providing free higher education. This was achieved in Chapter 5 of the study.

6.2 Contributions of the study

The study contributions were fostered by answering the following research questions:

- i. What are the significant historical roots of student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa after apartheid?
- ii. What role does social justice and equity play in student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa?
- iii. What is the role of public policies in post-apartheid higher education in South Africa?
- iv. Is free higher education feasible in South Africa?

6.2.1 Methodological contribution

Within a methodological context, this current study inherited a robust qualitative research approach. The application of this approach made it easy to acknowledge the researcher's population, which in this study was students from universities and which understand their social cultural environment within which they act and live. Furthermore, the adoption of the qualitative research approach followed a deductive orientation with a literature review. The qualitative research method meant that a thorough investigation and utilisation of previously known theories of social justice by John Rawls and the Keynesian theory by John Menard Keynes provided a methodological contribution towards the study of student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa.

6.3 Conclusions of the study

The study conclusions are presented as follows:

6.3.1 Conclusions from the literature review

The conclusions are guided by the following objectives:

- i. The first objective was to carry out an intensive literature analysis on South Africa and the transformation from apartheid and minority rule towards democracy from peer-reviewed articles and books from 1994 to 2019; social justice and equity peer reviewed articles from 1990 to 2018; and public policies, with a distinct focus on mainstreaming South Africa's higher education and student poverty and inequality issues.
- ii. The second objective was to ascertain the role of higher education, redressing past inequalities, transforming higher education, paving access to universities, and student funding by analysing Boulton and Lucas's literature named *What are Universities for* and Badat's study entitled "*The Role of Higher Education in Society: Valuing Higher Education*".

6.3.2 Conclusions from Chapter 2

In Chapter 2 of this study, '*The historical roots of student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa*', an in-depth analysis of the historical roots of student poverty was conducted. The massive inequalities and the challenges of quality, equity and transformation found and evident within Institutions of Higher Learning in

South Africa were identified as historical roots. It is no surprise that the vast backlogs caused by the legacies of apartheid, combined with the policies and legislation precluded, and continue to preclude the institutional landscape that is necessary for racial transformation in the demographic of South African students. Furthermore, the study concluded that one of the most crucial aspects of the historical roots of student poverty and inequality was to identify the origins, philosophies, and methodologies thereof. These origins, philosophies and methodologies were in the form of racial discrimination, legislation, and Acts that the government had implemented that had resulted into student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa today. In addition, this study accentuated the crippling issues that consequently paved the way for student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning. These issues were in the form of Bantu education, discriminatory education, education inequality, and the language policy and the medium of instruction that were implemented. As such, this chapter analysed the historical roots of student poverty and inequality by defining student poverty and Inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa.

6.3.3 Conclusions from Chapter 3

In Chapter 3 of this study, '*Social justice and equity in South Africa's higher education and its impact on Institutions of Higher Learning*', the study concluded that change and transformation in South Africa's Higher Education system experienced complexities, with reference to the three pillars of transformation, namely increased and broadened participation within Institutions of Higher Learning, responsiveness to societal needs by universities and co-operation, and governance by Institutions of Higher Learning. It highlighted that progress had been made with constructing these pillars of transformation. Additionally, South Africa needs to put more effort into addressing gaps that had emerged during the summon of these pillars and further address student poverty and inequality within universities in South Africa. While this chapter championed the accomplishment of social justice in South Africa being one of its greatest challenges, education was identified as a vehicle to eliminate social problems in the country. The chapter also provided an overview on social justice in South Africa's Higher Education system. In addition, the core of this chapter provided a conceptualisation of two notions of social justice in South Africa, namely normative and substantive social justice, and their impact on Institutions of Higher Learning. In South Africa, it is apparent that efforts are being made to integrate social justice into legislative and policy framework. However, there is no clear evidence whether

this was sufficiently addressed at the level of formulation or even at the implementation stage. Furthermore, this chapter significantly determined the degree to which normative social justice was adequately addressed. It is important to acknowledge that normative social justice has been employed to monitor and audit the distribution of benefits resulted from major social institutions, in this context, being South Africa's Higher Education system and Institutions of Higher Learning. At an ideal level, normative social justice advocates a utopian society. Consequently, this utopian position has contributed to its marginalisation coming out from central discussions. With reference to South Africa's Higher Education system and Institutions of Higher Learning, normative social justice is utilised to educate broad policies on education, including GEAR, which advocates "for education for all", and furthermore, "to inform the move towards massification with the emphasis on access, equity, and the inculcation of a democratic culture", which will imply equal participation in all geographic areas of South Africa's Higher Education. Fostering equality in regard to education and socio-economic variables within Institutions of Higher Learning informed the theoretical systems and framework of this study. Therefore, this has accentuated normative social justice issues in South Africa's Higher Education being parallel to the tradition of universities, which is to pursue and promote teaching and research, while equipping students with necessary skills and knowledge enabling them to compete in the global market. Furthermore, the intention of this chapter has been was to illuminate the attempts, through the three reform strategies implemented by the South African Higher Education and universities to combat social justice concerns such as inequality, discrimination, marginalization and student poverty, and it points to the inadequacies that were not effectively developed with an institutional capacity that will affect the institutional culture that already exists.

6.3.4 Conclusions from Chapter 4

According to Chapter 4 of this study, '*The role of public policies in post-apartheid higher education in South Africa*', conclusions were derived that the South African government had enacted a wide range of public policies after apartheid in order of achieving economic growth, social justice, equilibrium in the Higher Education system, and eradicating poverty and inequality, the affair of the government and higher education has seen part of cooperative governance in accordance to government provision. Institutions of Higher Learning have at times encountered the government proposing academic resolutions without any negotiations or consultation. Simultaneously, some potential is evident for

institutional leadership to impose on the autonomy of institutions, which protect student interests, while suggesting government intervention has colonised their ability to execute their powers when it comes to conflict between students in higher education.

