

The dilemmas of student body diversity regarding social cohesion: A critical analysis of the student body diversity in post-1994 higher education transformation in South Africa

Joseph Pardon Hungwe

A Research Dissertation submitted to the School of Education, Faculty of Humanities in the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, in fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Education.

August 2013.

DECLARATION

I, Joseph Pardon Hungwe, declare that this dissertation is my own work, except where otherwise acknowledged. It has not been submitted before for any other degree or examination in any University.

Signed.....

Date.....

ABSTRACT

This dissertation analytically explores an alternative model of student body diversity that can facilitate social cohesion within the institutions of higher education in the post-1994 democratic South Africa. This exploration is done in the scope of higher education transformation that began at the end of the apartheid era. Within the broad agenda of transformation, there is a relationship between student body diversity and social cohesion. In the attempt to establish a model of student body diversity, the dilemmas that are associated with the process of social cohesion in higher education are examined.

There are many interpretations of the concept of transformation. However, in navigating towards a sustainable model of student body diversity regarding social cohesion, the focus of this dissertation is on the social transformation of higher education. Chapter three points out that social transformation can occur at two levels; the demographic or substantive. When emphasis is laid on the demographic level, then the process of social transformation is primarily concerned with the numerical composition of different races and language groups within an institution. On the other hand, substantive transformation aims at a change that occurs at the level of social norms, common values, practices and attitudes that are upheld by the students in their diverse races and language groups. The Universities of Johannesburg and Witwatersrand in their processes of socially transforming their institutions are discussed in this dissertation.

A critical analysis of the current framing of the student body diversity within post-1994 social transformation agenda provides an indication that that emphasis has been laid on demographic change. In this regard, social transformation is spelt out as an imperative that institutions must reflect the demographic realities of the broader society of South Africa (Department of Education, 1997). This in-depth exposition of the theme of student body diversity reveals that for social cohesion across race and language to be realized, there is a need to move beyond the demographic approach to social transformation. It is a movement towards establishing the substantive social norms, practices and common values that are necessary to build a new social order which has no racial and language discrimination. However, it is in this movement towards

the substantive level that political ideological dilemmas within institutions of higher education come to the fore.

Chapters five and six are an extensive discussion on the political ideological dilemmas that are associated with any movement towards the substantive transformation. The main question that informs these dilemmas is, do the common social values for social cohesion not mean the suppression of the individual values? The contest of these dilemmas is, therefore, between individual student and community as denoted by the institution. In this dissertation, these dilemmas are framed as political ideologies of comprehensive liberalism and political communitarianism. Comprehensive liberalism advances the thesis that individual students are independent in terms of their preferences to association. On the other hand, political communitarianism views an institution as a community where individual students are members. It is from the fact of membership that they have to tailor their values in accordance to the institution as a community. The merits and demerits in so far as they relate to social cohesion are discussed in this dissertation.

It is from the inadequacies of both comprehensive liberalism and political communitarianism that in this dissertation civic-republicanism is proposed as an alternative model of student body diversity. The argument for this model is that it gives a balance between the individual and the community values so that there is cooperation. Civic-republicanism advocates for an engaged student body diversity that actively participates in the social life of the institution. It does not impose the common good, but gives room to the student community to explore and establish binding norms. What should be recalled is that a new social order is an indispensable component of the post-1994 South Africa. In proposing a civic-republican model of student body diversity, this dissertation asserts that a new social order where the phenomenon of inter-group interaction is realized in the institutions of higher education. The summative conclusion is that it is only through civic-republicanism that social cohesion can be attained in institutions of higher education in South Africa.

DEDICATION

To my loving mother, who despite battling ill-health has taught me to hope that tomorrow is better than today, and to my father who showed me the goodness of working hard.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I offer gratitude to a number of people who made this dissertation a reality. I give thanks to my Supervisor Dr Joseph Divala for not only offering me academic assistance, but emotional support in several times when I felt despondent and could not see a way out.

I owe a lot to Danisa Khumalo who always went out of his way to stand by me in the journey of this dissertation. My *broer*, I do appreciate your companionship, encouragement and instilling in me the conviction that the sun will certainly rise one day. You never looked at your schedule when I needed you. Thank you.

To my good friends in the diaspora, Melekias Zulu and Regina “*mwana*” Mandikonza, I owe it to you. You never stopped believing in me, even in those times I had lost self-belief. I treasure our golden friendship.

To Dr Mabhena Mpofu, and Mr Jahwi who took time off your busy schedules to read my draft and offer me constructive academic feedback, I offer you my deep appreciation.

To Dr Bertin Zinsou, Peter Nkomazana, Fikile Dlamini, Raymond Codjo and Sam Ogunyemi I thank you for your appreciation and belief in the supremacy of education. Your support in this project is immeasurable.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
DEDICATION	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENT	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vii
CHAPTER ONE	1
ORIENTATION TO THE STUDY	1
1.0 Introduction	1
1.1 Student body diversity.....	1
1.2 Social cohesion.....	3
1.3 Student diversity as component of higher education transformation in South Africa	6
1.4 Background to the study.....	8
1.5 The restructuring of Higher Education.....	9
1.6 The formal policy prescription on student body diversity	10
1.7 The gap between policy intention and what transpires in higher education institutions.....	11
1.8 Problem statement	12
1.9 Justification for the study	14
1.10 The potential contribution of a substantive approach to social cohesion.....	17
1.11 Possible limitation of the substantial approach to student body diversity	18
1.13 Chapters outline.....	19

CHAPTER TWO	21
METHODOLOGY	21
2.0 Introduction	21
2.1 Relationship between critical realism and other philosophical methodologies of research	21
2.2 Methodological justification	22
2.3 Critical realism: Towards a definition.....	23
2.4 Major components of critical realism.....	25
2.4.1 The concept of stratified ontology.....	25
2.4.2 The concept of structure and mechanisms	27
2.4.3 The concept of knowledge.....	28
2.4.4 The concept of the social world.....	28
2.5 Critical realism in relation to student body diversity for social cohesion	29
2.6 Concluding remarks	32
CHAPTER THREE	33
SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION.....	33
3.0 Introduction	33
3.1 Transformation: Towards a definition.....	33
3.2 Social transformation in South Africa.....	34
3.3 New social order.....	35
3.3.1 New social order in South Africa	36
3.4 Higher education and social change.....	38
3.5 The Higher Education transformation imperatives	40
3.5. 1 Demographic transformation in South African Higher Education	41

3.5.2 The possible outcomes of demographic transformation	42
3.6 Substantive transformation.....	45
3.7 The recreation of social transformation	45
3.7.1 Transformation at the University of Johannesburg	46
3.7.2 Transformation at the University of Witwatersrand.....	48
3.8 Concluding remarks	49
 CHAPTER FOUR.....	 50
A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE STUDENT BODY DIVERSITY THEME	50
4.0 Introduction	50
4. 1 Rationale for student body diversity	50
4.2 From racial and language exclusion to demographic inclusion	53
4.3 From demographic inclusion to racial and language exclusion: An exposition of the inadequacies of student body diversity	56
4.4 Racial integration	58
4.5 Multilingualism	60
4.6 Rainbow institutions of Higher Education	62
4.7 Dilemmas of social cohesion in Higher Education.	63
4.7.1 Unitary institutional culture.....	63
4.7.2 Institutions of higher education as social formation sites or academic sites	66
4.7.3 Institutional capacity to enforce social cohesion norms	68
4.8 Concluding remarks	70

CHAPTER FIVE	71
COMPREHENSIVE LIBERALISM	71
5.0 Introduction	71
5.1 Interpretations of liberalism	71
5.2 Comprehensive liberalism.....	72
5.3 The key constituents of comprehensive liberalism	74
5.3. 1 Concept of individual liberty	74
5.3.2 Concept of individual good	76
5. 3.3 Concept of equality.....	76
5.3.4 Concept of the minimal role of the state.....	78
5.4 A critique of the constituents of comprehensive liberalism.....	78
5.5 Comprehensive liberal model of social transformation	79
5.6 Post-1994 South African comprehensive liberal higher education construction	81
5.7 Comprehensive liberalism in Higher Education institutions	84
5.8 The tension between comprehensive liberalism and social cohesion	86
5.9 Possibility of social cohesion within comprehensive liberal approach to social transformation	90
5.10 Concluding remarks	92
 CHAPTER SIX.....	 94
POLITICAL COMMUNITARIANISM.....	94
6.0 Introduction	94
6.1 Conceptions of communitarianism.....	94
6.2 The conception of the political community.....	95
6.3 Conception of the common good	97

6.4 The place of the individual in the community.....	101
6.5 Political obligation	103
6.6 Common good and the individual good	104
6.7 Common good in relation to social transformation in South Africa	105
6.8 Common good in Higher Education in South Africa	107
6.9 Criticism of the common good theory.....	109
6.10 Concluding remarks	112
 CHAPTER SEVEN	 114
TOWARDS CIVIC-REPUBLICAN STUDENT BODY DIVERSITY: CONCLUDING REMARKS AND SUGGESTIONS	 114
7.0 Introduction	114
7.1 Justification for civic-republican model.....	115
7.2 Republicanism.....	115
7.3 Civic-republicanism as a model for sustainable social cohesion in higher education: A deliberative process.	 116
7.3.2 Social cohesion education	118
7.3.3 How social cohesion education can resolve the dilemmas.....	119
7.3.4 Social cohesion offices	120
7.3.5 Orientation day: An opportunity for induction of civic values	121
7.4 Higher Education institutions as social values formation sites	122
7.5 The harnessing of the Rainbow concept in Higher Education.....	123
7.6 Civic-republicanism and social transformation in institutions of higher education.....	124
7.7 Final concluding remarks	125
BIBLIOGRAPHY	126

CHAPTER ONE

ORIENTATION TO THE STUDY

1.0 Introduction

This dissertation argues that the theme of student body diversity within the transformation of higher education in the post-1994 South Africa is inadequate to promote social cohesion within the institutions of higher education. This argument arises in the given context where the student body diversity is supposed to fit into the broader social transformation agenda of the new social order in South Africa. The key features of this new social order are spelt out clearly in the new constitution. While the constitutional mandate urges institutions to create and nurture a “non-racial, non-sexist, non-discriminatory society where all people recognize each other’s differences while at the same time live in peace and harmony”(Cross, 2004, p.395), current conceptions of student body diversity are very inadequate in fulfilling this mandate.

Furthermore, the inadequacies of student body diversity in the promotion of social cohesion are a result of framing this theme as an imperative of demographic reflection (Department of Education, 1997). However, any attempt to move beyond the demographic model of transformation towards substantive transformation, brings about the dilemmas that are centered on the individual against the common good. These dilemmas arise when institutions attempt to implement social cohesion within higher education.

