

CHAPTER 3 – SOUTH AFRICAN HIGHER EDUCATION AND TRANSFORMATION PILLARS – FOCUS ON SOCIAL JUSTICE

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter, a background to the South African higher education policy context and a discussion of how South African higher education has performed in response to transformation pillars is offered. The following aspects will be addressed: a brief description of the South African higher education transformation pillars, namely, increased and broadened participation, responsiveness to societal needs and cooperative governance and an assessment of how higher education has responded to these three challenges. My purpose in this chapter is primarily to comment on higher education's response to the national mandate of transformation in general and to social justice in particular.

3.2 The South African Higher Education System After 1994

The transition to a democratic society in 1994 necessitated the creation of a new policy framework on which institutions would base themselves in promoting the new democracy. After 1994, all reforms sought explicitly to make important changes in institutions of higher learning. These changes sought to address the apartheid legacy. Their guiding goals and principles were laid down in the 1997 White Paper on Higher Education Transformation. In 2000, the Centre for Higher Education Transformation (CHET) reformulated the broad goals and principles of the White Paper 1997 into three broad transformation goals of Higher Education, namely 1. Increased and broadened participation, 2. Responsiveness to social interests and needs, 3. Co-operation and partnership in governance (CHET, 2000: 36-37). These overarching goals were subsequently referred to by CHET as the three pillars of transformation. The digests of the broad goal of transformation in higher education, as provided by CHET, are informative because they offer a South African perspective on policy developments in higher education. The table below attempts to summarise them.

Table 3.1 – Higher education transformation pillars

TRANSFORMATION PILLAR	BRIEF EXPLANATION
Increased and broadened participation	The historical legacy of fragmentation, inequality and inefficiency in the higher education system must be overcome and a larger and more diverse student population must be accommodated within the system (Cloete & Bunting, 2000:4).
Responsiveness to societal needs	The higher education system must deliver the research, knowledge and highly trained people required in South Africa to be able to compete successfully in a rapidly changing international context (Cloete & Bunting, 2000:5).
Cooperation and governance	An enabling environment must be created in higher education institutions. This environment must be sensitive to and affirm diversity, promote reconciliation and respect for human life, and protect the dignity of individuals (Cloete & Bunting, 2000:5).

Adapted from Cloete & Bunting, 2000

The three pillars of transformation in higher education formulated and initiated by the government of national unity in the 1990s were also supported by non-governmental organisations and higher education research and development organisations that strive to develop current research on transformation throughout the higher education system in the country. Organisations such as CHET, and various education policy units attached to institutions, such the Wits Education Policy unit at the University of the Witwatersrand, make use of these broad goals in their policy research and analysis so as to produce high quality and high impact research for the purpose of informing decision and policy makers in education.

The broad transformation goals provided a framework for the transformation of higher education which was in accordance with the democratic dispensation of 1994. Policy analysts and researchers both locally and internationally contend that the three pillars of transformation were formulated during the symbolic policy stage 1990 – 1994, and were reshaped and made more concrete during the substantive policy stage of the period 1995 to 1998 when the state and other established bodies elaborated on the framework and

clearly defined the values informing higher education transformation in South Africa, a characteristic of symbolic policy. Winberg (2004) describes it as follows:

Policy documents are future orientated and utopian. In order to ensure that the policy is taken up, the documents must focus on the potential for a happy resolution to the current situation... the promise implied by higher education is that as recommendations are implemented, so new institutions will be created in which there will be broadened access, academic productivity and financial stability. Policy documents recommend changes to intuitions, their practices and underlying values and predict a future in which shortcomings will be addressed and an effective and efficient equitable higher education community created (Winberg, 2004:492).

The late 1990s to the present saw the dawn of a new period: a continuation of the substantive stage. Currently, the development of higher education policy is characterised by the continuation of the substantive policy stage and the distributive and redistributive stage. During this stage, the role of the state has begun to predominate as a way of making decisive policy choices towards achieving an integrated, coordinated higher education system that transcends the apartheid legacy more concretely (Cloete, et al., 2006).

3.3 Social Justice as an Element of a Transformed Higher Education System – Contributions and Contradictions

There are a number of research reports and sources that have been produced since the formulation of policy documents which laid down the framework for higher education transformation. The common theme in these sources is concerned with the construction of policies that would address the apartheid legacy and modernise the higher education system so that it becomes more responsive to local and global development. The trend that these various scholars and analysts portray in their writings is the distinctive and commendable nature of transformation in higher education during the democratic dispensation (Gibbon & Kabaki, 2000:132).

Research reports that are exemplary in this regard are those stemming from research and development organisations, progressive policy consultants and scholars in higher education. The majority of them were formulated in the language of progressive politics

and enlightened radicalism, a language whose project is to deepen democracy in higher education and thus promote social justice as conceptualised in this research. In other words, they envisage a higher education system that would contribute to the political empowerment and socio-economic liberation of the South African society. The discourses of progressive South Africa perceive education as an instrument of political liberation and socio-economic transformation and of overcoming the oppressive apartheid legacy. Specifically, the role of higher education is to meet societal socio-economic needs while safeguarding democracy and social justice (Cloete, et al.; Cloete, 2002 b; Jansen, 2003; Kraak, 2001; Park, 2003; Waghid, 2002). Equally, Government policies that were formulated subsequent to 1997 echo the transformation and social justice discourse, for example, the National Plan on Higher Education's five policy priorities. These are: 1. increased access so as to produce skills and competencies for the 21st century; 2. Promotion of equality of access and outcomes so as to redress past inequalities; 3. Diversification of the institutional landscape; 4. Building of research capacity; and 5. Restructuring of the HE landscape and making it consistent with the values of democracy (NPHE 2001: 76).

The thread connecting the preceding conception of transformation in higher education, as encapsulated in the transformation pillars, is the common aim of breaking the mould of apartheid education and aligning transformation with the democratic and social justice concerns of the new democracy.

The transformation debates in South Africa, as noted, have been hailed as exemplary by a number of policy analysts both internationally and nationally. However, they have also been criticised by scholars from the left for retaining traces of neo-liberalism in their obsession with meeting the market and globalisation imperatives. Chisholm offers the following explanation for the dependency of South African education transformation debates on international trends:

First, there is a dependency argument about dependency on World Bank policy; second that the alternatives offered by the left were too weak and could not offer as much as those policies which eventually were adopted; third, that post-modern flexible technologies and information dictate the pace of change; and fourth, ...manifestation of the impact of

globalization of capital and markets consequent on the ending of the cold war (Chisholm, 1998:51-52).

The above implies that with the dawn of the democratic dispensation, South Africa's isolationist status was ended as it became part of the global community and was influenced by an array of policy options from international organisations such as the World Bank, as well as technological development informed by neo-liberalism and the new right movement which regarded globalisation as a panacea for most of the development and transformation challenges.

The trend described by Chisholm above resonates with the marketisation and globalisation of higher education in western countries such as America and the United Kingdom. This process also involves the ideological shift towards neo-liberalism.

The new ideological configuration among the political elites and ruling class in at least the English-speaking capitalist countries can be seen in the policies of the former Clinton administration and the current Blair administration. These policies offer an interesting combination of some social issues formerly part of traditional liberal platform such as affirmative action, gay rights and environmental concerns – that are now coupled with extremely conservative economic policies which hark back to turn of the century neo-liberal economic ideas about an unfettered, free-market economy and a minimal state ... These economic ideas are shared both by political liberals and conservatives alike in the United States, Australia, the United Kingdom and Canada, as well as elsewhere (Shumar, 2004:824).