Moreover, government policy discourses evident in South Africa had shifted dramatically in the context of the confusing government policy force field, which impacted negatively on policy activity. Transformation within higher education enhances access for students to overcome structural student poverty and inequality. The initial strong equity and redress thrust was replaced by a preponderance of higher education and its role in economic growth and human resource development. In addition, the scrapping of institutional redress for Institutions of Higher Learning suggested the predominance for an efficiency discourse, and signalled these institutions as highly dysfunctional, inefficient, and in need of public policy intervention.

Moreover, deliberation on funding and public policy and its ability to construct the affair between Institutions of Higher Learning to build capacity is critical. An important consideration to make should focus on the breadth and width of public policies and their ability to foster competition. The shaping of the Higher Education landscape had confounded policy expectations, examples of which were the proliferation of private sector provision by universities, and its continuing mismatch between relevant research and labour supply and higher education supply.

In addition, universities in South Africa need to conduct research on functions integrated within the Higher Education system space. Moreover, this research had facilitated in acknowledging which systems have to be funded and safeguarded. It is also critical to acknowledge that regulation is fully operational via a set of rules and demotion. Thus, an analysis needs to be conducted of certain incentives, allowing Institutions of Higher Learning to supply towards developmental objectives. Without a doubt, the South African government has made it mandatory to respond to critics by imposing frameworks that will unlock higher education expansion and materialise strong relationships. There is however, in government policy rhetoric in South Africa. It is evident in all spheres of government and in the education system. This has created doubt in the relationship between finance and performance gifts and the crucial ability to provide public goods. Most public policy outcomes have indirectly pointed to, on the one hand, the inability of the public policy and public policy levers to effect change in a difficult policy force field, and, on the other hand, to the ineffectual nature of a one-size-fit-all policy approach. What

has been intended as policy to direct higher education forces to serve uniform normative goals has ended up being interpreted in variable ways by different universities, depending on their historical conditions of institutional vision and capacity. Finally, the South African Higher Education system needs a revision on the comprehensive strategies and public policies that will collaborate national, provincial, and local development strategies towards higher education public policies.

6.3.5 Conclusions from Chapter 5

According to Chapter 5 of this study, '*The feasibility of free higher education in South Africa*', the 2015-2016 student protests were a clear indication of the unresolved issues in universities around South Africa. These unresolved student grievances include a shortage of government funds, student debt, the annual increase in tuition fees and the achievable mandate of free higher education. This chapter articulated higher education as a discipline of study and practice. Furthermore, it advocated student dreams with the hope and belief of attaining employment which will pay good salaries allowing them to achieve higher standards of living. Granting free higher education in South Africa, this chapter asserted that it might be the way out for those students who experience student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning. The possibility of this implementation received a lot of criticism. The genesis of this chapter highlighted Justice Jonathan Arthur Heher's fees commission on higher education. This chapter added that the report had found that the government lacked the financial capacity to provide free higher education to university students. Questions still lingers whether South Africa, considering its economic situation, will sustain free higher education. Furthermore, this chapter reminded one that not everyone will have the means and resources to have access to higher education. Considering accessibility, funding systems in South Africa's higher education domain needs fairness, and the provision of free higher education automatically conjures difficulty to remedy the solution. This chapter moreover devotes its attention to the feasibility of free higher education in South Africa. Additionally, South Africa's political and economic system and its relevance for the challenges encountered by higher education, such as student poverty and inequality are worth consideration. The ramifications of student poverty and inequality accentuates the high cost associated with higher education and the instant shift to families rooting from poor backgrounds; thus, benefiting the social elite disproportionately. Moreover, it was established that student

poverty within Institutions of Higher Learning came to light because of the #FeesMustFall movement.

6.4 Recommendations and final remarks

It is critical to acknowledge the efforts and contributions made by the government of South Africa towards addressing student poverty and the inequalities within institutions of Higher Learning. The government and Higher Education Institutions respectively have responded to the challenges of equity and institutional transformation, discrimination, widening participation, the achievement of social justice, financial exclusion, and inequalities. The important questions that must be answered as a matter of urgency are whether the current form of student poverty and inequality would remain an impediment in the longer term, and what is and is not possible within the limitations of the government and Institutions of Higher Learning. Undisputedly, the questions relating to student poverty and inequality remain a burning issue in South Africa's economic, political, and social society. Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa are already rolling out policy measures for efficiency, leaving students to wonder if they will be sustainable and be impactful.

Moreover, the findings of this study are relevant to the national challenges that the Higher Education system are currently facing. The researcher believes that the Institutions of Higher Learning need frankness, honesty, and robustness when it comes to tackling student poverty and inequality. There are public spats between the government and universities which, over proof that there is a need for continuous engagement behind closed doors before the dilemmas of student poverty and inequality are taken to the streets by university students. It is critical to take note that students are the biggest stakeholders in issues of student poverty and inequality within Institutions of Higher Learning. It is with this chapter in mind that the study, in conclusion, makes the following recommendations:

- There should be an increase in oversight management within Institutions of Higher Learning.
- The government needs to increase the budget in tertiary education in order to accommodate and facilitate student needs.
- Investments are needed and necessary in new institutional infrastructure at universities.