1.1 Student body diversity

The creation of student body diversity is contained in the imperative of post-1994 transformation of higher education which dictates that, “the composition of the higher education system’s student body must overtime begin to reflect the demographic reality of the broader South African society” (Department of Education, 1997, p.2). It is from this imperative that higher education was made accessible to all students without regard to their race and language groups (Badat,

2002). This was a shift from a situation under apartheid where, Bunting notes that, “higher education institutions had to be designated for exclusive use by one of the four race groups: African, coloured, Indian and white” (Bunting, 2002, p.61). The designation of institutions of higher education according to race and language, meant that there were no opportunities for students from diverse race and language groups to mingle and share common social values.

The concept of diversity in this theme refers to racial and language groups’ composition of the student body in higher education, as the demographic reality of the society is constituted by different races. Such demographic reflection by the student body of the South African society is in this instance taken as meeting the requirements of the new social order. Engelbrecht, for example, argues that

A flourishing democracy involves the rights of all previously marginalized communities and individuals as full members of society and requires recognition and celebration of diversity, reflected in the attitudes of its citizens and in the nature of its institutions (Engelbrecht, 2006, p.254).

Though diversity in this context is also defined to include attitudes of citizens towards each other, it is the argument in this dissertation that the chances of a demographic model of transformation towards a change in attitudes to diversity seem minimal. The mere accommodation of diversity is not a sufficient condition for democratic construction of a society. In the new social order, the diversification of the racial and language group composition of the student body is presumed to impart tolerance and interaction across the racial and language barriers that were once pronounced in the apartheid era.

The transformation theme on student body diversity is framed in a manner that lays emphasis on the numerical racial and language group composition of the student body in higher education institutions. Bunting points out that “increasing participation in higher education was to overcome the legacy of fragmentation, inequality and inefficiency” (Bunting, 2002, p.153). While a demographic shift is necessary in the context of higher education transformation, this however, seem not to be enough to foster social cohesion.

The line of demographic emphasis is further manifested in the evaluation and assessment of student body diversity in higher education. This is given in terms of numerical increase in students of different races and languages in higher education institutions. Badat observes that,

“black, and in particular African, student enrolments also increased rapidly between 1993 and 2000. Compared to 40 percent in 1993, 60 percent of all students in universities and technikons in 2000 were African” (Badat, 2004, p.31). The demographic emphasis on student diversity is explicit when a term such as “headcount” is employed to denote the success or lack of, diversity in higher education in the post-1994 society. It is claimed that “by 1997, the headcount enrolment for university plus technikon sectors had reached a total of more than 600 000, an increase of nearly 52% over the total for 1990” (Bunting, 2002, p.155).

A cursory survey on literature that gave emphasis on demographic transformation is indicated in many different terms that express a satisfaction with a growth in numbers of black, Indians and coloured students in the formerly white only institutions of higher education. According to Bunting (2001) the increase was a revolution. Cloete (2001) sees the shift in numbers as the most remarkable in the world. The well-known South African academics in education like Cloete and Moja (2005) acknowledge it as dramatic change.

The concern of this dissertation to explore whether such remarkable developments and revolution that occurred at the level of social values could promote racial and language group interaction. This concern arises out of a context where there is an acknowledgment of the fact that values and perceptions that students bring along in the institutions of higher education may in some instances clash, thereby fuelling tensions (Moja, 20100). Bringing students of different races and language groups to study under one institution also implies bringing together different social values, perceptions and norms that students hold. It is in light of this that in this dissertation, student body diversity will be related to social cohesion. It is also with the background of the creation of the broader new social order that it will be argued that imperatives of transformation of higher education cannot be limited to the demographic ‘revolution’ that took place in the institutions of higher education.

1.2 Social cohesion

In this dissertation, social cohesion is the concern for inter-group (racial and language) interactions. It is for this reason that interactions across the racial and language barriers are

considered as critical elements of social cohesion. To this end, a definition of social cohesion that emphasizes groups-interactions is adopted. Accordingly,

The theory of social cohesion might be obtained by elaborating the causal mechanism in a group that links individuals' attitudes and behaviors with the group level conditions in which they are situated. Groups are cohesive when group-level conditions are producing positive membership attitude and behaviors and when group members' inter-personal interactions are operating to maintain these group conditions (Friedkin, 2004, p.410).

Taking into consideration that institutions of higher education were once separated on racial and language group, I observe that any form of transformation that neglects interactions is inadequate. The social objectives in institutions of higher education must therefore encourage social practices, values and norms that facilitate social cohesion.

This discussion on social cohesion in the context of diversity has as its objective the need to create social harmony that is based on non-discrimination along race and language. According to Praeg, the transformation of a fragmented society presupposes the existence of a collective will, but the creation of a collective will can only result from a process of transformation" (Praeg, 2011,p. 233). With this consideration, social cohesion cannot be separated from the phenomenon of student body diversity. It is in this regard, that social cohesion is an imperative of transformation. Social cohesion therefore becomes a critical part of this dissertation as I analyze if the student body diversity theme is adequate to facilitate this.

It should be noted in this dissertation that the endeavor to move beyond demographic transformation is substantiated by the need to look for and live by social common values. A distinction is therefore made between social values and any other values that students body diversity may have. For instance, students may share and live by a common value of achieving good academic qualifications. While acknowledging the importance of this, I am however concerned with whether the previously socially fragmented student body in their race and language diversity are able to interact which is considered a sign for social cohesion.

To strengthen the development of relating social cohesion to student body diversity, Woodrooffe asserts that "social cohesion is defined as an individual's autonomy to contribute to the common good across the boundaries of groups and organizations" (Woodrooffe, 2011, p.171). The

common good in the context of South Africa is the new social order. This entails a movement from the discriminatory social practices of the apartheid system of governance to a society that is tolerant of racial and language differences. In my view, such tolerance is indicated by interactions that go beyond racial and language barriers. It is the promotion of this common good that will ultimately lead to the creation of the new social order in the institutions of higher education. However, there are three critical components in this definition, namely the individual, autonomy and the common good. In depth analysis will be given to these components in the later part of this dissertation.

In order to address the legacy of legislated and systematized racial and language barriers in the institutions of higher education, the process of inter-group interactions is of paramount importance. The contention here is that when racial and language groups are able to mingle, then to some extent, a level of trust is built. It is this trust that will gradually remove prejudices and consequently build social cohesion. Through social cohesion, a sense of a participative student community is built and developed. In this regard, Stanley gives another dimension as he notes that, “social cohesion is defined as the willingness of members of a society to cooperate with each other in order to survive and prosper” (Stanley, 2006, p.232). Willingness in this definition affirms the concept of individual freedom to participate and hold the values that are shared by the community.

The policy evaluations for student body diversity that lay emphasis on demographic change as a significant indicator for transformation, have limited themselves to the individual student who is independent from the community. Analysis such as, steep upward trajectory in headcount (Bunting, 2004), rapid increase in student enrolment (Badat, 2004), remarkable improvement in equity (Cloete, 2004), point to individual student counting. While this format of assessing a policy is important, it neglects the concepts of social values and perceptions as foundations for a new social order. This negligence compromises social cohesion in the institutions of higher education as an imperative of the new social order.

The aspects of social values, practices and norms as critical constituents of the social cohesion bring to the fore the seemingly tension between individual and common good. The contention is that these aspects are indispensable within the process of creating a new social order in South Africa through higher education transformation. Social cohesion, therefore, involves social

inclusion, social relationships, shared citizenship, identity formation and social justice (Stanley, 2006). As this section has indicated, there is an affirmation of the individual and social values, and this is given due consideration in the new social order.

1.3 Student diversity as component of higher education transformation in South Africa

Under the apartheid system of governance, there were institutions of higher education exclusively for white, Indian, colored and black people (Sayed, 2001, Bunting 2002, Reddy 2004). Reddy observes that “the striking feature of higher education in South Africa is that its provision evolved and reproduced itself along racial and language lines, prompted in large measure by deliberate state policy” (Reddy, 2004, p.7). Language groups in this context refer to Sothos, Zulus, Vendas or Xhosa as having specific institutions of higher education. This system therefore did not allow mixed race and language composition in an institution.

The National Commission on Higher Education (1996), which was arguably the first effort towards transforming higher education in the post 1994 South Africa, advocated student body diversity, through ensuring access to a full spectrum of educational and learning opportunities to a wide range of the population, irrespective of race, color, gender and age (Department of Education, 1996). Similarly, the White Paper 3 of 1997 as a document for higher education transformation emphasizes student body diversity within the scope of higher education transformation. There is an imperative that, “successful policy must overcome a historically determined pattern of fragmentation, inequality and inefficiency. The policy must increase access for black, women, disabled and mature students into higher education” (Department of Education, 1997, p.1). What is of note is that both the National Commission on Higher Education report and the White paper as a policy document advocated for a single coordinated system of higher education.

Taking into account that the high diversity of the student body in terms of race and language needed to not only reflect the broader society in terms of demographics, but also common social principles, the transformation agenda propagated these binding common values. In this way, the new social order was premised on the social principles that intended to build socially cohesive

institutions. Accordingly, “evidence suggests that a common denominator of all the policy initiatives outlined above as their emphasis on the principles of non-racism, non-sexism, democracy, redress and a unitary system of higher education” (Department of Education, 2008, p.328). As the theme of student body diversity was inserted in transformation policies, it enabled the creation of multi-racial institutions of higher education in South Africa. This was a movement from racially homogeneous institutions under Apartheid to institutions that reflected the demographic reality of the South African society.

In view of the above, the relationship between student body diversity has been established. In the post-1994 South Africa, it is an anomaly when students continue to discriminate against each other on racial and language lines. It is further noted that “the question of how to make higher education more inclusive has been a central concern in South Africa post-Apartheid policy documents reflect an intention to embrace values such as democracy, openness and human rights approach to education” (Bozalek, Carolissen & Leibowitz, 2010, p.1024). It is these values that one would assume that transforming the student body into a diverse constituent would also entail transforming the practices, norms and values that not only rid fragmentation at a formal level, but also in substance.

In this dissertation, part of the argument relating student body diversity to social cohesion will be that higher education transformation is always located in a given social context. The social context of South Africa in the post-1994 dispensation is that all practices and norms that are discriminatory along race and language were to be abandoned. There is, therefore, a social role that higher education had to play within its institutions. I concur with Mapesela and Hay that, “higher education in the post-1994 South Africa had to serve the new social order” (Mapesela & Hay, 2005, p.171). While the literature shows ample evidence that emphasis was laid on the demographic racial composition of higher education institutes, as this was taken as a significant indicator of transformation, I propose that the deficiencies of this theme are located in conflicts of the concept of private good, as it is contained in liberal ideologies, and the common good, as in the communitarian construction of the new social order.