The key drivers in the ideological configuration of neo-liberalism are higher education institutions. According to Olssen and Peters,

Higher education institutions have been encouraged to develop links with industry and business in a series of new venture partnerships. The recognition of the economic importance of higher education and the necessity for economic viability has seen initiatives to produce greater entrepreneurial skills as well as the development of new performance measures to enhance output and to establish and achieve targets (2005: 313).

The discourse that characterises the transformation of higher education is one of revived modernisation and human capital theory. It is one that has continued to consistently link

education, economic growth and international competitiveness continentally and globally (Chisholm, 1998:65). Notwithstanding this, the specificity of the South African context and needs is accommodated in the emphasis on redress and redistributive strategies as an attempt to counteract the legacy of apartheid (Chisholm, 1998). For instance, in subsequent policy, analysts were consistent and stressed the importance of breaking the mould of apartheid and replacing it with a more socially just and democratic dispensation, even in the context of a socio-economic policy that was anti social justice; for example, radical scholars in the West warn nation states of the dangers of embracing neo-liberalism. Giroux contends that:

Neoliberalism is the most dangerous ideology of the current historical moment....[It] has given way to the language of commercialisation, privatisation and deregulation and ..., within the language and images of corporate culture, citizenship is portrayed as an utterly privatised affair that produces self-interested individuals. [It] maintains that corporate culture functions largely to either ignore or cancel out social injustices in the existing social order by overriding democratic impulses and practices of civil society through an emphasis on the unbridled workings of market relations (Giroux, 2002:425).

It is evident from the preceding discussion that South Africa has not been immune to international trends and their impact on education reform. The question to ask, according to Chisholm, is whether equity and quality in education will be achieved in the context of the internationalisation and marketisation of education reform informed by neo-liberalism (Chisholm, 1998). This is of concern, particularly to the transformation of higher education in South Africa.

In the context of the educational focus on increasing access and participation informed by the human capital theory, the issue of how higher education is performing in terms of promoting equity of access is very important. A number of stakeholders and policy analysts in Africa consistently highlight the important role fair access to higher education plays in the improvement of social justice (Sawyer, 2002: 38). Similarly, in the South African context, the importance of equitable access is emphasised in the first transformation pillar, that of increased and broadened participation as stated above. It is a continentally accepted trend that increasing and broadening access to higher education is an important reform and transformation strategy. As an important method, measuring

or assessing how South African higher education has performed in this area is crucial because it represents a measure of quality in higher education and its relevance to the community.

3.4 South African Higher Education Performance in Terms of Three Pillars of Transformation

The table below is a representation of how higher education has performed in terms of meeting the goals of transformation pillar one: increased and broadened participation.

Table 3.2 – Indicators of transformation goals for higher education in South Africa

GOALS	INDICATORS							
	Total head count enrolment in public universities and technikons (thousands)							
Increased and broadened participation		1993	1995	1997	1999	2000	2001	2002
	Total enrolments	473	567	596	596	600	645	674
Student body to reflect SA demographics	Percentage head count enrolment by population group							
	White	47	31	28	27	27	27	27
	Indian	7	7	6	7	7	7	7
	Coloured	6	5	5	5	5	5	6
	African	40	58	60	60	60	61	60
Increased participation of female students.	Percentage head count enrolments by gender							
	Male	57	50	48	46	46	46	46
	Female	43	50	52	54%	54	54	54

(Cloete & Bunting, 2000)

The enrolment figures portray a positive picture in terms of the continuing access to higher education. On the basis of table 2, it could be said that higher education in South Africa has made remarkable progress towards meeting the transformation pillar of increased access and broadened participation. That is, there is an indication of a definite effect on transformation pillar one, resulting from favourable developments with regards to positive and representative enrolment figures. These figures also signify that South African higher education is attempting to be representative of the South African population and is thus partly fulfilling the policy imperative of redress as required of

such education in South Africa. Some researchers describe this trend as a revolution because “...the ratio of black students in total university enrolment increased from 32% in 1990 to 60% in 2000, while in technikons it rose from 32% to 72% over the same period. Thus, by 2000, there was a majority of African students both in the universities (60%) and technikons (72%)” (Cloete, 2002:1). With reference to the participation of women, the increase was three times greater than that of men: from 42% in 1990 to 53% in 2000 (Cloete) The positive progress made towards increased and broadened participation is further reiterated by the study commissioned by the Commission on Higher Education ten years after the beginning of democracy in 2004 (CHE, 2004: 90).

Furthermore, the positive indicators of performance as a move towards the transformation pillar of increased and broadened participation also demonstrate that higher education is embracing transformation, since it has been conceptualised by various scholars in the South African context. For example, this performance is illustrative of Waghid’s conception of higher education transformation as initiating equality through furnishing equal access and development opportunities for disadvantaged students, and promoting accountability, because higher education policy has to respond to and address national policy imperatives and finally promote quality assurance measures that involve the spirit of dialogism (2000: 109). Waghid’s conception of higher education transformation in South Africa chimes with Van Wyk’s re-imagining of such transformation. Van Wyk’s reformulation consists of four necessary conditions for transformation: equity and redress, critical inquiry, communicative praxis and citizenship (2003:157). For these two scholars, increased access and broadened participation represent one of the conditional issues for transformation in higher education. In this regard, South African higher education is doing fairly well. However, with regard to other conditions mentioned by these scholars such as the spirit of dialogism, critical inquiry and communicative praxis, it is not quite clear how to establish the performance as it would require more qualitative investigation than the quantitative approach used by the CHET study.

While the performance indicators employed above indicate that there are some pockets of change as regards the nature and effectiveness of higher education transformation, certain studies caution against their uncritical usage. According to van Wyk (2004;

2005), a focus purely on performance indicators – performativity – would not support deep transformation. Deep transformation would be enabled by re-asserting the influences of *ubuntu* in policy reformulation and communitarianism as well as by creating space for imagination and creativity (Van Wyk, 2004 & 2005).

Although these indicators depict progress towards the broad goal of increased participation and broadened access, they obscure deeper problems. For instance, the Centre for Higher Education contends that while the number of black students and women has increased, it has not increased favourably in hard science areas such as engineering and accounting (Cloete & Bunting, 2000:72). In the same vein, Van Wyk contends that focusing on a quantitative increase is a matter of performativity, which can be associated with the corporatisation of higher education that uses the business language and logic of input / outputs and more productivity while marginalising aspects of the common good in higher education transformation (2005:183). There still needs to be a more in-depth analysis of the extent to which this transformation pillar is addressed by developments in higher education.

The trend in South Africa, that of opening up higher education, resonates with that of higher education in England at the turn of the 21st century. In England under the new Labour government, higher education was informed by an inclusive language of social justice, being regarded as important to the future economic success of the country and as playing a role in shaping a democratic, civilised and inclusive society (Skelton, 1999:240). In England it was declared that “education must be a force for opportunity and social justice, not for the entrenchment of privilege” (White Paper on Higher Education as cited in Blanden, 2003:8). This inclusivity was exemplified in increasing numbers of students from underrepresented groups, which caused those in higher education to increase in number as well as to represent a more heterogeneous student population (Skelton, 1999:240). Studies show that the English government’s target is for 50 percent of 18-30 year olds to have some experience of higher education by 2010 (Lewis, 2002:04). In South Africa, the government’s target was a modest 20 percent of the age cohort 18 to 24 by 2001 (Bawa, 2000:7).