- Government subsidies to universities should be increased.
- A robust and cohesive funding model for higher education should be created.
- Universities need to find other innovative ways of assisting students who cannot fund or afford their tuition fees.
- Universities should ensure that historic debt does not pose as a barrier to entry and financially exclude students from entering or completing their academic studies.
- The government and universities should introduce a graduate taxation incentive and a national loan system that is payable upon employment. and
- The government needs a rapid participation output with improved completion rates and establish a differentiated fees structure.

REFERENCES

- Allan, L. 2020. John Rawls: Two Concepts of Rules. Available at <http://www.RationalRealm.com/philosophy/reviews/john-rawls-two-concepts-of-rules>.
- Argarwal, R., Epstein, S., Oppenheim, R., Oyler, C. & Sonu, D. 2010. From Ideal to Practice and Back Again: Beginning Teachers Training for Social Justice. *Journal of Teacher Education*. 61(1): 237-247.
- Akoojee, S. & Nkomo, M. 2008. Access and Quality in South African Higher Education: The Twin Challenges of Transformation. *South African Journal of Higher Education*. 21(3): 385-399.
- ANN 7. 2018. Vuka Africa. South Africa.
- Archer, A. 2015. Free Higher Education is an Inequality Engine. *Business Day*. Date of Access: 20 May 2022.
- Apple, M. 1993. *Official Knowledge: Democratic Education in a Conservative Age*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Arnolds, C. A., Stolfile, R. N & Lillah, R. 2013. Assessing the Outcomes of the Higher Education Mergers in South Africa: Implication of Strategic Management. *Acta Commercil*. 13(1): 175-189.
- Ashwin, P. & Case, J. 2018. *Higher Education Pathways: South African Undergraduate Education and the Public Good*. Cape Town: African Minds.
- Asif, M., Raouf, A. & Seacy, C. 2012. Developing Measures for Performance Excellence: is the Baldrige criteria sufficient for performance excellence in higher education? *International Journal of Methodology*. 47(6): 3096-3110.
- Atkinson, N. 1978. *Teaching South Africans: A History of Educational Policy in South Africa*. Zimbabwe: University of Rhodesia.
- Ayeni, V. 2001. *Empowering the Customer*. Commonwealth Secretariat Westminster.
-

Badat, S. 1989. *Economic Change, Social Conflict and Education in Apartheid South Africa. Perspective in Education.* Grahamstown: Rhodes University.

Badat, S., Barends, Z. & Wolpe, H. 1994. *The Post-Secondary Education System: Towards Policy Formulation for Equality and Development.* In: Kaplan, B, eds. *Changing by Degrees, Equity Issues in Southern African Tertiary Education.* Cape Town: UCT Press. pp. 59-62.

Badat, S. 2009. *The Role of Higher Education in Society: Valuing Higher Education.* Grahamstown: Rhodes University.

Badat, S. & Sayed, Y. 2014. Post-1994 South African Education: The challenge of Social Justice. *Sage Journals.* 127-145.

Badat, S. 2016. Deciphering the Meanings and Explaining the South African Higher Education Student Protests of 2015-16. *Pax Academica.* 1 & 2: 71-106.

Baijnath, N. 2016. A Word from the CEO. In: CHE South African Higher Education Reviewed: Two Decades of Democracy. Pretoria: Council on Higher Education.

Barker, B. J., Bell, P., Duggan, A., Harlen, V., Le Roux, V., Maurice, P., Reynierse, C & Schaler, P. 1988. *Illustrated History of South Africa.* Cape Town: Readers Digest.

Barr, N. 2004. Higher Education Funding. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy.* 20(2) 264-283.

Bawa, A. 2000. *A Social Contract between the Public Higher Education Sector and the People of South Africa.* Berkely Centre of Studies in Higher Education: University of California.

Begicevic, N., Divjak, B. & Hunjak, T. 2010. Decision-making on Prioritization of Projects in Higher Education Institutions Using the Analytic Network Process Approach. *Central European Journal of Operations Research.* 18(3): 341-364.

Bergdahl, R. M. 2008. Developed universities and the Developing World: Opportunities and Obligations. In: Weber, L. E & Duderstadt, J. J. eds. *The Globalisation of Higher Education.* London: Economica Ltd.

Berg-Schlosser, D. & Kersting, N. 2003. Poverty and Democracy. A Contradiction? In: Berg-Schlosser, D. & Kersting, N., eds. *Poverty and Democracy: Self-Help and Political Participation in Third World Cities*. New York: Zed Books Ltd.

Behr, A. L. 1984. *New Perspective on Education*. Durban: Butterworth.

Behr, A. L. 1988. *Education in South Africa: Origins, Issues and Trends*. Pretoria: Academia.

Bibbings, L. 2006. Widening Participation and Higher Education. *Journal of Law and Society*. 33(1): 74-91.

Bird, C. 2006. *An Introduction to Political Philosophy*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bitzer, E. 2009. *Higher Education in South Africa: A Scholarly Look Behind the Scenes*. Pretoria: SunMedia.

Booyesen, S. 2016. *Fees Must Fall: Student Revolt, Decolonisation and Governance in South Africa*. Johannesburg: Wits University Press.

Boulton, G. & Lucas, C. 2008. *What are Universities for?*

Bray, M. & Kwo, O. 2013. Behind the Façade of Free-Fee Education: Shadow education and its implications for social justice. *Oxford Review of Education*. 39(4): 480-497.

Brennan, J., King R. & Lebeau, Y. 2004. The Role of Universities in the Transformation of Societies: Synthesis Report. London: Association of Commonwealth Universities and the Open University. pp. 108-110.

