In 1953 the South African minister of native affairs, Hendrik Verwoerd, took the floor of Parliament in Cape Town to make the case for legislation restricting the quality of schools serving Africans. “Racial relations cannot improve if the wrong type of education is given to Natives,” he declared. “They cannot improve if the result of Native education is the creation of frustrated people who, as a result of the education they received, have expectations in life which circumstances in South Africa do not allow to be fulfilled immediately.” The Afrikaner-dominated Parliament accepted Verwoerd’s arguments and approved the Bantu Education Act of 1953, which asserted government control of church-run schools and forbade African teachers from criticizing the government or school authorities.

Fast forward to May 10, 1994. In a dramatic ceremony witnessed by an estimated 1 billion television viewers around the world, an African, Nelson Mandela, stood outside the Union Buildings in Pretoria and took the oath of office as the first president of a democratic South Africa. Marking as it did the orderly transfer of political power from white to black control, Mandela’s inauguration was an extraordinary moment in modern history. In his address Mandela laid out a vision of a new South Africa that would “reinforce humanity’s belief in justice, strengthen its confidence in the nobility of the human soul and sustain all our hopes.

for a glorious life for all.”\(^2\) Significantly, the constitution of the new nation, adopted on an interim basis in 1993 and given final approval in 1996, guaranteed to South Africans of all races “the right to a basic education, including adult education.”

The contrast between the repressive educational vision of Verwoerd and the idealism of Mandela and the new constitution could not be more striking. The approach articulated by Verwoerd, who would go on to serve as prime minister from 1958 to 1966 and become a personal symbol of apartheid, was a cornerstone of the apartheid era, which started when the National Party took power in 1948 and lasted more than four decades. The social, economic, and political system of apartheid was self-consciously racist and unequal. Starting from the tradition of racial segregation present in South Africa throughout the colonial period, apartheid systematically expanded and enforced the privileges of white South Africans, who in 1993 accounted for less than 12 percent of the population, at the expense of the black majority. Under apartheid, white people enjoyed good education, ready employment, and, through racially exclusive democratic structures, a sense of control of their individual and collective destinies. In contrast, black people—a group that included Africans, coloureds, and Indians—lived in an essentially totalitarian and dehumanizing environment in which their every move was restricted, education and vocational opportunities were severely circumscribed, and they were reminded daily, in big ways and little, of their relative powerlessness.\(^3\)

The apartheid system began to crumble in the mid-1980s because of increasingly effective mass resistance within South Africa, economic circumstances, and international pressure, including the imposition of economic sanctions. In January 1994, after several years of protracted negotiations between the government and leaders of the black liberation movement, South African voters of all races went to the polls in the country’s first truly democratic elections. Thus began the ambitious task of transforming the rigid and inequitable political, economic, and social structures fashioned during the apartheid era into a democratic society offering South Africans of all races the opportunity to participate as citi-

---


\(^3\) In keeping with general practice, we use the term “black” to refer collectively to Africans, coloureds, and Indians. We discuss these groups later in the chapter and examine their origins in chapter 2.
zens, workers, and fulfilled individuals. Crucial to this task was major reform of the education system.

**Purpose of This Book**

During its more than four decades in power, the National Party relied heavily on the state education system to promote and sustain the values of apartheid and to keep the black population in check. Under apartheid, all aspects of education—governance, funding, professional training, and curriculum—were defined and operated along racial lines in an egregiously unequal manner.

The system was run by fifteen separate departments of education, some of which served African, coloured, Indian, or white students in the country’s urban areas; others served Africans in the homelands and self-governing territories. Schools for white students were funded generously, while those for black students were systematically denied adequate facilities, textbooks, and quality teachers. At the height of apartheid, per pupil spending in white schools was ten times that in the African schools. Even after a significant increase in spending on behalf of black students during the waning years of apartheid, spending on white students remained two and a half times that of African students in urban areas and three and a half that of African students in most of the homelands. Education was compulsory only for white students, and the education for blacks was designed to reflect the view, as Verwoerd put it in his 1953 address to Parliament, that blacks should not rise “above the level of certain forms of labour.”