The discourse that informed this policy reform was that of neo-liberalism with the aim of utilising higher education for the common good while at the same time the market imperative was more important (Vally, 2007:17). In other western democracies such as Canada, the trend is similar: increased access to higher education makes a crucial contribution to economic development, social cohesion and the advancement of democracy in a knowledge based society Kaiser, Hillegers, Iwen, & Legro, 2005:1).

However, studies on higher education reform indicate that the trend of increasing access to higher education is greatly flawed. The defect lies in the failure to highlight the contradictions between inclusive access and the exclusionary experiences of students of higher education because the cultural assumptions underpinning these experiences are left unquestioned.

Liberal humanism maintains that learning and access to culture are essential to human development, but it fails to recognise the implicit assumptions built into any particular expression of culture. It also fails to recognise that culture is contested; a particular expression of culture is an outcome of power relations between two groups (Skelton, 1999:242).

The English experience, while positive, offers lessons for South Africa. The country has progressed in increasing access and broadening participation, but it stands in danger of perpetuating the cultural assumptions and injustices of neo-liberalism if it does not critically engage with this ideology and discover alternatives to it. South Africa might also face the same problem if it does not critically engage with the cultural assumptions of neoliberalism such as western cultural imperialism and bourgeois dominance.

The pillar of responsiveness was complex to analyse for both the CHET 2000 study cited above and the CHE 2004 that followed it. In regard to this, the CHE 2004 study indicates that due to the “South African phenomenon of non-absorption of labour”; there are still inadequate employment opportunities which in turn affect the ability of higher education to satisfy the pillar of responsiveness (CHE, 2004: 165). The rationale provided by researchers in the 1990s for this still relevant phenomenon is that South Africa, like most developing countries, adopted a “Fordist” method of production accumulation that emphasised massification, particularly education, a clear division of labour and authority (Chisholm, 1998:55). This resulted in many graduates acquiring

inadequate, limited skills to meet the demands of the competitive global market. According to this analysis, post-Fordism, as a method of accumulation that places a greater emphasis on smaller units of production, multi-skilling and flexibility, would have addressed this complex problem, but its adoption in the country has been limited (Chisholm, 1998).

In addition to this, the scenario is compounded by an unclear and ambiguous relationship between educational outcome, economic growth and social development (CHE, 2004:165). This implies that a pool of unemployed and unemployable higher education graduates still exists. With reference to the ambiguous relationship mentioned analysts contend that it has been informed by the human capital theory and was responsible for universal movements such as Education for All, with the hope that investment in education would lead to economic development. Regarding this issue, international researchers have shown that this is a contested area since countries that have heavily invested in education in Africa do not necessarily exhibit much progress in the area of economic development (Chisholm, 1998:56-57). For example, in the South African context, Horwitz (2007) is of the opinion that the issue of the creation of skilled manpower resulting from investment in education in South Africa, like that of a two sided coin, is both a myth and a reality. He argues that South Africa needs to revamp its human capital strategies so that it can meet the needs of the global economy (Horwitz, 2007). In the South African context, it could be said that in principle and to some extent in practice, a mixture of Fordism and post-Fordism has exerted an influence on educational reform, particularly in the focus on increased participation and broadened access. The idea was an image of a multi-skilled, flexible worker to ensure the international competitiveness of the country (Chisholm, 1998:58).

While the present study takes cognisance of these complex links between education and economic development as informed by both Fordist and post-Fordist modes of production, it concurs with CHE in cautioning against reducing the pillar of responsiveness to only meeting the demands of the labour market and downplaying the important role of higher education in fulfilling its obligation to the public good (CHE, 2004: 165). The role that higher education plays in promoting the public good is a crucial element of social justice as advanced in this thesis.

The third pillar of transformation, cooperative governance, is intended to guide higher education in the area of governance. The rationale behind this pillar was to destroy the legacy of autocratic management in apartheid higher education through the implementation of democratic governance structures and processes (Cloete, et al., 2000:10). South African literature reveals that during the apartheid era, two approaches to higher education management existed. The first was the strong state control that characterised the white Afrikaans speaking institutions in their relation to the state. With reference to internal management processes, these institutions were highly centralised, autocratic and conservative (Cloete, et al., 2000:14). The second was the polar opposite approach, of the weak state supervision that characterised the English speaking institutions. These institutions held anti-apartheid leanings and had a strong collegial tradition with participative decision making (Cloete, et al., 2000). The terms under which they engaged with stakeholders correspond with the participatory management approach. Conservative Afrikaans institutions adopted a non participative approach while the liberal English institutions adopted a more participative approach (Cloete, Kulati & Phala). Furthermore, the language and tone of cooperative governance portrays a post-Fordist method of accumulation because it is couched in the language of participation as opposed to non-participation, which is more Fordist. Although this pillar possesses impressive credentials for promoting transformation as discussed in this chapter, recent research reports reveal that problems do exist. These problems were identified in the complexity of implementing cooperative governance in 2000 and 2004 respectively.

From 2000, analysts (Cloete, et al., 2000; Hall & Symes, 2005) contended that the policy framework did not accord adequate attention to the management of institutional change and that, as a result, the majority of institutions were failing to translate the broad agenda of transformation into concrete strategies for institutional change (Cloete, et al., 2000:17). In 2004, the same problem of inadequate guidance with regards to how to make decisions emerged, thus hampering equity and democracy (CHE, 2004:184). In a similar context, certain analysts perceived the concept of cooperative governance as a hindrance to academic freedom (CHE, 2004:199). Thus, for cooperative governance to take root in the transformation of higher education, the latter's stakeholders needed to formulate proper guidelines for the implementation of cooperative governance.

Consequently it could be safely said that the implementation of such governance is in its infancy and that this issue continues to be a challenge to higher education.

The above assessment of the transformation pillars indicates that there are varying degrees of change and non-change in higher education. This scenario is also explained by contending challenges faced by this sector in its attempts to promote the transformation and social justice agendas. In 2004, CHE released a document that identified a number of critical issues and challenges facing higher education after 10 years of democratic rule. The array of challenges include addressing the legal and policy context at the systemic level by ensuring appropriate processes of monitoring and evaluating in order to identify and address policy gaps. At institutional level, the process of evaluating the progress made towards institutional transformation with respect to the institutional landscape and culture was identified as important, as was, furthermore, the process of developing processes for sustaining and maintaining the progress made in the following areas: equity, teaching and learning, research, community engagement, responsiveness, governance, financing and internationalisation (CHE, 2004:11)

In October, 2004, a seminar organised by CHET took place which brought together a group of various reputable and renowned experts who identified key issues challenging higher education ten years after democracy. The theme uniting the seminar was higher education and development, which was adopted because it was considered as more forward looking and linked to national agendas than past themes that were retrospective (CHET, 2004:5).

The conference recommended that South African higher education needed to adopt a positive discourse on higher education, democracy and development as opposed to a negative, disabling discourse. This implies that an optimistic attitude to the capabilities of higher education engaging with the challenges and creating meaningful solutions needs to be embraced. The paradox of skills availability, and scarcity, was reiterated as an issue to be prioritised. Related to the skills concern was the subject of an increase in the participation rate while not compromising quality. Since the core function of higher education is research, the challenge is to broaden the research spectrum. With regard to the policy process, it was suggested that adopting a more differentiated policy, as

opposed to a comprehensive and symbolic policy, would be appropriate and timely. The rationale was that this would encourage all institutions to participate equally, while those that needed support would be assisted. Since there is inherent dissonance or discord in the policy process, higher education needs to prioritise the creation of a more harmonious and orchestrated policy (CHET, 2004:1-2). While the conference focused on higher education democracy and development, it could not avoid the emphasis on the economic importance of higher education by reiterating the need to focus on skills development in order to meet the demands of the market and industry and the challenges of the globalising South African society.