Brenner, N., Peck, J. & Theodore, N. 2010. After neo-liberalisation. *Globalisations*. 7(3): 327-345.

Bunice, C. 2017. The Student as Consumer Approach in Higher Education and Its Effects on Academic Performance. *Studies in Higher Education*. 42(11): 1958-1978).

Bunting, I. 2006. Students. In: Cloete, N. eds. *Transformation in Higher Education: Global Pressures and Local Realities*. 2nd Edition. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Burnley, S. M. A. & Saleem, H. 2008. *Inductive & Deductive Research Approach*. Karachi: University of Karachi.

Cameron, M. J. 1989. The Introduction of Bantu Education and the Question of Resistance: Co-operation, Non-Collaboration or Defiance? The Struggle for African Schooling with Special Reference to Cape Town. M.Ed. dissertation. Cape Town: University of Cape Town.

Chabalala, J. 2017. What Zuma does with Fees Commission Report in Entirely Up to Him – Heher. Available at [http://www.news24.co.za/South Africa/News/What-Zuma-Does-With-Fees-Commission-Is-Entirely-Up-To-Him-Heher-20171113](http://www.news24.co.za/South%20Africa/News/What-Zuma-Does-With-Fees-Commission-Is-Entirely-Up-To-Him-Heher-20171113). Date of Access: 17 May 2022.

Chernick, I. & Kalipa, S. 2016. The High Price of Protests at Universities. Available at the Star. 17 March 2016.

Chisholm, L. 1998. The Restructuring of South Africa's Education and Training in a Comparative context. In: Kallaway, P., eds. *Education After Apartheid: South African Education in Transition*. Johannesburg: Juta Academic.

Clark, J. 2006. Social Justice Education and Schooling: Some Philosophical Issues. *British Journal of Educational Studies*. 54(3): 272-287.

Cloete, N & Bunting, I. 2000. *Higher Education Transformation: Assessing Performance in South Africa*. Pretoria: Council of Higher Education Transformation.

Cloete, N., Fehnel, R., Massen, P., Moja, P. T., Perold, H. & Trish, G. 2002. *Transformation in Higher Education: Global Pressures and Local Realities in South Africa*. Lansdowne: JUTA Publications.

Cloete, N., Pillay, P., Badat, S. & Moja, T. 2004. National Policy and Regional Responses in Southern African Higher Education. Cape Town: James Currey and David Phillip. pp. 96-105.

Cloete, N. 2016. *University Fees in South Africa. A Story from Evidence*.

Cloete, F. & Mmakola, D. 2018. Development and Public Policy. In Cloete, F., de Coning, C., Wissink, H & Rabie, H, eds. *Improving Public Policy for Good Governance*. 4th Edition. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers. pp. 105-107.

Coates, R. D. 2007. Social Justice and Pedagogy. *American Behavioural Scientist*. 71(1): 571-591.

Collins, R. 1998. *The Sociology of Philosophies: A Global Theory of Intellectual Change*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Council of Higher Education Transformation (CHET). 2000. *Towards a New Higher Education Landscape: Meeting the Equity, Quality and Social Development Imperatives of South Africa in the 21st Century*. Pretoria: Council of Higher Education.

Council of Higher Education Transformation (CHET). 2016. *South African Higher Education Reviewed: Two Decades of Democracy*. Pretoria: Council on Higher Education.

Creswell, J. W. & Plano, C. V. L. 2007. *Designing and Conduct Mixed Methods Research*. California: SAGE Publications.

Dauids, N. & Waghid, Y. 2016. #FeesMustFall: History of South Africa Student Protests Reflects Inequality's Grip. Mail & Guardian. Available at <http://mg.co.za/article/2016-10-10-feesmustfall-reflects-inequality-grip>. Date of Access: 27 May 2022.

Davis, P., Francis, P. & Jupp, V. 2011. *Doing Criminological Research*. 2nd Edition. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

De Clerq, F. 1997. Policy Intervention and Power Shifts: An Evaluation of South Africa's Education Restructuring Policies. *Journal of Education Policy*. 12(3): 127-146.

De Coning, C., Cloete, F & Burger, W. 2018. Policy Implementation. In: In Cloete, F., de Coning, C., Wissink, H & Rabie, H, eds. *Improving Public Policy for Good Governance*. 4th Edition. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers. pp. 195-203.

Department of Education. 1997. *White Paper 3: A Programme for the Transformation of Higher Education*. Pretoria: Government Printers.

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

Department of Education. 2005. *Student Enrolment Planning in Public Higher Education*. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Department of Higher Education and Training. 2011. Report on the Ministerial Committee for the Review of the Provision of Housing at South African Universities. Pretoria: Department of Higher Education and Training.

De Villiers, P. 2017. The Poor and Access to Higher Education in South Africa: The NSFAS Contribution.

De Wet, C. 2014. Public Administration in a Democratic Developmental State. In: Thornhill, C., eds. Public Administration & Management in South Africa: A Developmental Perspective. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

Dhlomo, D. 1991. Challenges of Change in the Constitutional Sphere. In: Taylor, C.A., eds. The Challenge of Change in South Africa. Die: Jitdaging van Verandering in Suid-Afrika. Paper presented at a symposium held at the University of Port Elizabeth 13-15. February 1990 to commemorate 25 years of the existence of the University of Port Elizabeth: pp. 133-135.

Dowd, A. C. & Bensimon, E.A. 2015. *Engaging the "race question": Accountability and Equity in U.S. Higher Education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Dugard, C. J. R. 1978. *Politics and Education*. In: *South Africa's Crisis in Education*.