Just as a racially delineated education system had been central to the maintenance of apartheid, a completely new education system that eliminated all vestiges of racial inequity would be essential for the creation and functioning of a democratic South Africa. The purpose of this book is to describe the country’s post-apartheid strategies for transforming its education system in the context of the nation’s history and to evaluate their success in promoting a more racially equitable system. We focus mainly on the school sector and examine policies related to governance, funding,
and curriculum. These strategies included the establishment of a single national department of education, efforts to equalize resources across provinces and schools, and the introduction of a new curriculum. In addition, we devote one chapter to the transformation of higher education.

Our focus on the racial dimension of educational equity reflects the country’s long history of racial segregation and inequity not only during the apartheid era but also in the colonial period that preceded it. To be sure, other dimensions of educational equity, most notably gender equity, are also of current policy concern in South Africa, but they are not the subject of this book. From a policy perspective, racial equity is the overriding issue, given the racial structure of South Africa’s education system during apartheid.

The most natural racial categories to employ for such analysis are the four used by the apartheid system—African, coloured, Indian, and white—and those are the ones appearing most frequently in this book. We understand, however, that not everyone is comfortable with these categories.7 Some would prefer to eschew all racial classification for fear their use, even by researchers, may lend legitimacy to racial labels that for many purposes are and should be irrelevant. Others would prefer an inclusive category for the three nonwhite groups. We agree that such a category can be useful and, consistent with common practice, adopt the term “blacks” to describe them. The term “whites” refers collectively to English and Afrikaners.

Terminology aside, it is important to remember that the four categories are socially constructed and thus are not meaningful in any fundamental sense. As we show in chapter 2, the various ethnic and racial groups are by no means culturally or politically homogeneous. Coloureds can be Muslims or Christians. Whites include both the Afrikaners of Dutch ancestry and the English—two groups that have very different cultural heritages and speak different languages. Africans come from a wide variety of geographic and tribal backgrounds and speak dozens of languages. The only reason that these entities became distinct racial groups was that the apartheid system treated them as such.8 But it is exactly the social construction of race that is relevant for

7. See, for example, the discussion of racial terminology in Vally and Dalamba (1999, sec. 2).
8. See chapters 2 and 3 for descriptions of efforts during apartheid to differentiate the groups into smaller ethnolinguistic groups by moving large numbers of Africans with similar tribal or other backgrounds into “homelands” and through language policies in the schools.
the analysis in this book. It is because the apartheid system classified South Africans into four distinct racial categories and used these distinctions to differentiate the rights and opportunities of various individuals and groups that the four categories are so relevant for our analysis of the extent to which the country has moved toward a more racially equitable system.

We undertake our evaluation with a sense of awe at the progress that South Africa has made, tempered by recognition that the country still has a long way to go to create a racially equitable education system consistent with the goals and values of its new democracy. Our research covers the period of the early 1990s through 2002. In that year South Africa was only eight years into its new democracy (or six years if one dates it from the final approval of the constitution). This is a very short period—much too short for a fundamental transformation of the system. Nonetheless, because much has been changed and much has been accomplished—and because South Africa is in a hurry to make things work—it is reasonable to take stock of the country’s progress at this time. The reader should be aware, however, that education reform is still very much a work in progress. Policy debates are ongoing over fundamental issues relating to school finance and the high cost of schooling to parents, school governance, the relationship of education and poverty, and the restructuring of tertiary education.

Racial Equity in Education

We evaluate South Africa’s reform strategies using three standards of racial equity: equal treatment, equal educational opportunity, and educational adequacy. These concepts come from a rich philosophical tradition as well as the international literature on education reform. Although South African policy documents and discussions do not always refer to equity in these specific terms, they provide a useful framework for analyzing the country’s progress toward a more racially equitable system.

**Equal Treatment**

Equal treatment, which can also be described as “race-blindness,” means that no one should be treated differently simply because of his or her race. A racially equitable education system would be one in which race played no explicit role in the decisions made by any of its officials.
Thus equal treatment would rule out racially discriminatory school admissions policies, and it would require that school funding formulas not make distinctions between schools on the basis of their learners’ race. Such an approach is generally consistent with philosopher John Rawls’s first principle of justice: namely, 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 a country such as South Africa, with its long history of discrimination against blacks, one can understand the appeal of race-blind treatment as an equity standard for education. The new constitution, adopted in interim form in 1993 and in final form in 1996, rests on principles of equality. According to its bill of rights, “Everyone is equal before the law and has the right to equal protection and benefit of the law.” Further, equality includes “the full and equal enjoyment of all rights and freedoms.” Basic education is explicitly included among those rights, and the adoption of race-blind policies in the delivery of education would send a clear signal that the racial differentiation that had been the centerpiece of the apartheid system and that had had such devastating consequences for blacks was no longer acceptable. At the societal level, race-blind policies would promote universal human dignity, one of the fundamental values mentioned in the first section of the constitution.