In November 2004, the CHE also held a colloquium whose sole purpose was to critically identify South African higher education trends and review its commitment to transformation. The colloquium bore the following fruits in terms of paradoxes and challenges facing higher education after democracy. The need to re-examine the goals of higher education and strategies to achieve these goals emerged as contested terrain from the perspective of both opponents and defenders of the White Paper on Higher Education Transformation, for example, exposes inherent contradictions in and contributions of higher education as regards the promotion of equity and access. The core activities of the higher education sector were identified as a need to focus on re-inventing curricula and their content with a particular focus on mathematics, science and technology education, including teacher training. Other important focus areas identified were the promotion of staff equity, research and innovation, strengthening the link between higher education and further education and training, and the promotion of regional cooperation as well as the internationalisation of higher education. The relationship of higher education with the state was discussed and it was reiterated that the preferred state role is that of a strong steering state, essential for the furtherance of the transformation goal of the White Paper of 1997. This position was opposed by those favouring a loose state control in order to protect institutional autonomy and academic freedom. Since higher education does not operate in isolation but within society, there was a need to conceptualise the relationship between higher education and civil society while addressing the neo-liberal agenda that informs higher education. The relationship between higher education and the market was also reiterated as being of utmost importance since the private sector is an important source of additional funding. On the

overall theme of a transformed and engaged university, the challenge lies in the broadening of the transformation agenda that needed to be informed by debates on the African renaissance through continental consultation (CHE, 2004:3-9).

While the CHE colloquium raised current pertinent issues regarding higher education transformation, it also appears to have been influenced by the global discourse of techno science, particularly with the emphasis being placed on the genuine need to develop skills in mathematics, science and technology. Furthermore, the influence of a neo-liberal discourse is also evidenced by the importance being accorded to the role of the private and business sector with regard to funding. One unique point the colloquium raised is that of relevance to the African continent in the resuscitation of the African renaissance discourse, thus locating the role of higher education in Africa and avoiding completely Eurocentric influences. It can be said that the policy review and analysis carried out after ten years of democracy reveal that higher education policy in South Africa represents a strong embodiment of neo-liberal principles. While these principles may provide the best way to meet the needs of the global knowledge economy in principle and practice, they seriously undermine progress towards equity, social inclusion and social justice.

3.5 South African Higher Education: Persistent Policy Challenges

The celebration of the ten years of democracy also influenced other higher education stakeholders to begin to debate issues that continue to challenge higher education and the transformation agenda. The points of convergence between the various stakeholders demonstrate that South African higher education needs to adopt a positive and enabling discourse while re-interpreting the goals of higher education ten years after democracy. That is, the focus is to redefine and justify the existence of higher education. This focus comes at a time when globally, higher education trends signal shifts from the traditional professional culture of open intellectual inquiry and debate to one that stresses performativity – as mentioned, the language and logic of business evident in the emphasis on measured outputs, strategic planning, performance indicators, quality assurance measures and academic audits (Olssen & Peters, 2005:313). According to these Western researchers this is a period that is informed by neoliberalism; they maintain that

In a global neo liberal environment, the role of higher education for the economy is seen by governments as having greater importance around the world. Universities are seen as key drivers in the knowledge economy and as a consequence higher education institutions have been encouraged to develop links with industry and business in a series of new ventures and partnerships (Olssen & Peters *ibid*).

In South Africa, the CHET project of developing performance indicators for higher education is influenced by the same global trend, but this does not render the project as trivial and irrelevant. It continues to be a timely and relevant one that is useful for measuring higher education performance in order to make in-depth and informed choices and policy decisions. For instance, the CHET (2000) study has revealed policy gaps and contradictions such as the fact that, with reference to increased and broadened participation, the enrolment figures in higher education have levelled while the participation rate of blacks and women is still low, particularly in the mathematics and science areas. Such policy gaps need to be addressed. It is hoped that all these contradictions will be used to reformulate a more targeted and specific policy for higher education in order to meet this goal.

The challenges and trends that continue to plague higher education in South Africa indicate that while the process of producing broad and symbolic policies seemed to be easy and was hailed as exemplary because it promoted democratic principles, the process of implementation is fraught with problems and is complex. According to implementation analysts, the stakeholders often level accusations, such as implementation failure or paralysis and overload, at the government (Gornitza, Kyvik and Stensaker, 2005:35). This phenomenon is reflected in policy inconsistencies and contradictions. A number of factors have been attributed to the implementation gap – the main ones being the macroeconomic policy, GEAR, and the budget (UNDP, 2004: 56-57). This may possibly explain why, among the challenges facing higher education, some of the transformation goals still emerge as issues to be addressed ten years later. The limited implementation of most of the transformation goals further illustrates that systemic change at universities is complex and paradoxical because contradictory positions regarding the necessity for change and resistance to change always exist (Meister-Scheytt & Scheytt, 2005: 97). In the South African context, the position of the government of national unity was to concur with the necessity for change because it

embarked on a grand symbolic policy that aimed at a break with the apartheid legacy. An example of the “resistance to change” group is evident in intellectuals and institutions that engineered the apartheid legacy and are still interested in maintaining it. Furthermore, those which subscribe to neo-liberal ideology can also be grouped in the category of resistance to change because they preach the language of limited reform as opposed to the discourse of transformation. The elements of resistance to change are found in the conservative and new right movements who benefited the most from the apartheid regime. For this group the policies of the democratic government spell socio-economic and political disaster for the country.

The trends and challenges that South African higher education is facing mirror those of universities in the other parts of the world. This is evident in the fact that, while this sector is pursuing the noble role of teaching, research and service to the community, economic and social realities continue to impact either negatively or positively on contributions to national development by higher education. During the 21st century one of the socio-economic realities that most pervasively influence higher education is the phenomenon of globalisation. With regard to globalisation, its impact on South Africa is evident in a number of issues, the main one being the neo-liberal policy of GEAR which has influenced education decisions being made on the basis of fiscal austerity and market procedure (Oldfield, 2001:36). The second related impact is in the restructuring of higher education within market driven concerns: a situation that is detrimental to the nurturing of a newly found democracy in South Africa (Waghid, 2001: 455). The sentiments of South African researchers on globalisation chime with those of western researchers such as Reading, one of the more provocative researchers on the modern university, who asserts that globalisation is changing the structure and role of the university. He contends that due to this phenomenon, the traditional role of the university in serving and promoting the idea of a national culture is being replaced or downplayed, as nation-states are in decline and national cultures are being replaced by global cultures. Furthermore, universities are embracing the culture and business logic of trans-national corporations. Reading perceives this as the demise of the modern university and appeals to the creation of a new community of critical thinkers on the role of universities in the 21st century (Reading, 1996). In the South African context, Waghid et al., further contend that globalisation

...contributes to the redefinition of the notion of a university as a place that has been reduced to subservience to the idea of human “resource development”, based on a data base or education management information system, regulated three-year budget plan, reviews, performance appraisals and the rating of academics, appraisal meetings and annual reports creating a secure over-regulated world of excellence... Regulatory mechanisms based on auditing systems in effect reduce public accountability to the language of accounting, creating a false sense of security that limits society’s critical reflective ability. (2005:53)