Dung, S.H & Mncayi, P. 2016. Determinants of Perceptions of Free Higher Education among Students at a South African University. *International Journal of Economics and Finance Studies*. 8(1): 309-345.

Donnelly, L., Patel, K. & Letsoalo, M. 2017. How You Will Pay for Zuma's Free Education Plan. Available at <http://www.mg.co.za>. Date of Access: 15 May 2022.

Dye, T. R. 1995. *Understanding Public Policy*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Edigheji, O. 2007. The Emerging South African Developmental State. Research Centre for Policy Analysis, Research Report No. 108. Gauteng.

Fataar, A. 2000. Engaging the Narrowing Education from Trajectory in South Africa. *Southern African Review of Education*. 6(1): 19-30.

Fataar, A. 2003. Higher Education Policy Discourse in South Africa: A Struggle for Alignment with Macro Development Policy. *South African Journal of Higher Education*. 17(2): 31-37.

Fiske, E. B. & Ladd, H. F. 2004. Elusive Equity: Education Reform in Post-Apartheid South Africa. Washington DC: Brookings Institution's Press.

Fourie, J. 2018. The Hidden Cost of Free Higher Education. Available at <http://www.fin24.com>. Date of Access: 12 April 2022.

Fox, W. & Meyer, I. H. 1995. *Public Administration Dictionary*. Cape Town: JUTA.

Francis, D. & Le Roux. 2011. Teaching for Social Justice Education: The Intersection Between Identity, Critical Agency, and Social Justice Education. *South African Journal of Education*. 31(3): 1-12.

Fraser, J. W. 2008. Factors Influencing Academic Success or Failure of First Year and Senior University Students: Do Education Students and Lecturers Perceive Things Differently? *South African Journal of Education. Pretoria*. 23(4): 150-156.

Frattura, E. M. & Tropinka, C. 2006. Theoretical Underpinnings of Separate Educational Programs: The Social Justice Challenge Continues. *Education and Urban Society*. 38(1): 327-328).

Gerwitz, S., Ball, S. J. & Bowe, R. 1995. *Markets, Choice, and Equity in Education*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Gerwitz, S. 1998. Conceptualising Social Justice in Education: Mapping the Territory. *Journal of Education Policy*. 13(1): 469-484.

Glen, L. & Castle, M. 2018. Argumentative Essay: Free Education. Scholar Advisor. Available at <http://www.news24.com>. Date of Access: 12 April 2022.

Goh, C. B. & Gopinathan, S. 2018. The Development of Education in Singapore Since 1965. In: Lee, S. K., Goh, C. B., Fredriksen, B & Tan, J. P eds. Towards a Better Future: Education and Training for Economic Development in Singapore Since 1965. Washington DC: The World Bank. pp. 12-38.

Gornitza, A., Kyvic, S. & Stensaker, J. 2005. *Implementation Analysis in Higher Education Reform and Change*.

Govender, J. 2016. Social Justice in South Africa. *Civitas, Rev. Cienc. Soc.* 16(2): 237-258.

Guest, G., Namey, E. E. & Mitchell, M.L. 2013. *Collecting Qualitative Data: A Field Manual Applied Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Gumede, V. 2015. Economic policy in post-apartheid South Africa. In: De Jager, N., eds. *South African Politics: An Introduction*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press Africa (Pty) Limited. pp. 227-243.

Graham, V. 2015. Socio-economic contexts. In: De Jager, N., eds. *South African Politics: An Introduction*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press Africa (Pty) Limited. pp. 205-206.

Gratton-Guinness, I. 1989. New Great Trek of South Africa: Which Reforms for Education? *Education Forum*.

Greef, M., Mostert, C., Kahl, C., & Jonke, C. 2021. The #FeesMustFall Protests in South Africa: Exploring First-Year Students' Experience at a Peri-Urban University Campus. *South African Journal of Higher Education*. 35(4): 1-10.

Griffin, A. M. 2016. *Toward Deliberative Democracy: The Institutional Forum as an Innovative Shared Governance Mechanism in South African Higher Education*. International Centre for Higher Education Management: University Bath.

Gumede, A 2018. Zuma's Free University Promise May Cause Registration Chaos. Available at <http://www.timeslive.co.za>. Date of Access: 9 April 2022.

Gwaindepi, A. 2014. *The Developmental State, Social Policy and Social Compacts: A Comparative Policy Analysis of the South African Case*. Department of Economic and Economic History. Rhodes University: South Africa.

Habib, A. 2019. *Rebels and Rage: Reflecting on #fees must fall*. Jeppetown: Jonathan Ball.

Hartshone, K. B. 1985. The State of Education in South Africa. *South African Journal of Science*. 18: 148-151.

Harvey, D. 2005. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Harvey, D. 2007. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hay, D. & Monnapula-Mapesela, M. 2009. South African Higher Education Before and After 1994: A Policy Analysis Perspective. In: Bitzer., eds. *Higher Education in South Africa: A Scholarly Look Behind the Scenes*. Stellenbosch: SUN Media.

Heywood, A. 2013. *Politics*. 4th Edition. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Hlokwa-la-tsela ntshebele. 1999. Discussion about education in South Africa. Thobela FM Radio.

Hull, G. 2015. Free University Education Is Not the Route to Social Justice. Available at <http://mg.co.za/article/2015-10-28-free-university-education-is-not-the-route-to-social-justice>.

Jansen, J. D. 2001. Rethinking Education Policymaking in South Africa: Symbols of Change, Signals of Conflict. In: Kraak, eds. *Education in Retrospect: Policy and Implementation Since 1990*. Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council.