1.4 Background to the study

My adult life has been spent in the higher education sector. Having been formally trained in Zimbabwe, my initial experiences of higher education in South Africa were filled with hope of a renewed and transformed higher education experience. South Africa is known for coining the metaphor ‘Rainbow Nation’ to show the reality of diverse races and languages that make up the nation. My understanding of this ‘Rainbow Nation’ metaphor is that it could be realized as a result of social cohesion in terms of racial integration and multilingualism. This is essential given, the fact that higher education was divided along race and language during the apartheid era and that higher education acted as a vehicle for further polarizing society during the apartheid period. However my experience of what goes in the higher education institutions of South Africa made me wonder whether substantial transformation had really occurred. I came across many newspaper articles that painted a grim picture of racial discrimination and intolerance within the student body. For instance, in 2008 there were incidents of racism among the students at the University of Johannesburg. In the same year, I also saw on a South African Broadcasting Corporation news television bulletin how white students played a dehumanizing game on black workers at the Free- State University. Besides these incidents, in 2009, I used to make occasional visits to the University of Witwatersrand. What fascinated me was to realize that students as if it is by nature, always moved or sit in accordance to racial or language groups. This pattern of association could be seen both inside and outside the lecture halls. It is out of these circumstances that I began to develop an interest and an inquisitive mind to discover the underlying values and norm system that informs such incidents and the attitudes of continual discrimination in the post-1994 higher education institutions.

Despite the above seemingly discouraging observations, I have no doubt that higher education must play an indispensable role within a society in terms of recreating social values and holding society together. I agree with Singh (2001, p.11) that “the role of higher education in equalizing the life chances of talented individuals, irrespective of social origin or financial capacity, could be a powerful lever in the construction of a more just society”. Higher education can therefore be used to construct the new social order that is marked by non- discrimination and the promotion of the once-marginalized languages. As critical social institutions, I am of the conviction that beside economic benefits, higher education institutions have social obligations to fulfill. It is the

social obligation of institutions to inculcate social values that mitigate instances of racial and language discrimination in higher education.

I contend that in South Africa, social cohesion in the institutions of higher education is an imperative that transformation sought to promote. In view of the above notation, it is crucial to note that 1994 presented an opportunity to bring to an end all social practices that sustained apartheid system of governance (Mapesela & Hay, 2005). This is the context in which many social policies were put in place by the incumbent democratic government. It is obvious that one key area that needed attention in higher education was the diversification of the student body within institutions of higher education (Woodrooffe, 2011; Akoojee & Nkomo, 2007).

In the sub-sections that follow, I begin to map out some of the critical issues that are assumed as going along with the transformation of the higher education as I continue to provide an orientation to this dissertation. But given the special interest I have on student body diversity for social cohesion, I confine my discussion to such issues as the restructuring process, transformation imperatives, and policy prescriptions as well as the gap between policy intentions and what really transpires in institutions of higher education.

1.5 The restructuring of Higher Education

In 1996, the National Commission on Higher Education (NCHE) was instituted with the primary objective of advising the Minister of Higher Education on the restructuring of the higher education sector (Reddy, 2011; Badat, 2004). The final work of this commission culminated in the production of the ‘roadmap’ of higher education transformation that is referred to as the White Paper 3 of 1997. From the onset, one can notice that this commission acknowledged and appreciated the diversity within South African society. Among other things, this commission emphasizes “the importance of developing an individual’s intellect, abilities and aptitudes, regardless of race, gender, age or other forms of difference” (Schneider, 2005, p.102). Schneider’s thinking is in line with the NCHE, which notes that higher education institutions should avoid social practices that replicate the apartheid system of racial and language discrimination. While acknowledging the crucial contribution that higher education has made towards the realization of the desired social order in the post-1994 period, I am of the opinion

that the process of social cohesion within the diverse student body still needs to be attended to (Department of Education, 2008).

The structuring of higher education under the apartheid system was not only physical segregation of different races and language groups, but it did create a sense of white superiority, while other races were regarded as inferior. Fragmentation occurred therefore, not only at that physical infrastructural level but also at social value and perceptions. The argument in this dissertation is that what is urgent within the diverse student body in the contemporary higher education is the process of inculcating social values that promote social cohesion within higher education institutions.

1.6 The formal policy prescription on student body diversity

As indicated above, one of the major proposals contained in the 1997 White Paper on Higher Education Transformation is that through transformation, higher education institutions should reflect changes that are taking place in society as a result of the movement to a democratic order. The vibrancy of every democratic social system is judged on how well such a system manages to harness diversity. It can be argued that what is important is that the (racial and language) composition of the higher education system's student body must over time begin to reflect the demographic reality of the broader South African society (Department of Education, 1997). However, the imperative to diversify the student body, taking into account the fact that the broader South African society is indeed diverse in terms of racial composition has necessarily meant that one of the features of the envisaged society would be a broadened social base of the higher education system. This social base can of course be considered in terms of race, class, gender, age and physical ability (Mapesela & Hay, 2005, p.116). Even though Mapesela and Hay's description of diversity is broad, I argue that the realization of a transformed higher education system in South Africa needs to go beyond formal demographic diversity.

If the “higher education system must be transformed to redress past inequities, to serve a new social order and to meet pressing national needs and to respond to new realities and opportunities” (Department of Education, 1997, p. 1), then particular and substantive understandings of social cohesion need to be explored. These understandings would cement the

argument that if efforts to address the past inequities are to become meaningful, higher education institutional practices that operate by exclusively focusing on demographic racial lines cannot be sustained; neither can this focus be a necessary condition for the creation of the new social order. This position does not imply that transformation is going to be linear. This position is further explained in the chapter that deals with social transformation.

1.7 The gap between policy intention and what transpires in higher education institutions

Seemingly the institutions of higher education derive their institutional policies on non-discrimination, diversity and tolerance in order to build a new social order. The issue of social cohesion in the higher education sector is not merely an intellectual exercise. It is one of the social problems confronting higher education in South Africa today. For instance, a racial incident at the University of Free State in 2008 necessitated a special ministerial committee to investigate the extent of social cohesion within higher education institutions (Pattman, 2010, Soudien, 2010). While concerns had been raised about “the slow pace of transformation, major public contestations on multiple campuses, and private communications addressed to state officials from parents, students, workers and staff on campuses, all these added weight to the necessity for an informed investigation of campus residences, learning and working life” (Lewis, 2010, p.127). The incident in question raised the issue of social cohesion given the constitutional mandate towards a diversified student body community in the higher education institutions as raised above.

The gap between policy intentions and what transpires in the institutions of higher education is demonstrated by the above incidences. An example is that policy intentions are that social practices should be in line with the new social order, yet racial and language discriminations continue. Despite that many institutions of higher education have policies on non-discrimination; there are frequent cases of racial and language tensions. It is even claimed that students in higher education ‘by-pass’ each other, meaning that they hardly associate with those who are not from their racial or language group. An investigation into racism and discrimination in higher education institutions found that there social practices that are discriminatory are still prevalent and are among the issues which the department of Education had slated for discussion at a

summit by higher education stakeholders in 2010 (Department of Education, 2010). This Ministerial Committee's findings came fourteen years after National Commission on Higher Education (1996) and White Paper 3 (1997) documents recommended student body diversity in the institutions of higher education. The question that one may still ask is, therefore, is there any alternative model of student body that can facilitate meaningful social cohesion in the institutions of higher education?

1.8 Problem statement

The problem that this study seeks to address is that the current framing of student body diversity in terms of demographic reflection (Department of Education, 1996) is not sufficient to promote the social cohesion as a basic tenet of the new social order in South Africa. In this regard, the idea of social cohesion through the management of student body diversity becomes inadequate for the promotion of the required values, norms and ideologies that would eventually facilitate intended social cohesion in the institutions of higher education. In order to clarify this point, I agree with Soudien (2010) who notes that transformation can be either structural or ideological. Soudien notes that the first “relates to how the system is ordered sociologically, and particularly the relationship of the subjects within it. The second is the domain of ideology, that is, the beliefs and assumptions that define and articulate understandings of what the nature of the problem and its solutions are” (Soudien, 2010, p.883). In order to understand the insufficiency in current approaches to student body diversity, one would have to come to grips with both the structural and ideological levels that constitute the problem.

On the structural level, the emphasis on student diversity is laid upon the numerical racial composition of the student body. Specifically, one notes that “the composition of the higher education system's student body must over time begin to reflect the demographic reality of the broader South African society; that the participation rates of African, colored and women students in higher education must increase” (Department of Education, 1997, p.2). I argue that transformation at this level is only interpreted in terms of racial numerical composition of higher education institutions. Numerical composition means the numbers of different races and language groups that constitute institutions of higher education. Within the transformation of higher education, this is referred to as the demographic reflection of the broader society.

The second level of this theme is ideological. The ideological level of the student diversification theme facilitates the sharing of life forms within the student body. It is the level of ideologies, beliefs, values and assumptions that the students hold, both as individuals and as a group. In further exploring this notion, it is important for us to note what Woodrooffe says. Woodrooffe argues that:

Within the context of South Africa's diverse population, education can provide a common experience in hopes of creating a society with a common bond, mold desired behavior of future citizens, teach tolerance, which can foster a society in which people do not consider each other to be cultural 'strangers' and establish a consensus on social contracts, which is essential in establishing a foundation upon which efforts to advance social cohesion can be accomplished (Woodrooffe, 2011, p.175).

Taking into account the above understanding, it becomes critical that the student body diversity theme mandates institutions of higher education to go beyond a mere reflection of the demographic realities of South Africa. Transformation has to therefore go beyond mere demographic reflection; towards the level of social values and norms that student body could uphold and live by. For instance, how does a value of non-discrimination in any form, get addressed by a theme that emphasizes demographic transformation? The policy on student diversification appears to have assumed that by merely bringing students of different races and ethnic groups to study at one university, increase in social interaction across race, gender and ethnic boundaries will consequently take place (Reddy, 2004). This is why I argue that the demographic change approach is problematic in the creation of the new social order through social cohesion.

It is the objective of this study to point out the inadequacies of a demographic approach to student body diversity. There is a need to incorporate complimentary social values, norms and practices that challenge the attitudes of the past and create a non-discriminatory social order. This can be implemented by cultivating appropriate social values with the help of social cohesion offices within institutions. Like the model of international offices in some universities that have international students, social cohesion offices will address issues of discrimination as well as monitoring salient forms of discrimination. These offices necessarily have to give compulsory accredited seminars on diversity issues, imparting social values that encourage social cohesion.

Besides these seminars, these offices can also be mandated to coordinate, and implement the institutional missions and visions on social cohesion. Social cohesion offices can be further mandated to run ongoing orientation programmes for all students emphasizing on “an increased awareness of diversity and what students have in common despite their differences” (Strydom and Mentz, 2008, p.1089). The idea here is to address transformation both at an ideological level and at a practical level.