The regulatory logic of auditing to which Waghid is referring reflects earlier in his research with regards to globalisation and universities, which drew attention to the concepts of new managerialism, academic capitalism, and the entrepreneurial university as important features of economic aspects of globalisation (Deem, 2001:7). Academic capitalism, as part and parcel of the knowledge and global economy, involves the process of developing, marketing and selling research products, education services and consumer goods in the marketplace. Slaughter and Rhoades provide the following illustrative analysis:

Academic capitalism in the new economy is a regime that entails colleges and universities engaging in market and market-like behaviours. What do we mean by that? How is the present different from the past? After all, colleges and universities have long operated bookstores and sold tee shirts and coffee mugs for profit and professors have long written textbooks and engaged in consulting for profit. We believe the difference is a matter of breadth and depth. Colleges and universities — particularly public colleges and universities faced with a major loss in state support — now develop, market and sell a wide range of products commercially in the private sector as *a basic source of income*. This goes far beyond non-academic consumption items (such as logos, tee shirts, etc.). Today, *higher education institutions are seeking to generate revenue from their core educational, research and service functions*, ranging from the production of knowledge (such as research leading to patents) created by the faculty to the faculty’s curriculum and instruction (teaching materials that can be copyrighted and marketed) (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004:37).

In the South African context, Waghid (2000) illustrates this in a critical analysis of CHE’s agenda of transforming higher education. The criticism is levelled at the goal of transforming higher education by increasing capital and knowledge intensive production and services, thus addressing the demand for skilled professionals in the scientific,

technological, technical and business field (2000:450). While the supporters of the audit culture might argue that a form of bureaucratic control is beneficial to the achievement of social justice, growing numbers of research findings indicate that it is counterproductive. In the South African context, researchers in support of Waghid's anti-audit culture stance argue that attempts to monitor and regulate universities are compliant with the audit culture, and undermine the very practices of academic work and professional autonomy that are essential for the promotion of social justice in universities (Enslin, Pendlebury & Tjiattas, 2003:75-56). The observations of these South African researchers concur with those of international research with reference to the introduction of a market logic in higher education (Apple, 2005) This trend is detrimental to the realisation of radical social justice because not only does it undermine the democratic culture, but it also infringes on the liberatory and emancipatory roles that higher education intellectuals need to play for the common good.

The overarching factors that have influenced this reformist policy trend are neo-liberalism and the macro-economic policy of GEAR, as discussed earlier. According to GEAR, higher education plays two important roles. Firstly, universities are to assume a more entrepreneurial position in outlook, research and curriculum content and secondly, they are to produce human capital that would render South Africa globally competitive, with the emphasis falling on the natural sciences instead of the arts and humanities. As noted, this newly assumed role or position has been criticised for downplaying the role of universities in contributing towards the promotion of a critical and actively engaged citizenry (Motala & Singh, 2001; Waghid, 2000: 11). This critical analysis is shared by Jobbins in arguing that:

In a democratic society, healthy universities act as a check on authority, as a watchdog ready to bark at excesses, errors and miscalculations by government. They give their academics a secure platform from which to analyze and criticize without fear or retribution from the state. The role is especially vital in the developing world, particularly for nations such as South Africa, as they struggle to compete in a global economy with the technological cards heavily stacked against them (Jobbins, 2002:56).

In other words, healthy universities are custodians of economic and social justice. They are the vanguards of democracy and transformation for the benefit of the majority of the

population rather than the privileged few. In universities, there is a mass of critical intellectuals whose agenda is to humanise and promote higher education for the public good and thus seek to alleviate socio-economic inequalities and advance democracy. The logic of globalisation does not automatically decrease socio-economic inequality and injustices and anti-democratic positions and ideologies (Waghid, 2001:463). Globalisation and its concomitant neo-liberal discourse are posing a serious threat to the maintenance of a critical mass of intellectuals that are housed in “healthy universities” because universities are now adopting business organisational culture and logic. For universities to promote social justice in the context of globalisation, they need to humanise the global market logic with that of social justice so that the conception of higher education for the common good is protected.

3.6 Conclusion

This chapter has attempted to indicate the complexity of change and transformation in higher education by discussing how South African education has transformed or changed with reference to three pillars of transformation. It has demonstrated that while some positive progress has been made in constructing these pillars, South Africa still has to put much effort into adequately addressing the gaps that emerged during the erection of these pillars. Furthermore, South African higher education must contend with the complex paradox of the effects of globalisation while attempting to advance the mandate of the common good and social justice. The chapter that follows will focus on the University of Pretoria and its attempts to implement transformation goals as embodied in social justice projects.

CHAPTER 4 – UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA AND TRANSFORMATION

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter a synopsis of the University of Pretoria is provided. This consists of a brief background to the institution during the apartheid years so as to provide an explanation of recurrent themes from the past. This will be followed by a critical discussion of the University during the more recent transformation and democratic dispensation in order to illustrate its position on social justice.

4.2 University of Pretoria before 1994 - The Conservative Tradition and Ideological Outlook

The University of Pretoria as an African University has its roots in the pioneering higher education institutions that existed in Egypt about two or three centuries before Christ (BC) and in Timbuktu in about the 11th century (Lulat, 2005:71 -72), an indication that its intellectual history is entrenched in African ancestry, in like manner as other institutions. The university itself was established in 1908 as the Pretoria centre of the Transvaal University College during the British occupation of South Africa (*South African Standard Encyclopaedia*). During British rule and, later, the apartheid era, the University of Pretoria played a crucial role in contributing to the creation of higher level human resources to assist the country's socio-economic and political development, in line with the role of universities in the rest of the African continent. However, the University was established in a context that was embroiled in conflict between the British and the Afrikaners. Originally it was established as an English medium public institution but due to the dominance of Afrikaans speaking students and the call for Afrikaner nationalism, the Institution became an Afrikaans institution in 1930 (*South African Standard Encyclopaedia*). The positioning of the University as an Afrikaans institution initiated and highlighted its role in promoting the interests, culture and ideology of the Afrikaner community in South Africa, while contributing to the development of the country.

Although the focus of this research is placed on this university after 1994, a brief synopsis is used to illustrate the extent of Afrikaner dominance in higher education.

Coupled with this was the project of Christianising education in general, but with specific reference to higher education. The CNE declaration of 1948 stated that:

Article 11: Higher Education

We believe that our higher education should have the same basis and purpose as our primary and secondary education, the Christian-National life and world view to the forming of the man of God completely equipped for every good work. We desire that our institutions for higher education, beside the usual secular sciences, Christian theology (*geloofsleer*) and in particular Christian philosophy should be taught and practiced. But we desire still more that instruction and practice in the secular sciences must proceed from the Christian life and world view: in no single science may the light of God's truth be lacking. We believe that our University education especially should be thetic rather than antithetic, never merely eclectic and never reconciliatory. A Christian University institution must expound Christian science positively, must place it in opposition to non-Christian science, but never give unconnected instruction, merely choosing here and choosing there, and it may never try to reconcile or remove the fundamental opposition: creator and creation, men and animal, individual and community, authority and freedom remain in principle insoluble in one another. University councils have no more serious vocation than to appoint the right men and women for the teaching work; professors and lecturers must be convinced Christian and National scientists (Rose and Tunmer, 1975: 126).