Jansen, J, D, 2002. Political Symbolism as Policy Craft: Explaining non-reform in South African Education after Apartheid. *Journal of Education Policy*. 17(2): 199-215.

Jansen, J. 2015. A Quiet Contemplation on the New Anger: The State of Transformation in South African Universities. *New Agenda: The South African Journal of Social and Economic Policy*. 60(1): 6-8.

Johnson, R. W. 2019. *Fighting for the Dream*. Cape Town: Jonathan Ball.

Jones, B., Coetzee, G., Bailey, T. & Wickham, S. 2008. Factors that Facilitate Success for Disadvantaged Higher Education Students – An Investigation in Approaches used by REAP, NSFAS and selected Higher Education Access Programme.

Joyce, P. 1990. *The Rise and Fall of Apartheid*. Cape Town: Struik.

Kandjou, I. 1985. Namibia: The Politics of Race Relations, Ethnicity and Education. D.Ed. thesis. Columbia: University of Columbia.

- Kissack, M. & Enslin, P. 2003. Reconstruction from the Ruins: Higher Education Policy and the Cultivation of Citizenship in the new South Africa. *South African Journal of Higher Education*. 1(1): 36-48.
- Koen, C., Cele, M., & Libhaber, A. 2006. Student Activism and Student Exclusion in South Africa. *International Journal of Educational Development*. 26(4): 404-414.
- Kose, B.W. 2009. The Principal's Role in Professional Development for Social Justice: An Empirically based Transformative Framework. *Urban Education*. 44(1): 628-663.
- Kraak, A. & Young, M. 2001. *Education in Retrospect Policy and Implementation Since 1990*. Pretoria: Human Science Research Council.
- Kraft, M. E. & Furlong, S. R. 2013. *Public Policy: Politics, Analysis, and Alternatives*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Kgware, W. M. 1973. Education and the Changing Scene in Black South Africa. *The Transvaal Education News*. 70(9): 14 – 18.
- Lee, W. O. & Manzon, M. 2014. The Issue of Equity and Quality of Education in Hong Kong. *Higher Education Journal*. 23(4): 823-833.
- Lemmer, E. M. 1993 Addressing the Needs of the Black Child with a Limited Language Proficiency in the Medium of Instruction. In: Le Roux, J., ed. *The Black Child in Crisis, A Socio-Educational Perspective*. Pretoria: Van Schaik. pp. 143-170.
- Lepori, B. & Naidoo, R. 2017. Field Interconnectedness and Strategic Action in South Africa's Higher Education. Presentation at the Academy of Management Conference, Organisation and Management Theory Division.
- Mafumo, T. N. 2011. *Social Justice in South African Universities: A Bridge too Far?* Polokwane: University of Limpopo.
- Mailovich, C. 2018. Where is Zuma Getting the Money for Free Higher Education from, asks SACP? Available at <http://www.businesslive.co.za>. Date of Access: 25 April 2022.
- Majola, T. & Hayward, F. 2000. Higher Education Policy Development in Contemporary South Africa. *Higher Education Policy*. 13(1): 335-359.
-

Makhanya, M. 2020. War on Education: Glorification of Hooliganism is Damaging the Value and Reputation of our Tertiary Sector. The Natal Witness.

Makhubele, M. 2016. Face of the Fees Revolution Unmasked. The Sunday Independent. Date of Access: 25 May 2022.

Manganyi, N. C. 2001. Public Policy and the Transformation of Education in South Africa. In: Janson, J eds. Implementing Education Policies: The South African Experience.

Marginson, S. 2011. Equity, Status and Freedom: A Note on Higher Education. *Cambridge Journal of Education*. 41(1): 23-26.

Masuku, S. 2017. Free Higher Education in South Africa: Opine Cutting through the lies and Statistics. Available at <http://www.lol.co.za>. Date of Access: 12 April 2022.

Mathews, S. 2017. *NGOs and Social Justice in South Africa and Beyond*. Durban: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press.

Mavunga, G. 2019. #FeesMustFall Protests in South Africa: A Critical Realist Analysis of Selected Newspaper Article. *Journal of Student Affairs in Africa*. 7(1): 81-96.

Mavrozacharakis, E. & Tzagkarakis, S. 2018. Modern Welfare State and Social Democracy: Interdependence and Policy Importance. *Open Access Journal*. 3(5): 1-41.

McLean, L. D. & Walker, M. 2012. The Possibilities for University Based Public-Good Professional Education: A Case Study from South Africa based on the "Capability Approach". *Studies on Higher Education*. 37(5): 585-601.

Meister-Scheytt, C. & Scheytt, T. 2005. The Complexity of Change in Universities. *Higher Education Quarterly*. 59(1): 79-99.

Merriam, S. 2009. *Qualitative Research: A Guide to Design and Implementation*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

Miller, D. 1999. *Principles of Social Justice*. London: Harvard University Press.

Ministry of Education. 2000. *National Plan on Higher Education in South Africa*. Pretoria: Government Printers.