1.9 Justification for the study

The main justification for this study is that there is a need to establish a model of student body diversity that facilitates social cohesion in the institutions of higher education. In this justification therefore, social practices and norms that perpetuate racial and language discrimination should be curtailed. There is need to explore enabling complimentary values and ideologies that are capable of facilitating new social order in the process of the transformation of higher education in the post-1994 South Africa. Furthermore in this study, I argue that the substantial complimentary social values transformation model brings dilemmas in the attempt to realize social cohesion in the institutions of higher education.

I argue that higher education is a vantage point for social cohesion. This is because institutions of higher education are bound to have a more racially and language diverse student body as compared to the lower educational institutions as they do not fall under the zoning principles of student enrollment in South Africa. On the other hand, in the lower educational institutions, like primary schools and secondary schools, zoning principles are the norm. Primary schools in Soweto are more likely to be populated by students from Soweto and Waterkloof schools by students who reside in Waterkloof. However, in higher education institutions all races converge at an institution that might not even be in the geographical location where some students are considered to reside. This in my view puts higher education institutions at strategic positions to initiate social cohesion in the form of multilingualism and racial integration.

A higher education system that has diverse yet unified racial and language groups is an important characteristic of the transformed education system as compared to the divisive education under apartheid. Commenting on the apartheid system of higher education, Jansen observes that “the

state maintained control in ways that were bureaucratically centralized, racially exclusive and politically authoritarian. This pattern was firmly established with the consolidation of white political power in the wake of the electoral victory of the National Party in 1948 on its platform of apartheid” (Jansen, 2001, p.13). As such, the higher education framework in the apartheid contributed to the construction of a racially fragmented society.

The higher educational policies in the apartheid period were framed at both structural and ideological levels. Structurally, universities were divided along racial lines. Ideologically, the old system ensured that social values had to be inculcated to sustain the system. This is why Reddy argues that the “ideological functions of educational policy under Apartheid were designed to fit with the Apartheid social arrangement of society; distributing educational resources unequally on the basis of “race”. This had the objective to “teach” subaltern youth that (inferior) otherness was natural” (Reddy, 2000, p.11). The categorization of the population implied that higher education had to be subdivided so as to cater for different people in their different contexts. One can also argue that “higher education system in Apartheid South Africa was the epitome of racial and ethnic exclusivity” (Wangenge-Ouma, 2010, p.482).

In recommending an alternative model of student body diversification that can enhance social cohesion, this dissertation acknowledges that “the system of higher education must be reshaped to serve a new social order, to meet pressing national needs and to respond to a context of new realities and opportunities” (Department of Education, 1996, p.1). The theme of student body diversity in the transformation agenda is inserted to dismantle both the structural and ideological underpinnings that sustained the apartheid system. In view of this understanding, Schneider (2005) argues;

Addressing societal diversity in university study and learning is a means not an end. The ends or goals are the dignity of full recognition for all peoples and more just connections among South Africa’s citizens. But the means and goals require enabling conditions for their achievements (Schneider, 2005, p.104).

This dissertation is important given the South African context where efforts through transformative policies have been put in place for a new social order. The transition from an apartheid fragmented society to a unified non-racial post-1994 South Africa requires that all policies are oriented towards this process. Pattman notes that “integration (should) not just be a

co-existence with others, but an engagement and friendship between students of different races” (Pattman, 2010, p.954). This research agenda is central to any investigation on race and student relations at universities. As such, an enquiry that seeks to discuss dilemmas that surround the intended goals of student body diversity as they relate to social cohesion also becomes critical.

While some people may argue that the core business of higher education lies in promoting the academic agenda in terms of training the citizens for the labour market and the political system (Bunting, 2002, Motala and Vally, 2003), it is virtually impossible to separate the idea that higher education institutions are also social formation sites. When institutions of higher education prioritize the understanding of higher education institutions as mere academic sites, this creates major dilemmas as such an approach fundamentally makes the institutions to focus on simple demographic change model. This may seem to take care of the constitutional mandate where values of the new constitution are embraced. However, I argue that the approach falls short of meaningful adherence to the same values that should be the critical components of a new social order. Separating the world of academia from the imperative of a university as a site for the creation of a better society with a new social order aggravates the dilemma.

Another dilemma that arises from the student body diversity for social cohesion is the mechanisms of institutions to implement social cohesion practices. The institution management can easily take action against students who fail to academically perform in their programs. For instance, an institution can deny graduation to a student who has not written an examination. However, enforcing social cohesion practices within institutions of higher education can bring in tensions between the primary obligations of institutional management as academic instructors or social values instructors? Academic instructors, this refers to a situation where institutional management limits itself to the business of imparting academic knowledge to the students. On the other hand, they can act as social instructors when they focus on social values, norms and principles that facilitate social cohesion.

Social cohesion is a concept that can have different meanings depending on the given context. In this dissertation, an attempt is made to discuss the common practices, values and norms that could promote social cohesion. In the context of a diverse student body, is it possible to come up with common social practices, values and norms that can enable social cohesion in the institutions of higher education? It can be questioned whether an adherence to common values

that necessitates social cohesion, is not an imposition on students? Can the institutional management give disciplinary measures against individual students who violate common values that are meant to promote social cohesion? In the South African liberal democratic dispensation, there is a dilemma of the balance between upholding the private and common good, in other words, the good of the individual student or good of the collective student body.

A discussion on comprehensive liberalism and political communitarianism political ideologies is made as an attempt to find alternative model of student body diversity. The individual and common good as general features of comprehensive liberalism and political communitarianism ideological approaches to student body diversity are employed to discuss alternative model for social cohesion. The common good of higher education cannot be limited only to racial and language group demographic composition of institutions of higher education. To this end there is an argument that “higher education’s mandate is to realize a system of education that is transformed and democratized in alignment with the values guarding human dignity, equality, human rights and freedom, non-racism and non-sexism, and one that ensures the right to basic education for all citizens” (Mapesela & Hay, 2009, p.12). While I do agree that these values ought to promote social cohesion in institutions of higher learning, I further propose that the values at stake should be reinforced to provide an alternative model that includes both demographic reflection and communal values within the student body. Similarly, Badat notes that “universities are meant to advance the public good and should be able to exemplify how their scientific and scholarly endeavors contribute to social equity and economic and social development and make a difference to the lives of people” (Badat, 2007, p.17). The contention is that student body diversity forms part of the process of realization of the new social order.

1.10 The potential contribution of a substantive approach to social cohesion

In concluding this orientation to the study, I here outline some of the potential contributions that the study being proposed is likely to make. The main frame of this work contributes to the social objectives of higher education, particularly by emphasizing a social values approach to student body diversity and transformation, where the building of a cohesive society through higher education goes beyond the numbers game. I have therefore endeavored to show in this chapter that is an orientation to the study that there is little effort put on how higher education can

contribute to the construction of the desired new social order. For instance, in the apartheid period, higher education was used to inculcate the social values that some races and languages were superior to others. In the new political dispensation, an education transformation that does not substantively address the social (racial and language) fragmentation of the past is in my view not helpful in the construction of the desired new social order. In so doing, I hope to unveil the potential of higher education in ensuring social stability in South Africa. In my view, if higher education puts more emphasis on skills training, information and technology and knowledge in general at the expense of building a socially cohesive society, then the supposedly correction of historical legacy will be derailed. This approach in re-imagining student body diversity, capable of creating and facilitating meaningful social cohesion in the South African higher education institutions, navigates towards a communitarian stand. The policies of higher education should be informed by social values and not only be concerned about the economic benefits of education to the individual and society. It should be the task of the Department of Education to come up with social practices, norms and principles that address racial integration and multilingualism so as to build a new social order.

1.11 Possible limitation of the substantial approach to student body diversity

This dissertation is a critical analysis of relating the student body diversity to social cohesion and as such there are possible limitations that arise. Firstly, a study that explores a substantial approach to the student body diversity by employing a conceptual research methodology is limited taking into account that it can easily become a subjective reflection on the part of a researcher. The limitation I point out here is that a theoretical approach to a lived-out experience like social cohesion and student body diversity may give a partial reflection of the whole picture of how inter-group interactions are occurring in the institutions of higher education. A subjective interpretation that emanates from this study comes about because experiences were interpreted from the researcher's point of view.

The second limitation concerns the model of transformation that I am advancing in this study. I am advancing a substantial approach whereby there are recommended social values, norms and practices that have to be inculcated into the student body so that what is transformed is not only numerical composition but substantial norms and values composition. This model is limited by

the very context of diversity that it intends to operate in. Students in their diverse races and languages have their own social values that may not necessarily be discriminatory in intention, but can still maintain the status quo of non-interactions. For instance students may prefer to socialize with people of their own language because there are comfortable and conversant in that language. This may be done therefore purely on the grounds of fluency in a language and not that someone does not like to interact with other language group on discrimination practices. Consequently the limitations are in the identification of the discrimination practices that this approach intends to curb.

1.13 Chapters outline

This chapter has given an orientation to the study. The student body diversity is understood in this chapter as relating to social cohesion. I have pointed out that the problem is that the current framework of student body in terms of demographic reflection is inadequate to facilitate inter-group interactions across the barriers of race and language. This chapter has highlighted the fact that I am not necessarily against demographic transformation, but I am advocating for complimentary substantial values. It has also been discussed in this chapter that there are dilemmas that are confronted in the quest for social cohesion in the institution of higher education.

Chapter two is a discussion on the methodological framework of this dissertation. This dissertation is in philosophy of education, and it is primarily for that reason that I have chosen philosophical analysis as a method of research. Specifically, the analysis uses the methodology of Critical Realism. Chapter Two therefore discusses Critical Realism as a methodology that enables a critical reflection on the main issues that pertain to student body diversity. Critical realism advances the notion that ‘being’ is stratified on three levels. There is the empirical, real and actual. This methodology assumes that there are underlying structures and mechanisms that possess the generative power to influence or determine the course of events in the actual world. It is in taking into account this view, that critical realism is employed since my assumption is that there could be salient underlying social norms that can explain some events of language or racial discrimination within the higher education sector. The main components of critical realism are also discussed in this chapter in relation to student diversity.

In chapter three, the discussion is around the concept of transformation as it relates to the phenomenon of student body diversity. I give a general description of transformation. After this, the discussion is narrowed to social transformation and this leads to higher education transformation in South Africa. I discuss the efforts to transform student body diversity in the Universities of Johannesburg and Witwatersrand.

Chapter four is a critical analysis of the current framing of the student body diversity in South Africa. I give brief chronological developments of the student body diversity. This historical background will eventually locate the problem and also show why it is an imperative of transformation.

In Chapter five the dissertation focusses on the first dilemma that is encountered in the social cohesion process. The concepts of common good, the concept of the community and the place of the individual in the community are discussed in this chapter. The theoretical incoherence of political communitarianism is given attention so as to sift that which can be matched with student body diversity that relates to social cohesion.