The above quotation illustrates the extent to which Christian National Education¹ influenced higher education in South Africa during the apartheid years, particularly after the ascendancy of the Nationalist Party in the 1940s. With reference to other aspects of white education at tertiary level the above quotation embodies the following principles: the Christian basis of Afrikaner education, mother-tongue instruction and cultural separation; the moulding of the child, clericalism and the complementary roles of the church and state (Hofmeyer, 1982:100) (Ashley, 1989:59). According to scholars, these

¹ Christian National Education was the official education policy of the Nationalist Party during the apartheid era. It was informed by the religious element of the said Party that emphasised a religious state heavily informed by Christian principles. Translated to education, education policy founded on Christian principles that were conservative was implemented and promoted the world view of the Afrikaner as a dominant group.

principles, when applied to white education, resulted in an education that was conservative, unilingual and heavily state controlled (Hofmeyer). Since the University of Pretoria existed in this context, it was also influenced by these principles and continued to be integrated with the culture and ideological outlook of the conservative institutions throughout the apartheid years and even beyond.

A further reading of the quotation informed by the organisational culture of universities reveals other aspects of Afrikaans speaking universities before 1994.

Organizational culture refers to the taken for granted values, the underlying assumptions, expectations, collective memories, and definitions present in the organization. It represents how things are around here. It reflects the prevailing ideology that people carry inside their heads. It conveys a sense of identity provides unspoken guidelines for how to get along and enhances the stability of the social system to which they belong (Cameron & Quinn, 1999:134).

Using Cameron and Quinn's (1999) framework to analyse the organisational culture of the University of Pretoria, it can be asserted that during the apartheid years the dominant ideology that informed "how things were done", gave a sense of identity to and enhanced the stability of the institution was that of Christian National Education. When implemented as education policy and embedded in organisational culture, the proposal in the quotation resulted in Christianised higher education that promoted Afrikaner nationalism. In the excerpt, the following features of Afrikaner Nationalism are identified: the religious quality of Afrikaner nationalism, the ideology of white supremacy, institutional racism and ethnic mobilisation (Franzsen, 1997:125-126). In more practical terms, the institutional culture reflected mainly that "the way things are done" was heavily informed by the Afrikaner culture, ethos and mission.

The historical reality that needs to be emphasised is that the University of Pretoria was founded as an apartheid university with a policy that supported racial discrimination or exclusivity from the start. This commitment was in line with the policies of the apartheid government. When university apartheid was enforced with the Extension of University Education Act in 1959, the University of Pretoria, like other Afrikaans medium universities, continued with minimal opposition to the government's higher

education policy (Moodie, 1994:7). This trend characterised the institution until the 1990s, while at the same time it enjoyed a sustainable degree of autonomy (Bunting, 2004:49).

4.3 The University of Pretoria during the Democratic Dispensation

On the dismantling of apartheid and the election of a democratic government, the role of the University of Pretoria as a South African university came to be redefined. The institution could no longer afford to support the apartheid status quo but was to experience a paradigm shift, that is, to move from a unilingual conservative university to a bilingual, multicultural and reformed institution that sought to promote transformation as outlined in the White Paper of 1997, thus partly embracing the culture and ideology of the democratic period. The paradigm shift was not experienced only in its philosophical outlook but also in the demography of the student population that had become almost representative of the South African population.

The dawn of the democratic period found the University to be an institution that is nationally and internationally recognised for its high standards of efficiency, productivity and innovation. In 1996, two years after the first democratic elections in 1994, it was among the top five institutions in South Africa with regard to efficiency and innovation. This was according to a project commissioned by CHET entitled “The Best in Higher Education”. There are several measures of efficiency and innovation in higher education, which indicate institutional productivity or the rate at which inputs are translated into outputs. The measures used by the CHET study were the following: undergraduate success rate, undergraduate throughput rate, relative cost efficiency, research outputs. In one measure of efficiency, the undergraduate success rate, the University of Pretoria was among the top five universities with an 82% rate. It can be argued that this sizable figure illustrates that good teaching was taking place at the University of Pretoria (CHET 1998:1). Although the study does not indicate the percentage success rate of African students, it clearly illustrates that the university’s overall success rate is satisfactory.

With reference to the throughput rate, the national average was 20% in 1996 while institutions with a percentage bordering on 20 were regarded as satisfactory. Once more,

in terms of this measure, universities fared much better than technikons (universities of technology). In this regard, the rate for the University of Pretoria was 22%: 7th out of the 10 universities under study. Hence it could be argued that even with graduate throughput, the University of Pretoria met the national average (CHET, 1998:2). Though this may not be the best indicator, it shows that the university met the minimum standards.

With regard to relative cost efficiency, the CHET study revealed that education at universities cost much less than that at technikons. This positive attribute functioned to the advantage of the University of Pretoria as a university because, for example, with regards to economics, students are more likely to choose university admission. This was illustrated five years later in market research (2002) conducted by Cornia Pretorius of the *Sunday Times*, a national newspaper, when the University of Pretoria topped all universities as being the most popular choice for higher education. This finding was utilised by the Vice Chancellor, Professor Pistorius, who emphasised the point that the University of Pretoria was positioning itself as the institution of choice for staff and students. “In the olden days, we were a strong white Afrikaans institution, but we have transformed to a South African institution and we are happy the results are showing” (Pretorius, 2002:7).

Not only was the University of Pretoria a popular choice amongst students; but its performance in research also makes it immediately and abundantly clear that it is among the best research institutions. The University of Pretoria is positioned second in terms of research outputs among all higher education institutions in the country, which, in terms of scientific strengths, indicates the aspects of research outputs that the institution was producing at required NRF standards. This further indicates that the University of Pretoria continues to play an important role in contributing towards the production of much needed research and knowledge for the growing South African democracy. This is the trend that the institution continues to maintain since, even prior to 1994, it was among the top 10 research universities in the country (CHET, 1998).

Considering the performance of the University regarding the aforementioned indicators of what is best in higher education at the dawn of the democratic dispensation, the case

can be made that the institution is efficient in terms of meeting the two core functions of the university: teaching and research. Furthermore, this efficiency could illustrate that its performance was in alignment with the country's goals of producing skilled human capital for the purposes of socio-economic development. This further illustrates that the institution had for many years been esteemed for the important contribution it made to socio-economic development. In the context of the policy developments and the transformation debates discussed in chapter 3, it is therefore important to consider the university's position on transformation and the extent to which it meets the needs of all South Africans and the government's social justice mandate.

4.4 University of Pretoria as an “Innovation Generation” Institution

The shift towards serving the interests of all South Africans occurred gradually, with several mission and vision statements being formulated and deemed as relevant to the democratic dispensation. At the University, the mission, vision and strategic plan that encapsulated the discourse of the democratic dispensation are to be found in the Innovation Generation strategic plan, which documents the position of the University of Pretoria as:

.... a leader in higher education in South Africa, and a research university that is recognized internationally for academic excellence and focus on quality. The university strives to be known for international competitiveness, local relevance and a commitment to continuous innovation, and to be the University of Choice for students, staff, employers of graduates and those that require research solutions. It will be a university with an inclusive and enabling value driven culture that provides an intellectual home for the rich diversity of South African academic talent and one that is committed towards discharging its social responsibilities. The university must be a symbol of national aspiration and hope, reconciliation and pride (*Innovation Generation*, 2000: 3).

According to the Innovation Generation documents, the strategic drivers of the universities are:

- Focus on academic endeavours;
- Quality;
- Local relevance;

- Transformation;
- International competitiveness;
- Value driven organisational culture;
- Sustainability; and
- Innovation.