From other perspectives, however, this procedural principle may be deemed morally insufficient. When racial groups start out on an uneven playing field, as they certainly did in South Africa in 1994, equal treatment does not, in and of itself, go far enough. Hampered by decades of underinvestment in school facilities and in the quality of teachers serving black students, uniform funding formulas for current operating spending will not provide the same educational opportunity to black students as to white students. Even if admissions policies no longer

9. South Africans use the terms “learners” and “educators” to refer, respectively, to students and to teachers and school administrators. We will use these terms interchangeably.
explicitly discriminate against students on the basis of their race, black students in South Africa may be differentially excluded from some schools because of the language they speak, their family’s poverty and inability to afford school fees, or prohibitive transportation costs. Thus equity defined as equal treatment, important though it may be for symbolic reasons in South Africa, would not move the country very far in terms of the other two standards.

Equal Educational Opportunity

Equal educational opportunity is a broader standard that expands the concept of equal treatment to include the potential for attainment. This concept of equity is consistent with Rawls’s second principle of justice, namely, that there should be “fair equality of opportunity” for social and economic advancement.\(^{15}\) This principle ensures not only that the possibility for such change exists, but also that all persons have a fair chance to attain it.

Given the historical disparities in educational investments by race in South Africa, this equity standard would require, at a minimum, that educational policies be “race aware.” Thus a uniform curriculum for all schools would be inequitable if educators in schools serving black students were less qualified to implement it effectively than were educators in white schools. More generally, this standard calls for some affirmative or positive action—or, in the parlance of South African policymakers, “redress”—to counter past educational disadvantage. Such an approach would seem to find support in the constitution, which specifically states that “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.”\(^{16}\)

To this end, policies might explicitly target schools or universities on the basis of their racial composition under apartheid. For example, capital funds could be provided for historically impoverished schools in the former homelands, or differentially high funding could be directed to historically black universities. Similar effects might be achieved without specifying racial criteria, perhaps by considering factors related to both race and educational disadvantage, such as poverty. The appeal of such an approach in South Africa is that it would not violate the standard of race-blindness.

\(^{15}\) Rawls (2001, p. 43).
\(^{16}\) South African Constitution, sec. 9 (2).
If defined narrowly as the opportunity to attend a particular school or to receive a certain quality of instruction, equal educational opportunity might be achievable in South Africa, albeit not without large additional expenditure and not within a short period of time. If interpreted more broadly, in the sense of a student’s life chances, this equity standard is far too demanding. It would require South African schools to offset all the family, individual, and societal problems that make it more difficult for black than for white students to succeed in school. As we describe in chapters 2 and 3, the racial disparities in family income and educational attainment bequeathed by colonialism and apartheid are huge. It would seem unreasonable to expect the education sector alone to address them. A variety of noneducation policy initiatives would also be needed.

In practice, the test for equal educational opportunity is not a matter of whether the system produces equal educational outcomes for students of all races, but whether it eliminates differences in the educational opportunities for students of different races, where opportunities are defined by the quality of the schooling received. Like equal treatment, equal educational opportunity is a distributional standard that judges equity by comparing the opportunities available to members of different groups. It disregards whether educational opportunities provide some threshold level of desirable outcomes. This limitation does not apply to the concept of educational adequacy.

**Educational Adequacy**

The criterion of adequacy shifts attention to educational outcomes and attention to the minimum acceptable—or adequate—level of education. As long as all schools are providing such an education, under this standard it would not be inequitable for some schools to surpass this level.

17. The philosopher Amy Gutmann highlights this criticism of equal opportunity as a prelude to the development of her democratic threshold principle of educational equity. Gutmann (1987, pp. 131–32).