- Mkhatshwa, S. 1988. *Alternative Education. The Road to a Democratic Future*. Cape Town.
- Mngomezulu, S., Dhunpath, R., & Munro, N. 2017. Does Financial Assistance Undermine Academic Success? Experiences of 'at risk' student in a South African University.
- Mohlamme, J. S. 1990. *The Early Development of Education in Soweto as Seen in The Story of Pimpville School*. Braamfontein: Skotaville Publishers.
- Moja, T. & Hayward, F.M. 2008. The Changing Face of Redress in South African Higher Education (1990-2005). *Journal of Higher Education in Africa*. 3(3): 31-56.
- Mokone, T. 2018. R57-billion for Free Tertiary Education. Available at <http://www.timeslives.co.za>. Date of Access: 14 May 2022.
- Moloi, R. C. & Motaung, R. R. 2014. Admission of and Service Provision for Deaf Students at a University of Technology. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Science*. 5(10): 370-375.
- Monzo, L. D. & Soohoo, S. 2014. Translating the Academy: Earning the Racialised Languages of the Academy. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*. 7(3):147-165.
- Motala, E. & Singh, M. 2001. Introduction. In: Motala, E., eds. *Education and Equity: The Impact of State Policies on South African Education*. Cape Town: Heinemann Publishers.
- Motala, S. 2016. Breaking the University Impasse: Time to Put Plans and Research into Action. *The Conversation*. <http://theconversation.com/breaking-the-university-impasse-time-to-put-plans-and-research-into-action-67386>. Date of Access: 10 May 2022.
- Motala, S. 2017, Introduction - Part 3: Achieving 'Free Education' For the Poor – a realisable goal in 2018. *Journal of Education*. 68(68): 16-26.
- Morrow, W. E. 1990. Aims of Education in South Africa. *International Review of Education*.
- Morrow, W. 2009. *Bounds of Democracy. Epistemological Access in Higher Education*. Cape Town: HRSC Press.
- Muller, J. 2000. *Reclaiming Knowledge: Social Theory, Curriculum, and Education Policy*. London: Routledge Falmer.
-

Muller, S. 2018. Free Higher Education in South Africa: Cutting through the lies and Statistic. Available at [http://: www.mg.co.za](http://www.mg.co.za). Date of Access: 12 April 2022.

Murphy, J. T. 1992. Apartheid Legacy to Black Children. *Phi Delta Kappa*. 73(5): 367-374.

Mutekwe, E. 2017. *Unmasking the Ramifications of the Fees-Must-Fall-Conundrum in Higher Education Institutions in South Africa: A Critical Perspective*. 142-154.

Myers, M.D. 2009. *Qualitative Research in Business and Management*. London: SAGE.

Mzangwa, S. T. & Dede, Y. 2019. The effects of higher education policy on transformation in post-apartheid South Africa. *Congent Education*. 6(1): 4-15.

Oldfield, S. 2001. The South African State in Transition: A Question of Form, Function and Fragmentation. In: Motala, E, eds. *Education and Equity: The Impact of State Policies on South African Education*. Cape Town: Heinemann Publishers.

Naidoo, A. 2015. *Student Funding at a South African Institution of Higher Education*. Gordon Institute of Business Science: University of Pretoria.

Naidoo, A. & McKay. T. J. M. 2008. Student Funding and Student Success: A case study of a South African University.

Naidoo, R. & Ranchod, R. 2018. Transformation, the State and Higher Education: Towards a Developmental System of Higher Education in South Africa. In: Ashwin, P & Case, J, eds. *Higher Education Pathways: South African Undergraduate Education and the Public Good*. Cape Town: African Minds. p. 10 – 27.

Nangenge-Ouma, G. & Cloete, N. 2008. Financing Higher Education in South Africa: Public Funding, Non-Government Revenue and Tuition Fees. *South African Journal of Higher Education*. 22(4): 906-919.

National Commission on Higher Education (NCHE). 1996. *A Framework for Transformation*. Pretoria: NCHE.

National Planning Commission. 2011. The National Development Plan. Available at <http://www.gov.za/issues/national-development-plan-2030>. Date of Access: 27 May 2022.

Nkomo, M. 2012. The Quest for Equity in Higher Education Across Racial, Ethnic and Gender Groups. In: Heymann, J., eds. *Lessons in Educational Equality: Successful Approaches to Intractable Problems Around the World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. p. 23-55.

Nkomo, M., Akoojee, S. & Matthanke, S. 2007. Between a Rock and a Hard Place: Understanding the Balance Between Access and Efficiency in South African Higher Education. *Journal of Asian and African Studies*. 42(5): 399-413.

North, C. E. 2006. More than Words? Delving into Substantive Meaning(s) of 'Social Justice' in Education. *Review of Education Research*. 76(1): 507-535.

Ntshoe, I. M. 2002. National Plan for Higher Education in South Africa: A Programme for Equity and Redress or Globalised Competition and Managerialism? *Human Science Research Council*. 16(2): 7-9.

Nussbaum, M. 2001. *Upheavals of Thought: The Intelligence of Emotions*. Cambridge University Press: New York.

Oketch, M. O. 2003. Affording the Unaffordable: Cost Sharing in Higher Education in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Peabody Journal of Education*. 78(35): 88-106.

Oxfam, 2016. *Financing, Not Funding, Mechanism Needed*.

Parker, D. 2014. University Education in the Department of Higher Education and Training. Date of Access: 9 April 2022.

Pink, W. & Noblit, G. 2017. *Second International Handbook of Urban Education*. Berlin: Springer.

Psacharopoulos, G., & Papakonstantinou, G. 2005. The Real University Cost in a "free" Higher Education Country. *Economics of Education Review*. 24(1): 103-108.

Rawls, J. 2001. *Justice as Fairness: A Restatement*. London: Harvard University Press.

Ramphoma, S. 2014. *Understanding Poverty: Causes, Effects and Characteristics*.

Reading, B. 1996. *The University in Ruins*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Richardson, M., Evans, C. & Gbadamosi, G. 2009. Funding Full-Time Study Through Part-Time Work. *Journal of Education and Work*. 22(4): 1-15.

Robertson, I. A. 1973. Education in South Africa: A Study in the Influence of Ideology on Educational Practise. D.Ed. thesis, Harvard: Graduate School.