The strategic drivers identify the University of Pretoria as an academic institution that is committed to providing access to all students in a supportive learning environment. Quality implies that the academic curriculum is relevant to the needs of most stakeholders and that the academic staff are motivated as regards the facilitation of learning. Transformation is a crucial driver which indicates that the institution is committed to the principles of democracy and redress of past inequalities and injustices. The adoption of a value driven organisational culture is also an important position which implies that it is inevitable for this institution to embrace transformation as a value since it operates in a context that is informed by the transformation paradigm. A focus on international competitiveness indicates that while the institution attempts to be relevant it addresses both local and global needs so as to meet the imperatives of the global knowledge economy. Sustainability indicates the commitment to transparent responsibility and accountability, efficient and effective use of resources while utilising appropriate monitoring and evaluating processes.

Since the title of the document is *Innovation*, it is important to cite the interpretation thereof:

The essence of innovation is renewal and continuous improvement. It is a powerful force that drives organizational competitiveness, and is fuelled by a creative energy. It is recognized that the process of innovation has two components, viz. the creation of new ideas or inventions on the one hand, and market adoption of the other. It is important that both components of the innovation process be managed. In order to be successful, the innovations must often be accompanied by organizational changes. Success will depend on the organization's ability to translate its interpretation of the concept into the ability to deliver quality products (*Innovation Generation*, 2000: 6).

There are some positive aspects of the Innovation Generation's strategic framework. It can be viewed as a precondition for the effective implementation of the main objective of the University of Pretoria in the new millennium informed by the transformation discourse. The document contains a comprehensive set of goals and priorities, ensuring that all stakeholders and decision makers are able to pursue a common agenda more coherently, an agenda that is unique to the University of Pretoria. This document can also be considered as a tool to orientate all stakeholders towards implementing and achieving the national call for innovation in higher education.

The concept of the "entrepreneurial university" is also reflected in the document. This is evident in the emphasis on creativity and innovation, which are the cornerstones of entrepreneurship (Clark, 1998 :). In this regard South African social scientists like Bundy advance the view that in relation to the adoption of the trend towards entrepreneurship, the University of Pretoria became a pioneer in a context that is strongly influenced by the global marketisation of education (Bundy, 2005:92). Consequently, in a sense, the university must balance the demands of the marketisation logic and those of transformation.

The University of Pretoria is engaged in multiple transformational challenges, which include giving effect to its mission, strategic drivers and changes in the institutional culture. The adoption of the Innovation Generation strategy at the University of Pretoria is an example of organisational change that is aimed at institutional transformation as a response to the national mandate, as well as at a transformed organisational culture. This is a complex process that requires the core values and shared beliefs to alter and become aligned to a shared vision of an ideal future. This kind of change is referred to as organisational change by Senge (1990:9). In the case of the University of Pretoria, the vision is to be a South African university that promotes the innovation generation, a shared vision that is relevant and is timely, given the global pressures and local realities of positioning the institution as a world player.

4.5 The Organisational Culture of the University of Pretoria

The adoption of the Innovation Generation strategic plan bears directly on the organisational culture of the university, which, according to Thaver, is a subset of a

much larger socio-historical process (2006:24). An understanding of organisational culture is important to the study of institutional transformation because it tells of “how things are done” at a particular institution.

The work on organisational culture was likened to that on institutional cultures by Tierney, with the aim of diagnosing cultures in universities and colleges and solving problems while managing change (Higgins, n.d.:104). Tierney extends the term “organisational culture” to the operations of universities as organisations and therefore considers that a synergy exists between organisational and institutional cultures since they have in common a focus on “how things are done” as informed by the prevailing and dominant ideology in any institution (Higgins, n.d.:105).

Since organisational cultures involve some pertinent aspects of the character and integrity of any institution, for any institution to be relevant to its epoch and context, it is inevitable that these aspects portray the said environment. In the case of the University of Pretoria, this implies that its ideological dispositions were required to portray the democratic dispensation as opposed to that of the apartheid past. At the said University, the adoption of the Innovation Generation strategic plan signals another change strategy and ideology informed by innovation – making improvements that are substantially and ideologically different from those of the past legacy in order to be aligned with the transformation imperative of the democratic state.

Understanding institutional cultures in the South African context has been influenced by a global common sense of neo-liberalism as well as by local questions with regards to racial and cultural identities in post-apartheid and post colonial society. According to Higgins:

The current, dominant sense of the term in South Africa understands the institutional culture of higher education institution through the lenses of ‘whiteness critique’. In this perspective, it is argued, institutional culture is above all experienced by black staff and students as the overwhelming ‘whiteness’ of academic culture. ‘Whiteness’ here refers to the ensemble of cultural and subjective factors that together constitute the unspoken dominance in higher education of Western, European and Anglo-Saxon values and attitudes as these are reproduced and inflected in South Africa. ‘Whiteness’ is or can be experienced as an alienating and

disempowering sense of not being fully recognised in or by the institution, and a consequent impossibility of feeling ‘at home’ within it (Higgins, n.d.:106).

In the South African context, the term “institutional culture” is highly contested and politically charged. The above analysis demonstrates that it is closely linked to the impact of the legacy of past racial injustices of black subjugation and white dominance. In this regard, Thaver takes the position that in comprehending institutional cultures:

.... we should be able to uncover various ways in which the racial “politicking” of the old has been transmuted and reconfigured (in other words, how it has been reinvented under the guise of “politically correct” rhetoric and democratic speak and even “nation building” or, alternatively how the old has been challenged and negated and how new modalities are seen to emerge in their stead (Thaver, 2006:25).

For the University of Pretoria, the adoption of the Innovation Generation strategy signals change. Though not an easy process, since it is meant to impact on the whole organisation, it represents a step in the right, and relevant, direction because the institution is attempting to conduct business differently from the past and to address the challenges and realities of the current democratic era in the country.

The adoption of this strategic plan by the university is a distinguishing feature of a complex organisation which is classified in the following manner by researchers such as Bergquist:

Bergquist focuses on archetypes by which numerous institutions might be categorized and described. He hypothesizes that different change strategies would be needed and appropriate within the four different academic culture archetypes that reflect any higher educational institutions – collegial culture, managerial culture, developmental culture and negotiating culture. The collegial culture arises primarily from the disciplines of the faculty. It values scholarly engagement, shared governance and decision making, and rationality, whereas the managerial culture focuses on the goals and purposes of the institutions and values efficiency, effective supervisory skills, and fiscal responsibility. This contrasts with the developmental culture, which is based on the personal and professional growth of all members of the collegiate environment. Lately, the

negotiating culture values the establishments of equitable and egalitarian policies and procedures (Bergquist, 1992, as cited in Kezar, 2002:439).

On the basis of Berquist's classification, and considering the status of the University of Pretoria, it can be inferred that the institution falls under the collegial type. However, the institution does not neatly fit into this category because of the past legacy and the fact that it also contains pockets of the managerial type within it. Although the reformational language and tone and some elements of transformation in the Innovation Generation document might be present and the institution may appear to be a collegial one, its management core continues to be more managerial in nature. Berquist's classification is useful in explaining one aspect of the categorisation of the University of Pretoria. A South African study that also deals with institutional classification is helpful in this regard. According to File, the collegial model is an "open system" subject to environmental changes and internal demands, with integration being achieved by the existence of a shared culture and a community of scholars (File 2000: 32).