18. Not only would it be costly and difficult, but it could also be undesirable in some situations. In the extreme, such an approach would inject the state education system so far into family matters related to the education of children that it could violate the liberal ideal of family autonomy. Gutmann (1987, p. 132).

19. This concept of educational adequacy forms the basis for many of the recent school finance cases in the United States. For a discussion of the concept as used in those cases and in associated legislation, see Ladd and Hansen (1999), Ladd, Chalk, and Hansen (1999), and Minorini and Sugarman (1999).
The challenge, of course, is to define the threshold level of adequate education. Here the central question becomes: adequate for what? One answer might lie in the Rawlsian concept of primary goods and the notion that every student should attain a minimum set of educational outcomes connected to his or her long-term life chances.\textsuperscript{20} Another might draw on philosopher Amy Gutmann’s concept of a democratic threshold. In her view, the primary role of education is to promote a democratic society, characterized by deliberative and collective decision-making, and hence the threshold is the level at which a person has the ability to participate effectively in the democratic process.\textsuperscript{21}

Combining these two views, we conceive of educational adequacy in the South African context as the education level needed for someone to participate fully in both the political and economic life of the country. Though by no means simple to measure in practice, adequacy so defined takes note of the fact that threshold levels are specific to a given institutional and political context. During apartheid, Africans were not represented in Parliament and, as Verwoerd emphasized in his 1953 speech to this body, were not expected to advance beyond the level of laborer. By this standard, the white rulers concluded that a low level of education for Africans was adequate. However, standards of adequacy are very different in the post-apartheid period. For one thing, all citizens are entitled to participate fully in the new democracy and are thus in need of the skills required for critical and independent thinking. Moreover, because the country’s economic vitality depends crucially on its ability to compete in the global knowledge-based economy, a typical worker must have a much higher level of education than in the past. Although the term “educational adequacy” is not normally used in South African discussion, the constitutional guarantee of a basic education is fully consistent with this notion of equity.

Though adequacy may be difficult to measure, educational outcomes declared acceptable for blacks in the past are clearly inadequate by today’s standards. Trends in outcome measures for historically disadvantaged racial groups could shed light on the progress South Africa is making in this regard. The trend in school inputs, such as school facilities and quality of teachers in the schools serving previously disadvantaged students, would provide further insight into the current situation.

\textsuperscript{20} Rawls (2001, pp. 57–61).
\textsuperscript{21} Gutmann (1997). See also the discussion in Ladd and Hanson (1999, pp. 102–06).
Of course, the adequacy of educational outcomes depends not only on the quantity, nature, and quality of the available resources (such as teachers and textbooks) but also on the efficiency with which those inputs are used and hence on organizational and other factors.

**Education Reform in Context**

Under South Africa’s new constitution, a person has an unqualified right to a basic education. By contrast, rights to other public services, such as health care and welfare, are linked to the availability of resources. This unconditional right to education in the constitution reflects in part the role that education played in sustaining the apartheid system as well as the importance of students and schools to the internal struggle against that system (see chapter 3). Emphasis on education reform also demonstrates the official commitment to securing basic rights for black students and lends legitimacy to the new government. In addition, a reformed education system would help the government carry out three of its primary social, political, and economic agendas: to meet the basic needs of all citizens, ensure that all citizens can participate fully in the political life of the country, and develop the human resources required to compete effectively in the global economy.

We write this book out of a conviction that education reform is a necessary element of South Africa’s transformation into a racially equitable society. That said, education reform has not been its sole concern. Because the apartheid system permeated so thoroughly all aspects of South African life, the new black-run government has faced the simultaneous challenges of forging national unity in Pretoria, mounting a completely new federal system with nine provinces, improving the quality of life for the vast majority of a population that had been systematically impoverished during the colonial and apartheid periods, and positioning the country for full participation in the global economy.

As a result, education has had to compete for resources and attention with these other reform priorities. At the same time, education clearly forms an integral part of these other agendas.

**The Social Agenda**

When the new government took office, it faced huge social problems. As of 1993, the poverty rate was between 35 and 55 percent, a strik-
ingly high rate considering that South Africa’s average income placed it among the world’s “upper-middle-income countries.” Its poor were disproportionately living in rural areas, comprised female-headed households, and were almost 95 percent African. Contributing to the high poverty rates were high rates of unemployment: as of 1998 overall unemployment surpassed 25 percent and jumped to 37.5 percent if those too discouraged to look for work were included. The comparable rates for Africans were 32 and 46 percent, respectively.