Chapter six is an exposition of the second dilemma which is comprehensive liberalism. Firstly this chapter outlines the different interpretation that is associated with liberalism. The comprehensive liberalism is explored as a derivative of liberalism. The concepts of liberty, individual good and egalitarian liberalism are intensively debated as I look at their merits and demerits as this relates to higher education transformation.

Chapter seven is a conclusive part that focuses on the alternative model of student body diversity. The civic republican student body diversity is proposed as an effective model that can enhance and facilitate the social cohesion that implies inter-group interactions across race and language. The argument in proposing this model is that it promotes students who are active participants in the social order as the common good. Non-discrimination practices have to be lived out experiences; not in the number of policies and themes that institutions of higher education produce.

CHAPTER TWO

METHODOLOGY

2.0 Introduction

This dissertation employs a philosophical research methodology called critical realism. This methodology is attributed to the writings of the British Philosopher by the name Roy Bhaskar. This chapter is an in-depth analysis and discussion on critical realism as an applicable methodology of research. I have chosen the philosophical inquiry route, which critical realism offers, into the theme of student body diversity because my interest is in attempting to explore the possibility of social cohesion norms and values in the post-1994 socially transformed higher education. This philosophical inquiry is important for this dissertation because the dissertation analyses a policy from a thematic perspective. Philosophy enables one to question the beliefs, assumptions and values that underline a policy. Regarding this, Divala notes that “a philosophical method can be characterized as a method whereby a person begins to wonder about the accepted beliefs and their meanings” (Divala, 2008, p. 24). It is my opinion that critical realism is best suited for a dissertation that seeks to discuss the beliefs and meanings that are associated with a policy. In discussing critical realism, this chapter also gives attention to the important components of this methodology. In concluding this chapter, the last subsection discusses the relationship between critical realism and student body diversity in so far as it relates to social cohesion.

2.1 Relationship between critical realism and other philosophical methodologies of research

In order to appreciate the relevance of critical realism to the overall argument in this dissertation, it is of importance to locate critical realism within the scope of other philosophical methodologies. Critical realism differs from empiricism in the manner in which it perceives ontology (the study of being as such). For critical realism, being is mind-independent; it is an external reality that is independent of the observer (Siljander, 2011). On the other hand,

constructivist traditions assert that “our conceptual construction always determine what we actually observe; that we can never attain reality in its pure form” (Siljander, 2011, p. 494). This difference in perspective on ontology between critical realism and constructivist traditions is of paramount importance in research. Critical realism makes a point that “what is known in the world is not dependent on whether what we know is there in the world” (ibid). Knowledge for constructivism comes as a result of observation. It is out of this process of observation that generalizations of universal propositions to do with knowledge are made. The constructivist tradition rejects the assumption that there are present underlying structures which determine events. For instance, empiricism posits that knowledge is built through the gathering of empirical evidence (Steinmeitz, 1998).`

2.2 Methodological justification

This dissertation is anchored on the need to establish an alternative model of student body diversity that lays conducive conditions for social cohesion. In order to arrive at that desirable situation, there may be a need to interrogate and critique the current social practices and values that underpin student diversity in terms of race and language groups. It is in taking this into account, that an interrogative analysis that comes along with critical realism suits this dissertation (Ndofirepi and Shumba, 2012). As a result, my choice of this methodology of research is chiefly because my interest is in understanding how student body diversity can create social cohesion. To this end, critical realism will enable me question the beliefs, assumptions and values that underlie student body diversity as an imperative of higher education transformation in the post-1994 South Africa. The justification of applying this methodology in this dissertation is that as its starting point, critical realism seeks to attend to the basic question of “what the world must be like for things to be the way they are in life and not the other way round” (Mingers, 2000, p. 1262). A typical analysis of this would be for example, probing and wondering why instances of racial or language discrimination persists in the institutions of higher education despite all policies put in place in the post-1994 era.

This inquiry is also motivated by the fact that policies, despite their bureaucratic slant, do promote social values. Particularly in education, this promotion of social values is indispensable. Secondly, the question of social cohesion is intended to lay the ground for a new social order

within higher education institutions. In adopting critical realism as the lenses for this academic work, I want to understand not only the nature of this reality of student body diversity, but also to understand the underlying social practices and values that give rise to reality of student body diversity. Given the complex nature of student body diversity in South Africa, I am of the opinion that a better model of student body diversity that facilitates social cohesion may be achieved through a critical reflection. The overall argument in this dissertation is therefore, a critical reflection on the dilemmas that are associated with social cohesion in the institutions of higher education. Critical reflection that is an outcome of critical realism is vital in this dissertation.

2.3 Critical realism: Towards a definition

Critical realism as a methodology of research gives primacy to the “belief that there is a world existing independent from our knowledge of it” (Ferber, 2006, p.177). This defining character of critical realism brings ontology (the being as it exists) and epistemology (knowledge) as central features of critical realism. According to critical realism, the world exists objectively. In other words, it is independent from anything else. On the other hand, knowledge as one of the central feature denotes the understanding that our world does not depend on our knowledge of it. In employing critical realism, a researcher’s concern is to probe the underlying factors so as to give an explanation of events in the world. It is in this view, that there is a claim in critical realism that actual knowledge is therefore, acquired after taking into account that the world exists independent from our knowledge. It is this distinction between the world and knowledge that forms the fundamental character of critical realism.

In addition, critical realism asserts that;

The world is composed not only of events, states of affairs, experiences, impressions and discourses, but also of underlying structures, powers, tendencies that exists, whether or detected or known through experiences and or discourses (Patomaki and Wight, 2000, p.224).

According to this methodology what people experience or encounter stems from some underlying structures and tendencies (Zachariadias, Scott and Barret, 2010, Ferber, 2006). For

example, there could be tendencies that some students deliberately choose not to associate with those who may be speaking a different language to them. In this scope of research, discrimination could be an underlying structure in those instances. Critical realism affirms the generative mechanism that drives observable practices. An observable practice within institutions of higher education can for example, be situations where in most cases, students always walk or sit in class, in their respective racial groups. With this in mind, a critical realist is “primarily concerned with relations between people and structures” (Archer, 2010, p. 201). Given this, it becomes crucial to a critical realist to acknowledge such practices. According to Siljander (2011), these structures are essentially “external reality that is independent of the observer” (Siljander, 2011, p. 495). Structures are an indispensable notion within critical realism because they can be referred to in the instances where an explanation is sought to certain observable social practices. To illustrate this, one could attempt to discover underlying structures that may explain the reasons behind the success or failure of multilingualism in the institutions of higher education.

In summary, Jefferies (2011) seem to offer an all-encompassing definition of critical realism. He notes that;

Critical realism is a school of philosophy that is presented as a critical application of realism which produces a stratified understanding of the world dividing the real from the actual/ empirical and the structures and mechanisms which produces events or phenomena, from events (Jefferies, 2011, p.3).

These essential components of critical realism as suggested by Jefferies’s definition which are, the notion of the world and the underlying structures and mechanisms, are given due attention in the following subsection. However, what is of significance at this juncture, is that a researcher who employs this methodology seeks to offer a critique of not only that which is in the experienced domain, but also discuss the dormant underlying social values and norms that give rise to what is observed. In this way, critical realism offers the possibility of “unveiling” the hidden layers of events, practices and norms.

2.4 Major components of critical realism

Critical realism is constituted by four major components that have a bearing in this dissertation. These components are namely, the concept of stratified ontology (ontology is the study of being), concept of structures and mechanisms, concept of knowledge and concept of social world (Evenden, 2012; Siljander, 2011; Archer, 2010). The following subsections give a detailed discussion of these components.

2.4.1 The concept of stratified ontology

Critical realism as a research methodology distinguishes itself in the manner in which it conceives ontology. For the purpose of clarifying this concept, I use the word ontology interchangeably with the word ‘world’. Accordingly, ontology or world consists of three domains, namely the empirical, actual and the real. In this regard;

The empirical refers to that which can be observed things that happen and exists according to our immediate experience; the actual domain is that which transpires independent of the researcher or any other observer who might record it. The domain of the real includes the mechanisms that are productive of different events and other surface phenomena (Evenden, 2012, p, 184).

Accordingly, ontology or the world is stratified, consisting of three domains, namely the empirical, actual and the real. These domains may be related within an institution of higher education for instance, that may be composed of students from different races and language groups. The empirical is the observable experiences or that which is encountered through senses. In this regard, it is the researcher observing or encountering events and drawing up certain conclusions. There could be a debate as to whether conclusions drawn by the researcher are objective enough to be empirical. In response to the possibility of this debate, the empirical is usually referred to as the domain of immediate experiences (Zachariadis, Scott and Barret, 2010). Taking this into account, empirical domain is mainly that which the researcher experiences.

The domain of the actual is events or incidences that are caused by underlying mechanisms (Vass, 2007; Mingers, 2000; Lewis, 1996). Within an institution of higher education, there could be actual events where students come together to protests, demonstrate or march in solidarity

against discrimination. The actual is the domain of that which transpires independent of the researcher. Taking into account the example of students protests, this actual event does not occur because at the instigation of the researcher. It does not also occur because the researcher happens to be there, but actual events are occurring independent of the researcher. The last domain which is the real refers to the underlying mechanism responsible for what we encounter through observable experience. Possibly, the social values of non-discrimination are the underlying mechanisms that necessitated the students to hold a demonstration within an institution of higher education campus. However this domain cannot be observed. No one can observe a social value of non-discrimination in the example used in this paragraph.

In the scope of critical realism, it should be noted that there is a strong emphasis on the independence of the ontology. Evenden (2012) contends that critical realists have a commitment to ontology. To this end, “the world exists independently of what we think about it” (Evenden, 2012, p. 171). The commitment to the independence of the world is very important in critical realism. A researcher therefore offers a critique to something that he affirms to be separate from him or herself. Consequently, the independence of ontology has implications on knowledge. This point on implications of knowledge is further discussed in the section that deals with the concept of knowledge in this chapter.

The point that may be crucial to note in so far as the assertion of a stratified ontology or world is concerned is that it disputes empiricism (Archer, 2010). Mingers (2000) aptly sums up empiricism approach to research as he notes that it “refers to those philosophies that see science as explaining events that can be empirically observed” (Mingers, 2000, p. 1258). The employment of stratified ontology is consequently, designed to negate an approach that limits research to that which is observable. Stratification can be explained as an arrangement where the ordered ontology is hierarchical. Putting this explanation in other words, stratification according to critical realist is that there are levels that in the ultimate constitute reality. Appreciating these levels (usually referred to as domains in critical realism) may mean that a researcher cannot limit his or her research to the empirical as usually demanded within empirical research. The stratified world would imply that for research to be wholesome in approach, all domains have to be attended to. This therefore, means that the domain of the underlying generative mechanisms has to be acknowledged and given its due attention. Failure to do this may mean that the research

began and ended at the level of observable events. If one could put it bluntly, a medical doctor when dealing with a patient, he or she has to appreciate that treating symptoms without investigating the underlying causes may be a futile exercise.