The above aspect of collegiality is reflected in the strategic document, in the proclamation of the adoption of a new organisational culture that is inclusive and enabling and is based on the democratic rights and values of the constitution (*Innovation Generation*, 2002:5). The fact that in theory and principle, the University states in clear terms that it values the rights enshrined in the constitution is another positive aspect of the document. However, due to the contested nature and politically charged context of the South African higher education environment, the realities and experiences on the ground continue to exhibit aspects of the political model in which, according to File, the institution exhibits a diversity of interests within the institution, lack of shared goals and a common vision; different sectors and groups with differential access to power and resources; and problem solving based on bargaining and compromise (File, 2000: 32). This is due to the power relations and contestations as a result of the apartheid legacy and will continue to exist for some time. While an organisational culture informed by collegiality has a greater chance of promoting the social justice mandate because it is couched in the discourse of an inclusive culture, the probability of achieving institutional collegiality is still in its infancy. It is an ideal that needs to be pursued for the sake of protecting and maintaining a democratic institution.

4.6 Competing Discourses at the University of Pretoria

In revealing other meanings attached to the Innovation Generation, it is useful to employ recent approaches to policy analysis in education that are informed by critical discourse analysis. This form of analysis is used by a number of progressive policy activists, such as Taylor, as an investigative tool to explore change in new times and to promote social democratic goals (Taylor, 2004: 435). A relevant point with respect to the analysis of the document is to consider the kind of language employed in it. The rationale behind this procedure is that language, in the context and times in which the document is written, is used as a vehicle of knowledge as part and parcel of the knowledge based economy – a distinct feature of globalisation (Taylor, 2004: 433). One of the strategic drivers of the document is international competitiveness, whose purpose is to benchmark the institution on an international level (*Innovation Generation*, 2002:5).

Another feature of critical discourse analysis that is useful to employ for comprehending the meaning attached to “Innovation Generation” is its focus, moving beyond ideological critique to other forms of text and discourses that may mark the productive use of power in the face of economic and cultural globalisation (Taylor, 2004:107). Using the lens of such analysis, it is evident that in the institution’s strategic plan, other forms of discourse exist, namely those of neo-liberalism and social justice. The specific values that capture the former are international competitiveness and innovation while those that embody the latter discourse are those of transformation and local relevance. In the said document, there is a juxtaposition of competing discourses, which is a distinct feature of the fluidity of the era of South Africa as a 14 year old democracy. This may be perceived as a positive state of affairs, but for the agenda of the present study it will be positive only if, in the final analysis, the progressive social justice agenda gains supremacy.

A closer examination of the text of the *Innovation Generation* reveals the language and discourse of globalisation and indicates that neo-liberalism is predominant. This is evidenced in the pervasive rhetoric and values of the market in the representation of the text: for instance, most of the strategic drivers reflect certain aspects of market logic

such as technological innovation, focus on excellence, students referred to as clients and performance management systems (*Innovation Generation*, 1-14).

An important question stemming from the strategic document is the extent to which it addresses the government's mandate of transformation and social justice. Indeed, transformation is indicated as one of its important values. In comprehending the meaning attached to social justice in this document, it is important to identify the aspects that are closely similar to social justice as conceptualised in this research. Transformation is one of the values that are identical to social justice as theorised in this study, yet the transformation that is indicated in this document is one that is informed by the organisational culture of neo-liberalism and is therefore more reformative in nature, not promoting transformative radical social justice. Therefore, the discourse of transformation informing the document is not in harmony with the original transformation discourse which was informed by socialist discourse promoting equal distribution and access to all social and economic services. The kind of transformation in the document is reformist, focuses on minimal changes or adjustments and tends to legitimate a neo-liberal project of globalisation. This researcher is weary of an uncritical enthrallment with transformation that is more likely to prejudice the members of the disadvantaged communities and perpetuate existing educational injustices. The tone adopted regarding transformation in the document is neutral.

A further reading of the said document reveals that transformation as a value is embraced and manifested in a variety of ways that attempt to be relevant to the current era of democracy. Although the transformation as conceptualised in the document is still couched in reformist language which points to commitment to the process of modification without fundamental change, the fact that transformation is stipulated as a value indicates a *prima facie* commitment, in principle, to progressive values. The strategic plan as a response to the national systemic change informed by transformation discourse also encapsulates elements of reculturing. According to Fullan, reculturing refers to the process of developing new values, beliefs and norms (Fullan, 1996:422). The aspect of reculturing is significant as a contemporary value of the *Innovation Generation*, because it implies that all academic stakeholders across the generations are

to embrace the value of innovation. This further reinforces the point made by a South African researcher that:

Transformation ...is not about changes in the composition of staff and students, or changes in governance structures or course content (*curriculum*). Essentially, it is about the transformation of the organizational culture and the development and acceptance of new, shared values. This can only be achieved through fundamental changes in the mindset... of all stake holders and role players... (Fourie, 1999:277).

This conveys an important lesson for the *Innovation Generation*: that transformation which impacts on organisational culture needs to bring to the fore both the bottom and top structures in order to communicate. These sentiments are shared by Fullan (1999) in contending that the three strategies that carry a greater possibility of effecting change are networking, reculturing and restructuring. According to Fullan, networking is action orientated and increases the involvement of the majority of stakeholders by means of, for instance, ongoing, multilevel development. Reculturing entails developing new values – transformation. Restructuring concerns changes in roles, and structures and other mechanisms that enable new cultures to thrive (Fullan, 1999:422). Fullan's ideas are applicable to the promotion of social justice because they concern building a new and transformed order at an institution that promotes collaborative work and respects diversity. For the university to fully realise the *Innovation Generation* credo, it needs to reinforce its endeavours of networking, reculturing and restructuring. These are crucial processes that fall beyond the scope of this research and need separate treatment. However, Fullan's analysis is useful in explaining the extent of transformation at the university and how it has met the government mandate of social justice. It enables one to question the role played by the three centres being studied in the process of networking, re-culturing and restructuring so that the university is seen to be meeting the government social justice mandate.

Since the focus of this research falls on the three centres mentioned, in terms of the strategies of transformational endeavour that fulfil the national social mandate, it is proper to comment on how the strategic document treats them. The UPFY is given as an example of transformation: it is perceived as an innovative approach to increasing

access to mathematics, science and engineering by students from disadvantaged backgrounds. Consequently, the UPFY contributes to the human and social capital of the nation by equipping students in mathematics and science for the global knowledge economy. CSA is mentioned in the section on students as an aspect of innovation that contributes to a value driven organisational culture in addressing the university community and other stakeholders affected and infected by HIV and AIDS. These sentiments render the strategic document timely and relevant to one of the most profound challenges of higher education in Africa. The IGWS is referred to under “academic initiatives” as an area of special interest or expertise and research area housed by the faculty of humanities. The institute accordingly adds value to the *Innovation Generation* value of transformation since it focuses on gender – an aspect that is high on both the international and national agendas. The three centres not only embody most of the innovation values, they are also pertinent as agents of change towards furthering social justice goals as envisaged in the present research. The sections that follow will provide a detailed and critical analysis of the three centres. This will constitute an attempt to analyse the extent to which the University of Pretoria is addressing the national mandate of social justice.

4.7 Conclusion

This chapter has provided a brief background to the University of Pretoria during the apartheid era and the succeeding democratic dispensation. It has demonstrated that while there are competing discourses at the institution, the dominant institutional culture is a conservative liberal one. This culture tends to favour the interests of the dominant Afrikaner. It has also been shown that the University has embraced certain aspects of transformation in terms of the *Innovation Generation* strategy. The influences of neoliberalism and market ideology have also been shown to be present at the institution. Regarding the conceptualisation of social justice, it is evident that, owing to the dominance of conservative and liberal ideology and the influence of the market, the kind of social justice that is espoused by the university possesses more liberal tones than those of the radical left. It is clear that the institution has not completely shed its conservative outlook.