As of 1996, almost 40 percent of all households in South Africa had no access to running water, and a similar proportion had no electricity. Even as late as 1999, only 17 percent of African households had flush toilets in their homes. Other problems associated with poverty included family breakdown and migration in search of employment, malnutrition (particularly among children), and the growing devastation caused by HIV/AIDS. According to one estimate, South Africa already had 100,000 AIDS orphans in 1999, and the numbers were expected to grow exponentially. By 2000 one of nine South Africans was infected with the virus. Understandably, the new government had a vast array of urgent social issues on its agenda, ranging from the building of new housing, the extension of electricity, and the development of water policies to the provision of job training and dealing with the HIV/AIDS pandemic.

An improved education system can play an instrumental role in addressing such issues. As attested by economic and sociological research worldwide, educated persons, on average, tend to have higher earnings than persons with less education. Studies in South Africa confirm these patterns. A 1995 national household survey showed, for example, that mean monthly earnings of both African and white males aged thirty to forty-nine were highly positively correlated with years of schooling. The mean monthly earnings of African males who graduated from secondary school were more than twice as high as those of males who only completed primary school. Even the very low levels of skills imparted to African children appear to translate into higher wages when

25. Except where otherwise noted, the figures in the next two paragraphs are from the South African Institute of Race Relations (2001, pp. 37–41).
they enter the labor force. Moreover, education typically has a generational echo effect in that the children of more educated individuals, especially mothers, tend to be more educated than those with less well-educated parents.

Thus any long-term social strategy to improve the welfare of black South Africans will undoubtedly have to include a strategy for improving the quality of their education. The household survey data just cited also indicate that for any level of schooling, African prime-age males have much lower monthly earnings than white prime-age males and that a major contributor to the differential is far higher rates of unemployment among Africans. This observation highlights the fact that the ability of education policies to raise family income depends crucially on the country’s success in reducing the extremely high rates of unemployment, particularly among Africans.

**Political Participation**

The South African constitution emphasizes that all citizens should be able to participate fully in democracy. Because Africans had been given little real political power under apartheid, the new government needed not only to set up provincial legislatures, municipal governments, and other new structures that would enable participation, but also to ensure that all citizens, including Africans, have the knowledge, ability, and inclination to assume their new roles as active citizens.

After the 1994 election, significant energy was devoted to setting up such institutional structures, as we describe in chapter 4. The country established nine new provinces and set up a complex system of cooperative federalism designed to provide an appropriate balance between provincial and national input into the policymaking process. The provincial legislatures were empowered to make decisions about education, health, and welfare, and the entire system of municipal and local governments had to be restructured, a process that is only now under way.

Education, especially the curriculum, is important for the success of the new political structures. Since the substance of the curriculum imparts the knowledge and skills necessary for participation, it needed to be revised to reflect the new values that define South Africa: it required a nonauthoritarian tone and an emphasis on democratic delivery, critical thinking, and critical inquiry rather than the rote learning of the apartheid era. As we describe in chapter 8, the resultant new cur-

riculum also promoted democracy by giving individual teachers more responsibility to design their own curriculum.

**Economic Development**

After a long period of being shunned by much of the international economic community through sanctions and other means, South Africa emerged from the apartheid period wanting to participate as fully as possible in that community. Much has been written about the role of human capital in promoting economic development and growth, especially in the context of an increasingly global economy. Developing countries with ample human capital tend to be in a better position than those without to innovate or to adapt technology from other counties. In addition, a more educated population enables a country to adjust more readily to a world economic system increasingly characterized by rapid flows of international capital. Thus the demands of the global economy put further pressure on South Africa to improve its education system.

Compounding the challenge of improving the quality of education for the existing cohort of school age children was the reality that a large proportion of the adult population was poorly educated. Demands for adult education and training thus competed with demands for investments in the schooling sector. Further, the prediction of economists that more spending on education will increase the productivity of the work force and thereby promote economic development assumes that the formal sector of the economy in question is sufficiently dynamic to expand and thus to absorb additional semi-skilled or skilled workers. If the newly educated are the rural poor with little access to wage employment, however, economic development and greater employment are not assured. At a minimum, a country such as South Africa must combine education with other strategies for expanding the labor market. Even with a dynamic labor market, any benefits in the form of economic growth from investments in additional years of schooling are likely to take many years to emerge.