2.4.2 The concept of structure and mechanisms

The concept of structure and mechanisms occupy a central place in the philosophical school of critical realism. The emphasis on structures and mechanisms is summed up by Mingers (2000) who argues that, “scientific reality is not just consistent conjunctions of observable events but objects, entities and structures that exists and generate the events we observe” (Mingers, 2000, p. 1260). According to this assumption, structures play an active role in the observable events. Their role is to produce events. To give a graphic example of structures and mechanism, one could take the geographical occurrence of a volcano. The smoke and hot muddy that are seen by people are caused by the underlying natural principles. While these natural principles may not be seen, it is their presence that would have given rise to a volcanic event. According to critical realism, structures and mechanisms testify that the world is ordered in a manner that everything cannot be reduced to events of experience (Lewis, 1996, 489). Structures are underlying factors that account for actual events that are observable in the public domain.

Relating structures to the subject matter of this dissertation, an example could be that an institution may experience events of racial violence. This may manifests itself in the form of students of different races engaging in harsh verbal confrontations fights within the institution. In this regard, there may be underlying structures like the values that these races may be holding against each other. Underlying mechanisms can be “triggered off” by some related cause and thereby push for an occurrence.

For Zachariadis, Scott and Barret (2010), structures and mechanisms are hidden distinctive features of objects. They are not tangible or observable. To this end, “objects have certain structures and powers that behave in particular ways and cause change” (Zachadriadis, Scott and Barret, 2010, p.6). This explanation of mechanisms brings out the assertion that structures do possess the potential to cause events. What is also important to note is that for critical realist, this power to cause is not only manifested through given “surface” events, but that it still remains

dormant even in the absence of any events. In view of this, mechanisms always possess potency to cause certain events. To give an illustration here, one can say that the absence of concrete incidences of racial or language confrontations within an institution of higher education is not a guarantee that salient social practices that can cause such incidences are not present.

2.4.3 The concept of knowledge

As already noted in the introductory part of this chapter, there is a close connection between the notion of the world (ontology) in its independence and knowledge. The premise within critical realism that denotes that the world is independent from the mind has permutations on how the knowledge is conceived in this theory. Knowledge is acquired through critical reflection (Jefferies, 2011).

To the extent that knowledge is independence from the world, critical realism posits that there is a possibility of fallibility. In this regard, Scott (2010) observes that “critical realism accepts neither the view that there are fixed philosophical first principles that guarantee epistemic certainty, nor the idea that first order activities are self-justifying” (Scott, 2010, p.41). According to critical realism, the knowledge that has been acquired through a process of research needs to be constantly exposed to critical reflection. There is an acknowledgement that humanity has on several times come to mistaken conclusions, pitfalls and misappropriated validations.

2.4.4 The concept of the social world

The concept of social world within critical realism is pertinent to this dissertation. For critical realists, the social world is real to the extent that it is occupied by individuals. Individuals enter into a social world in which they did not play a part in constructing (Shipway, 2011; Wikgren, 2004). This assertion is referred to as the preconstruction of the social world. The point that I consider to be of remarkable importance is that critical realism posits that despite the assumption that the social world is pre-constructed; individuals do have the power to change it thus eventually improving their circumstances and the discourse of their lives. In this regard, Ayers (2011) notes that “individuals must contend with the societal structures into which they are born, yet individuals have the capacity to act on and influence their world” (Ayers, 2011, p. 347). This

exposition of the concept of social world is of value since it brings out the suggestion that individuals are not simple victims of their circumstances but are capable through critical reflection to critique social structures and mechanisms. Critical realism therefore, advocates for social change. Individual can contribute towards making their societies better places. For instance, students who attempt to shun racial and language discrimination through social interactions with other race groups could contribute to a transformed community of the student body. Given this stance, employing critical realism becomes relevant given that the main subject matter in this dissertation is looking at student body diversity in its relationship to social cohesion within transformation. It is primarily for this reason that the following subsection discusses the possible application of critical realism to student body diversity.

2.5 Critical realism in relation to student body diversity for social cohesion

The notion of social transformation within higher education institutions is critical in South Africa (Fourier, 1999, Department of Education, 2008). When transformation is taken into account, it is my view that the application of critical realism to matters related to this may bring coherent analysis of policies and themes. Critical realism's general approach to research assumes that all the three components of the world have to undergo change. This is important for this dissertation given that the current model of student body diversity is possibly not attending to the underlying generative mechanisms of events. Given the assertion of generative mechanisms, critical realism may facilitate a critique of social values that are hindering social cohesion. To this end, in this subsection, I relate the components of critical realism as discussed in the above section to the subject matter of this dissertation.

The concept of social world within critical realism may facilitate a close relationship to the student body diversity. Social world with its underlying mechanisms has a general bearing to the institutional student body diversity. Shipway argues that "a major task for critical realist researchers in education is therefore one of untangling the intricacies of how wider social structures and mechanisms 'filter into educational organizations'" (Shipway, 2011, p. 161). Taking this into account, critical realism may assist in the discussion of diversity. The social world, in which students are born into, is a reconstructed reality. It has its own theories, metaphors, values and norms. Given this, there is a possibility that students come into

institutions with preconceived social misconceptions on other races and language groups. It is these misconceptions that could be exposed to critical reflection in an attempt to improve social interactions within the institutions of higher education. In applying the concept of social world, this dissertation explores the possibility of institutions of higher education acting as social formation sites. The main purpose in relating higher education institutions to social formation sites is to discover an alternative model of society that may facilitate social cohesion.

In view of a stratified ontology, the diversity of student body in terms of race and language groups as the empirical part of the concept of reality. The post-1994 transformation has resulted in this diversity to be a reality within the institutions of higher education in South Africa. Student body diversity is indeed an immediate experience. Secondly the actual refers to the reality that diversity within the student body means that there are social practices and values that are taking place. Finally, the real refers to the underlying factors that contribute to the social practices and values that are currently found in the institutions of higher education. Wilson and McCormack (2006) notes that “the real domain is comprised of the mechanisms used to lead to some kind of effect on social situation” (Wilson and McCormack, 2006, p. 47). These causal mechanisms occur in a given social context. For instance, in the context of diversity in terms of language and race groups, there could be salient practices that are specific to ways in which students relate with others from different groups. According to critical realism, it is the primary task of a researcher to relate the real to both empirical and actual. What this means in this dissertation is that I will seek to understand the underlying factors that result for instance, in the continual discrimination that may be going on in these institutions of higher education. In this regard, Wilkgen (2004) observes that “critical realism is a specific form of realists’ philosophical theory about the world, human agency and the interaction between these” (Wilkgen, 2004, p.13). It is through knowing this triangular form of the world that knowledge of it can be sought, researched and appreciated.

Generally, a qualitative researcher “brings a critical view to methodology, promoting social justice and engaging with systems of education by seeking to identify and address the problems within them (Watson and Watson, 2011, p. 631). As I have noted in the above section, the aim of a critical realist in doing research is to “uncover” the underlying structures. Lewis (1996) for instance, notes that the aim of a researcher is the “identification of mechanism, structures, powers and so on that produces the phenomena of experience” (Lewis, 1996, 489). Applying

this methodology to the student body diversity for social cohesion, in this dissertation I seek to propose an alternative model of student body diversity that facilitates the critical reflection of the underlying mechanisms that may be causing some of the events associated with racial and language intolerance. A critical reflection of these mechanisms is vital as Shipway notes, “underlying structures and mechanisms (in the domain of the real) constrain human action (in the domain of the actual) and produces beliefs and values in the domain of the empirical” (Shipway, 2011, p. 165). The task at hand here is to identify and explore the “new” mechanisms and structures that institutions of higher education can come up with in order to bring social cohesion.

One important area that critical realism gives attention to is how concepts are employed in a given context. The risk of not giving adequate attention to concepts is aptly summed by Elder-Vass (2007) who contends that “concepts are frequently pressed into service with loose contextual definitions; with no attempt to establish what their real referents are (Elder-Vass, 2007, p. 228). The theme of student body diversity is laden with concepts that in my view need to be exposed to critical reflection. For instance, social transformation, student body diversity, social cohesion and new social order are concepts that require critical reflection. As I have already alluded to in this chapter, the notion that a philosophical inquiry enables a person to wonder is in line with the attempt to analyze concepts. This methodology gives a critical reflection to the conventional understanding of concepts. Critical realists encourages that people think in alternative ways.

Having discussed critical realism in this chapter, I am aware that there are limitations in this methodological approach. The first notable limitation that is a critical realist approach has is that in the discussion of empirical, there is “thin line” between objectivism and subjectivism. In other words, when a researcher within the empirical domain encounters events, there is a possibility of drawing subjective conclusions and analysis. While other philosophical methodologies may offer possibilities of subjective construction of the world-view in research (Siljander, 2011), critical realism rejects such possibilities. The being is mind-independent. In my view the objectivity of the being is an implicit weakness of critical realism because it becomes rather difficult to access that which is objective.

Secondly critical realism asserts the underlying mechanisms and structures as the generative principles behind observable events. Whilst this assertion may facilitate a deeper and coherent research, however, the fact that these mechanisms are inaccessible or unobservable makes it challenging to apply them. This is because their “inaccessibility” can easily reduce them into conspiracies. I equally do find it to be contradictory in terms to say that something exists but I do not know it. In relation to the subject matter of this dissertation, how could I possibly discuss underlying social practices in the institutions of higher education that I do not know of? In my view the most pronounced weakness of critical realism is revolves on the quest for objectivity.

2.6 Concluding remarks

The discussion in this chapter on methodology, had given the indication that critical realism can be applied in the search for a better model of student body diversity. The primary objective of undertaking this dissertation is to analyze the possible social values that could facilitate social cohesion. In order to do this, the creation of multi-racial and multilingual institutions could be an opportunity to break the barriers around race and language that were created under the apartheid era. Critical realism offers the opportunity to look at the possible underlying barriers to social cohesion. However, as will be noted later in this dissertation, there are dilemmas that are encountered in the process of attempting social cohesion in order to realize the new social order. My understanding of a dilemma is a situation where there are two inherent conflicting alternatives, options or choices to make. In the context of student body diversity regarding social cohesion, such dilemmas arise because within a transformed higher education system, there are alternatives between making higher education institutions to be liberal in order to give academic needs necessary for job market or forming a cohesive social community in the institutions of higher education. These dilemmas include transformation for the new social order from higher education institutions as comprehensive liberal academic institutions or transformation from a political communitarian perspective that promote social objectives like the public good. The most important point to note is that critical realism may facilitate an alternative model of student body diversity. The following two chapters (chapter three and four) discuss these dilemmas as they relate to social cohesion that arises from the student body diversity in South African institutions of higher education.