Sabbagh, C. 2003. The Dimension of Social Solidarity in Distributive Justice. *Social Science Information*. 42(1): 256-276.

Shindler, J. 1984. South African Institute of Race Relations (SAIRR) Topical Briefing.

Simkins, C. 2016. Funding South African Higher Education Reviewed: two Decades of Democracy. Pretoria: Council on Higher Education.

CRA-Socio-economic Survey of South Africa. 2023.

Soiferman, K. 2010. *Compare and Contrast Inductive and Deductive: Research Approaches*.

Sonn, F. A. 1986. The Challenge to Business. (In Van den Heever, R., ed. A Decade of Struggle: The Hopes and Purposes of Franklin. Cape Town: University of Cape Town).

Soudien, C. 2016. Who is 'getting through' in South Africa? Graduate output and the reconstruction of the formal curriculum. In: Featherman, M. Hall, & M. Krislov eds. The next 25 years: Affirmative action in higher education in the United States and South Africa Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press. pp. 229-243).

South Africa. 1953. Bantu Education Act 47 of 1953. Pretoria: Government Printers.

South Africa. 1976. Medical University of South Africa Act 78 of 1976. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Spreen, C. A. & Vally, S. 2006. Education Rights, Education Policies and Inequality in South Africa. *International Journal of Educational Development*. 26(1): 352-363.

Steyn, G. & De Villiers, P. The Changing Face of Public Financing of Higher Education with Special Reference to South Africa. *South African Journal of Economics*. 75(1): 136-154.

Stonier, J. 1998. Breaking Out of a Separatist Paradigm: Intercultural Education in South Africa. In: Cushner, K. E. eds. *International Perspectives on Intercultural Education*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Squelch, J. 1993. Towards a Multicultural Approach to Education in South Africa. In: Le Roux, J., eds. *The Black Child in Crisis, A Socio-educational Perspective*. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.

Squelch, J. 1993. Towards a Multicultural Approach to Education in South Africa. In: Todd, R., eds. *Education in a Multicultural Society*. London: Cassell).

Tandwa, L. 2016. South Africa: #FeesMustFall Costs Country R150-Million – Nzimande. News 24. Date of Access: 9 April 2022.

The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. 2012. *Higher Education in Regional and City Development Higher Education in the Free State, South Africa*. Paris: OECD.

Timmis, S. 2021. *Rural Transitions to Higher Education in South Africa: Decolonial Perspective*. London: Routledge

Thorsen, D. E. 2010. The Neoliberal Challenge: What is Neoliberalism. *Contemporary Reading in Law and Social Justice*. 2(2): 188-214.

Tjabane, M. 2010. *Education Policy and Social Justice in Higher Education: A South African Case Study*. Department of Education Management and Policy Studies. Pretoria: University of Pretoria.

Tshiyoyo, M. 2014. The Role of The State in Ensuring Sustainable Development. In: Thornhill, C., eds. *Public Administration & Management in South Africa: A Developmental Perspective*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

UNDP. 2004. *The South African National Human Development Report of 2004*. New York: UNDP.

Unterhalter, E. & Wolpe, H. 1989. The Politics of South African Education. In: *Research on Education in South Africa (RESA)*., ed. Economic Change, Social Conflict and Education in Apartheid South Africa. Conference Report. Date of Access: 15 January 2021. pp. 1–21).

Van Der Bank, C. M & Nkadimeng, M. R. 2014. Exploring Funding in Higher Education to Eliminate Poverty in South Africa. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*. 3(1): 353-356.

Van Der Merwe, M. 2016. Insight SA Education, What Comes Next? Available at <http://www.dailymaverick.co.za/article/2016-09-06-insight-sa-education-what-comes-next#WOIPPdlzZPY>. Date of Access: 17 May 2022.

Van Der Merwe, B. 2020. Challenges faced by South Africa. In: Rathbone, M., eds. *Understanding Business and Ethics in the South African Context*. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.

Van Der Westhuizen, G. J. 2008. Evaluations of High Education Transformation in South Africa: *South African Journal of Higher Education*.

Van Zyl, A. 1997. A Historical Overview of South African Education. In: Lemmer, E. M. eds. *Introduction to Education for South African Teachers. An Orientation to Teaching Practice*. Cape Town: Juta Publishers.

Wagid, Y. 2000. Knowledge Production and Higher Education Transformation in South Africa: Towards Reflexivity in University Teaching, Research and Community Service. *Higher Education*. 43(1): 457-488.

Walker, M. & Mkwanzani, F. 2015. Challenges in Accessing Higher Education: A case study of marginalised young people in one South African informal settlement. *International Journal of Education Development*. 40-49.

Wangenge-Ouma, G. 2010. Funding and The Attainment of Transformation Goals in South Africa's Higher Education. *Oxford Review of Education*. 36(4): 481-497.

Whitehead, Y.D. 2017. Food and Housing Challenges: (Re)framing Exclusion in Higher Education. *Journal of Education*. 68(68): 149-169.

Wiidshout-February, A. 2020. How Large is the Missing Middle and What Would it Cost to Fund?

Wilson-Strydom, M. 2016. A Capabilities List for Equitable Transitions to University: A top-down and Bottom-up Approach. *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities*. 17(2): 145-160.

Wolhunter, C. C. 2009. The Transformation of Higher Education in South Africa since 1994: Achievements and Challenges. *Higher Education Forum (Japan)*. 1(1): 59-72.

Wolpe, H. 1990. *Race, Class and The Apartheid State*. New Jersey: Africa World Press.