**The Relevance of South Africa's Experience**

South Africa’s national effort to build an equitable education system is, in and of itself, an inherently interesting and important story. In many


respects, it is also unique. No other country in modern times has experienced racial segregation and racial inequity in the extreme form known as apartheid. Thus the question arises whether the South African situation is qualitatively different from that of other countries or whether it is simply an extreme example of forces that exist elsewhere.

The South African experience with education reform is of interest to other countries precisely because of the magnitude of the apartheid-era disparities and the resulting need for bold policy strategies. Bold strategies facilitate the social scientist’s task of observing and analyzing inevitable tensions and trade-offs. Moreover, as in other areas of modern life, the urgent issues confronting educators today transcend national borders, as do possible solutions.

Indeed, the South African experience is relevant to other countries for a number of reasons:

—Educational equity is a topic of widespread political concern internationally. Post-apartheid school reform in South Africa serves as a natural experiment in which equity is a primary goal—a priority that stands in refreshing contrast to market-driven models that dominate so much of the educational discourse around the world.

—The distinction between race-blind policies and more interventionist policies designed to promote equality of educational opportunity by race is central to policy debates about racial equity in all countries. Seeing how this distinction plays out in terms of education reform in South Africa helps to clarify and inform the situation in other countries where the historical legacy may be less clear.

—South Africa’s efforts to promote equity are taking place in the context of a restrictive economic policy dictated in part by global pressures, international institutions, and international comparisons. This case study illustrates how global pressures can restrict the actions of a developing country. Moreover, because of those constraints, South Africa’s experience demonstrates the limits of what can be done without additional resources.

—Like many other countries, South Africa was forced to make difficult decisions about the relative roles of public and private resources in the funding of its schools. The path it chose—the use of school fees in public schools to keep parents from exiting to the private sector—is of potential interest to other countries.

—The South African experience illustrates the tension between the political need for quick results and the reality that education is a process
that plays itself out over time. Although one can understand the country’s preoccupation with the matriculation pass rate or with the rapid introduction of a new curriculum, for example, true progress toward racial equity requires attention to more fundamental aspects of the education system that may not generate returns for many years.

Our Analysis

Crucial to any analysis of education reform in the post-apartheid period is an understanding of South Africa’s history and of the role of education during apartheid. In chapter 2, we briefly review the country’s complicated colonial and apartheid history, particularly its racial dimensions. Readers who are familiar with South African history may want to skip this summary, but for others it provides essential background on the racial context of the post-apartheid period. Chapters 3 and 4 set the stage for the recent education reforms. In chapter 3, we describe the central role of education in supporting both the apartheid system and the struggle against it, and we spell out apartheid’s legacy for education. In chapter 4, we describe the educational aspirations of the African National Congress on the eve of the election and the major constraints facing the new government as it sought to attain them.

The heart of the book, chapters 5 to 9, presents our detailed analysis of efforts to reform the school sector. This analysis is based on information from government documents and articles, our interviews with policymakers and school principals during the first six months of 2002, and our examination of provincial, school, and teacher data. The data come from all nine of the country’s provinces and thus offer a picture of how the reforms played out throughout the country. Given that national education policies are implemented at the provincial level, however, it is useful to look below provincial averages to examine patterns across and within schools in particular provinces.

A major contribution of this study is our use of administrative data for two of the country’s nine provinces. The availability of a complete census of schools and teachers within the impoverished and predominantly rural Eastern Cape and the relatively wealthy and more urban Western Cape makes possible a rich and comprehensive analysis of the course of reforms in those two provinces. To be sure, every province has distinctive characteristics, and no two of them could ever fully represent all nine. At the same time, our detailed analysis of patterns within two
considerably different provinces represents an important tool for understanding what the national reforms meant for previously disadvantaged schools and students.

Chapter 10 evaluates the progress toward racial equity at the level of higher education. In chapter 11, we summarize why equity has been elusive in South African education, consider prospects for future progress, and offer insights for other countries based on South Africa’s experience.