CHAPTER THREE

SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

3.0 Introduction

The first chapter in this dissertation in giving an orientation to the study highlighted a relationship between student body diversity and social cohesion. In order to appreciate this critical relationship, this chapter discusses the concept of social transformation as it occurred in South Africa. The objective this discussion is to explore the concept of social transformation as it relates to student body diversity and social cohesion. The various theoretical understandings and interpretations of transformation are given attention since this has implications in this study. I discuss the two models of transformation, namely the demographic and substantial. In comparing and contrasting the demographic and substantial models of transformation, the ultimate objective is to find out manner in which an effective model of transformation for social cohesion can be established. I discuss the cases of Universities of Johannesburg and Witwatersrand in terms of their efforts to establish social cohesion within the diverse student body.

3.1 Transformation: Towards a definition

The objective of this subsection is to explore a definition that has crucial implications on the understanding and appreciation of debates on student body diversity and social cohesion. Literally, the word transformation is composed of two words, that is, trans- meaning across and formation- meaning form or shape of something. There is therefore, a movement from one state to the other. Nothing can be said to be transformed and yet remain in its previous form or shape. In this regard, transformation means a movement or change in the form, structure, shape or outlook of something.

Fourie defines transformation as, “usually a process by which form, shape and/ or nature of the institutions are completely altered” (Fourie, 1999, p. 277). It is critical to note that Fourie uses the word alteration to denote transformation. Alteration involves a superficial or “cosmetic” change that affect the form or nature of an institution so that the post-transformation is not the

same as the pre-transformation phase. In altering an institution results in minimal change that hardly touches the fundamentals.

While this dissertation might not be about active participants in politics, however the above definitions highlight three important constituents of transformation. Firstly according to these definitions, transformation involves movement. There is an abandoning of a situation in order to acquire the new place. Movement in this instance is not necessarily physical, but could be in the form of a shift in the value and norms system. Secondly transformation results in changes of patterns of interactions. This is relational level of transformation where change affects the modes of interactions, to the extent that in places where members used not interact, they are now able to. Thirdly, I must point out that the process of transformation is not always linear in the sense of always moving towards the desired objectives. It could happen that some situations or societies undergone transformation that brings about negative or undesired outcomes. However what should be noted is that the effects of the process of transformation bring about change. In conclusion, it would therefore, appear that a definition of transformation involves the above three mentioned constituents.

3.2 Social transformation in South Africa

Given the possible transformation as discussed in the above subsection, social transformation would imply an occurrence of a radical change in the society. Social transformation means that the fundamental social values, norms and ultimately people's perceptions undergo a deep change (Castle, 2001). This change results in new social practices, values and norms. Social transformation is, therefore, a radical shift in terms of how the society perceives itself and how members interact with one another. In line with this, the incumbent government under a new democratic dispensation had to create a new society where integration of races and language groups was initiated. Nieto observes that "in South Africa, integrating an immense population that was legally excluded from the full benefits of citizenship looms much larger" (Nieto, 2009, p.19). The creation of the new society implied social cohesion that involves bringing together the different racial and language groups that had been separated under Apartheid.

The preceding paragraph makes it possible to insert higher education transformation in the broader social transformation context. There are observations that, “educational transformation must be seen as strictly connected to social change, and education must be understood as a process that facilitates and supports social growth and development” (Striano, 2009, p.379). The themes that are contained in the transformation agenda of higher education are arguably designed to the realization of the new social order as the final outcome. It is, therefore, in the context of social transformation that student body diversity is discussed in this dissertation.

The critical point here is, given the historical context of racial and language division in the apartheid era, student body diversity is an attempt towards the inter-group relations of different races and language groups of students in the higher education. In this regard, I suggest two levels of transformation, namely the demographic and substantial. These two levels are given due attention in subsections 3.5.1 and 3.6 respectively of this chapter on social transformation.

Taking into account social transformation in South Africa, it is vital to note that the objectives of transformation are normally dictated by circumstances and needs of the society. In accordance with this, the South African objectives of transformation are framed as “transition from apartheid and minority rule to democracy requires that all existing practices, institutions and values are viewed anew and rethought in terms of their fitness to the new era” (Department of Education, 1997, p. 7). The circumstances that necessitate transformation in this context are that there were social practices and institutions that by their segregative objectives, needed to be changed so that they fit in the new social order. For instance, racial discrimination as a social practice of the apartheid era needed to be eradicated, since in the social new order, non-discrimination was introduced as the accepted social value. Accordingly higher education was transformed so that it also serves the social objectives of the new social order (Department of Education, 1997). From my perspective, social transformation of higher education in South Africa can be evaluated in as far as it conforms to the overall social values and norms of the new social order.

3.3 New social order

Since social transformation suggests a movement from one order to the other, the outcome of this process is a possible new social order. The basic component of the new social order is the

emergence of new social practices, values and norms. Furthermore, new social practices that are associated with the new social order require commitment, compliance and a sense that they are of relevance to collective members of the society.

The precept of collectivity is of significance in the sustenance of the social order. To this end, Irwin, Mcgrimmon and Simpson argue that, “social order is possible only to the extent that individuals make collectively oriented versus individually oriented choices when they are in conflict” (Irwin, Mcgrimmon and Simpson, 2008, p. 380). What is pointed out is that individuals as part of their commitment to the norms and values of social order; are consistently required to submit their individual preferences to the collective. Irwin, Mcgrimmon further state that the “social order is fundamentally about cooperation” (ibid). The cooperation by individuals could mean that ultimately all members become the active custodians of the common social values that sustain the new social order.

From the above discussion on the new social order, it would appear that a transformed social order consists of rearranging the critical components of society. Such critical components involve social practices and norms. In this dissertation such rearranging that involves transformation, comprises of two levels. There is a level of demographic and substantial transformation. Though these two levels would be given due attention in the following subsection of this dissertation, it is worth to note that my argument is that when a situation arises where they are separated, then the chances of realizing of the new social order are minimal.

3.3.1 New social order in South Africa

The new social order presumably begun with the new constitution of 1996 that marked a radical transformation of society from apartheid to a supposedly liberal democratic society. Cross aptly describes the new social order as he notes that, “the broad aim of the constitution is to create and nurture a non-racial, non-sexist, non-discriminatory society where all people can recognize each other’s differences while at the same time live in peace and harmony” (Cross, 2004, p.395). In this regard, what Cross describes here are characteristics of the new social order that clearly distinguishes it from the apartheid order.

The ideal construction of the new social order was instituted through transformative policies in economic, social, political and cultural facets of South Africa (Mapesela and Hay, 2005). This dissertation locates this critical analysis in higher education transformation for the new social order. Policies that seek transformation were designed to realize a cohesive society, as opposed to the racially and language fragmented system of higher education under apartheid. In pointing out the deficiencies that were apparent in the apartheid higher education, it is noted that;

There has been a tendency for higher education institutions to replicate the ethnic, racial and gender divisions of the wider society. This has limited the role of higher education in constructing a critical civil society with a culture of tolerance, public debate and accommodation of differences and competing interests (Department of Education, 1996, p. 2).

The new social arrangement in higher education dictated that racially and language exclusive institutions abolished for multi-racial and multi-lingual institutions as a reflection of the broader social change. Post-apartheid era, therefore, saw races and language groups sharing the physical space of institutions of higher education.

Within the new social order, higher education would appear transformed in line with social purposes that are compatible changes that occurred in the society. Such changes through transformative policies like the White Paper 3 of 1997 were designed to align higher education so as to fit into the new social order. The educational transition is affirmed in the White Paper 3 of 1997 that notes;

South Africa's transition from apartheid and minority rule requires that existing practices and values are viewed anew and rethought of their fitness for the new era. In South Africa today, the challenge is to redress past inequalities and to transform the higher education system to serve the new social order, to meet pressing needs, and to respond to new realities and opportunities (Department of Education, 1997, p.2).

As noted earlier, a change in social practices and values is the necessary condition for the creation of an ideal new social order. Mickelson, Arlin and Nkomo, 2011 argue that the creation of the ideal post-1994 social order implied the destruction of white supremacy and ethnic separation in the public institutions. This is the context in which higher education transformation occurs in South Africa. Furthermore, "transformation requires that the ethos that prevailed at

higher education institutions in the past needs to be replaced with a new democratic culture directed at actively undoing race-based separation” (Akoojee & Nkomo, 2007, p.390).

In most cases, higher education transformation cannot be separated from social transformation. Taking this into account, the democratic government sought to create a new society through transformative policies. Woodrooffe notes that “post-apartheid social reform was specifically aimed at deconstructing the established social order in an effort to promote a new racially and ethnically neutral South Africa” (Woodrooffe, 2011, p.171). The implication is that transformation policies can be adequately assessed and be valued to serve the demands of the new social order. There is also an argument that higher education can be instrumental and contributes to the advancement of objectives and values of the democratic dispensation (Jonathan, 1997).

Evidently, higher education transformation is part of the process of establishing the new social order. This subsection has indicated that it is through social practices and values that societies are changed and transformed. The implication is that if there are practices that contradict the critical constituents of a new social order, then it can be claimed that transformation has been inadequate. The primary concern of this dissertation is a discovery on how the student body in the institutions of higher education can effectively embrace the social values and principles of the new social order. In other words, the objective here is to explore how the new social order of non-racism and non-discrimination on the basis of language can be realized. Given the fact that there was racial and language fragmentation in apartheid, it becomes imperative that the social values that promote the new social order become a reality. The framework of my argument here is that apartheid had its own social values that manifested themselves in the fragmentation of the society along race and language lines. Consequently, it is incumbent upon the It is in regard of this that higher education and social order consequently leads to social change.

3.4 Higher education and social change

Higher education is a significant component of the society. My observation is that social stability is vital for the sustenance of society. Taking this into account, higher education is critical in the formation and imparting of social values that can facilitate social stability. This is

so because higher education involves the passing on, of not only academic knowledge, but the social norms and values that is critical for social stability. The role of higher education is to impart imparting knowledge to the students. This ultimately implies that it is critical for institutions to be active in the passing on of social norms that guarantee the stability of the society. Yaqoob asserts that, “education plays a primary role in maintaining and fostering conditions of ideological hegemony and legitimacy of oppressive class relations in a capitalist society” (Yaqoob, 2011, p. 317). In this way, it should be noted that higher education can be used to perpetuate social injustice by creating social opportunities for other races and language groups while denying others. Besides these economic opportunities, higher education can be used to perpetuate social fragmentation (as was the case under apartheid). It can also promote social cohesion, as this dissertation investigates the context of the post-1994 transformation of higher education in South Africa

Higher education institutions are critical social structures for constructing a society, as they are sites where social values and principles are transmitted to a generation. The student body diversity makes these institutions vantage points for the construction of a new social order through social cohesion. As argued earlier in this dissertation, in the lower educational institutions like primary and secondary schools, there is less student body diversity as compared to higher education institutions

Therefore, higher education has “a social task and function” (Kumar & Oesterheld, 2007, p. 113). In apartheid era, there was an ideology that in order for students to maintain their cultural identity, they had to study according to their race and language groups. This social function of higher education resulted in the fragmentation of education. The task was not only limited to this structural fragmentation of higher education, but it also created a social value where some members of the society felt inferior, while others felt superior. This was primarily because, white universities offered good quality education in comparison to the black universities. Social fragmentation under apartheid also created a value of non-interaction of the different race groups, since higher education separated people accordingly. To support this observation, there is a contention that, “when society fragments, its members separate themselves so that interactions across a particular category boundary are reduced and perhaps eliminated” (Obell,

Zeng & Mulford, 1996, p. 1018). Social fragmentation resulted in the racial and language groups' mistrust and intolerance.

Student body diversity should be understood in the context of the social change that occurred in 1994. This change implied that social fragmentation had to be eradicated in order to foster one unified society that accommodates its racial and language differences. In the transformation of higher education therefore, student body diversity for social cohesion is an attempt to break the pattern of racial group mistrust, non-interaction and intolerance, which is a legacy of apartheid. It is an attempt to unify races and language groups as opposed to fragmentation under apartheid era. Taking this scenario into consideration, education is linked to social change in the sense that as a social task and function, education follows the patterns of the given society. This is the background of this chapter as it will show that higher education transformation in South Africa was linked with the society that was 'migrating' from the apartheid system of governance to liberal democracy in 1994. Education had to align itself with the imperatives of the expectation and needs of the new social order (Department of Education, 1997).

3.5 The Higher Education transformation imperatives

There is a contest between the demographic and substantial as imperatives of transformation. In transforming both society and higher education, what is it exactly that needs to be given emphasis between the numerical or substantial values and practices? This is the question that forms the basis of a conceptual inquiry into the transformation imperatives of higher education. It is within the imperative of the size and shape of higher education that one can manage to draw out the theme of student body diversity. Ironically, all we get in this policy imperative is spelt out in terms of reflecting the mere demographic realities that a new South Africa ought to operate in (Department of Education, 1997, University of Witwatersrand, 2006). This leaves open the question on whether mere adherence to the demographic numbering is sufficient for the intended democratic transformation of the South African society.

3.5. 1 Demographic transformation in South African Higher Education

Demographic transformation refers to a change that occurs at a numerical level. In other words, an institution can undergo demographic transformation, when for instance; the numbers of race and language group is changed from a state where it moves from being the minority to numerical majority. As noted earlier, transformation does not always create a situation whereby one racial group is advantaged to exploit and dominate others. Sometimes demographic transformation results in numerical balance where all races and language groups have more or less the same number of students in an institution. Demographic transformation is designed, therefore, to correct situations where there is deliberate numerical dominance of one race and language group over others.

Demographic transformation is an essential feature of the post-1994 higher education landscape. Under the theme of size and shape within transformation (Department of Education, 1997), there is an imperative that demographic transformation has to occur in the institutions of higher education. Accordingly, “the composition of the higher education system’s student body must over time begin to reflect the demographic reality of the broader South African society” (Department of Education, 1997, p. 2). It is implied that, if, for instance, the black people are 79%, white people 9%, colored 9%, and Indians 1%, such demographic composition of the broader society, should also be reflected in the demographic compositions of institutions of higher education. In order to achieve this scenario, the institutions of higher education changed their enrolment system, where they would take students across racial and language groups.

Such demographic changes ultimately meant that the institutions of higher education had to increase the number of students that they annually take. Accordingly change implied an “increase of access for black, women, disabled and mature students” (Department of Education, 1997, p. 3). There was a sharp numerical increase in the students that were absorbed in the institutions of higher education across the whole country. The assessment of this demographic transformation is usually given in terms of numerical headcount. According to the numerical headcount, the institutions of higher education increased the individual students intake compared to the apartheid era (Bunting, 2002). The demographic transformation is in this way, a model that concerns itself with the numerical composition of the institution of higher education.

The demographic transformation as an imperative is informed by the contextual background where higher education under apartheid was designed to create mono-racial and language institutions of higher education. What this means is that institutions would be numerically composed of the students from the racial and language group that particular university is designated for. For example, if the University of Stellenbosch was designated for white Afrikaans students, then one would expect that the numerical composition of this institution would be white Afrikaans. In an attempt to realize demographic representation of the society in the institutions of higher education, Hay notes that, “at higher education level, the main task of the national department was to provide access for all South Africans to all institutions of higher education” (Hay, 2004, p.36).

3.5.2 The possible outcomes of demographic transformation

As I have alluded above, demographic transformation is a model that seeks to address and correct the numerical inequality of the racial, ethnic and gender composition of an organization. In this way, the significant indicator of demographic transformation in higher education is numerical composition of different races and language groups. Accordingly, numbers are the only essential value and the criterion upon which transformation can be assessed. Demographic transformation is usually necessitated by a context where there is neither racial nor language group representation or there is under representation.

One central outcome of the demographic transformation of institutions of higher education is massification. Massification is the opening up of higher education so that a wider number of qualifying students can, without segregative legislations, gain entrance into higher education institutions. Ntshoe observes that, “massification has created a higher education that is to accommodate new kinds of students and students from previously underrepresented groups including women, ethnic minorities and mature students” (Ntshoe, 2004, p. 203). Massification implies that the higher education system had to be expanded so that there are many institutions that offer higher education to the deserving students across racial and language divides.

The second outcome of demographic transformation is an increase in enrolment of the student races and language groups; however, it was the white only (English and Afrikaans) universities

that offered good education. In this way, one could argue that superior higher education was availed to a smaller number of students. Most of the institutions of higher education for other races were comparatively of lower standard to the white institutions. As a result of transformation, the increase in enrolment of students is viewed as a significant indicator of the student body diversity.

The increase in enrolment is regarded as transforming the system of higher education because it has resulted in the high diversity of the student body in terms of race and language groups.

Given the preceding two outcomes of the demographic transformation, the concept of common good in higher education perspective can be interpreted in numerical terms. The common good implies a good that is consumed by all and whose good net benefits are distributed equally among the members of society who desire and qualify to enrolment for higher education (Ukpokolo, 2006). Accordingly, something is common to the extent that it is made available and accessible to the largest number possible of the students within the society. One could argue that in the case of apartheid where higher education was offered according to race and language groups, the commonality of such a good is contestable. The contention arises with the observation that education was designed to benefit the numerically white minority race and language group. Consequently, higher education fell short of being a common good in so far as its distribution was not equal to a large number of students in the society. Under demographic transformation, a change, therefore, occurs only when the accessibility of higher education moves from being a privilege of the minority to the numerical majority. To illustrate demographics as an essential component of common good, Peterson observes that, “common good is what belongs to everyone by virtue of their common humanity” (Peterson, 2011, p. 22). The term ‘common humanity’ that Peterson employs here could be substituted by common citizenship in the context of South Africa. This, therefore, means that demographic transformation makes higher education to be common, meaning it is available to numerically all the people; all the citizens of South Africa. The term ‘common humanity’ in the demographic transformation refers to all South Africans regardless of their race and language group. Higher education, therefore, becomes a common good as it is accessible to the greatest number of students.

Demographic transformation creates a sense of social inclusion. I use the word ‘sense’ in this regard, because demographic transformation gives the impression that races and language groups have been transformed into a cohesive unit by bringing them to study under one institution. As will be discussed in Chapter four, demographic inclusion may still imply social exclusion.

Social inclusion is a process of numerically accommodating all the people within their social classes, racial lines, ethnic and language classification into the broader social system. In this way, social inclusion necessitates non-discriminatory social practices, so that all members of a given society have access to the service that is on offer. In order to appreciate and demonstrate the importance of social inclusion, it is of relevance to note in this argument the social exclusion that was a feature of apartheid higher education. As pointed out in this dissertation, apartheid higher education structurally facilitated social exclusion to the extent that some social classes were excluded from institutions of higher education on the basis of their races and language groups. Commenting on how socially exclusionary higher education under apartheid was, Nkoane notes that, “all spheres of education in South Africa were shaped and molded on the principle of separation and divisions along race lines” (Nkoane 2006, p. 243). The contrast between higher education under apartheid and the transformed post-1994 is that the former was socially exclusionary, while the latter was socially inclusive. It is in this regard that demographic transformation can arguably be termed as a model that initiates social inclusion.

By social inclusion, the demographic transformation of higher education serves a crucial social objective. It facilitates the eradication of a fragmented education system under apartheid. Under social inclusion theme, higher education moved from being elitist to a mass social service. An elitist system is when education is made available to only the upper class of the society. Presumably such a process of social inclusion would go beyond the numerical level; to a situation where what is transformed is not only the demographic social composition, but also the core social values of the institution of higher education.

This discussion on demographic level of transformation has indicated that what is essential is the numerical composition of an institution of higher education. When an institution change from a situation where the percentage of a for example, black people rise from 20% to 70%, then transformation is said to have occurred. The benefit of a demographic transformation is that it resulted in diversification of races and language groups in the institutions of higher education.

However, in relation to social cohesion, how are common social values transformed by demographic change? Does a demographic transformation create enough space and opportunities for social cohesion within the diverse student body? These questions point to inadequacies of demographic transformation. With this background, I now explore substantial transformation which constitutes the proposed model in this dissertation.

3.6 Substantive transformation

Substantive transformation is a change that occurs at the level of the core social values, norms, ideologies and principles which inform the social life of an institution. Substantive transformation aims to address and change the underlying substantial social values, ideologies, principles and norms under which institutions function. This model of transformation is a shift in terms of underlying social values from the ones that were held under a given social order to the new social order. The observation here is that institutions function because there is an organized or conventional system that they follow and abide by. It is this organized system that is informed by substantial values. An organized system of higher education for instance, can be informed by substantial social values like, non-discrimination practices, inclusiveness, racial and ethnic diversity, tolerance and accommodating differences that might be present within student body diversity.

In the transformation of higher education in the post-1994 democratic dispensation, higher education institutions are strategic points for substantive transformation. In this regard, Jansen puts it aptly as he observes that, “education is arguably one of the most important sites through which to advance and contest a new vision of a post transition society” (Jansen, 2007, p.120). It is this view that makes transformation at both substantial and demographic levels, a critical issue in higher education institutions.

3.7 The recreation of social transformation

The process of transforming institutions of higher education in South Africa is premised on the need to move from exclusion to inclusion (Daniels and Damons, 2011). Recreating institutions of higher education in this way means racial and language groups that were excluded in the

apartheid era are included through admission to institutions of higher education. This process of recreation encompasses the two levels of transformation. From the above subsections on demographic and substantial levels of transformation, it became evident that both numbers and common social values are of critical importance. There is a need for the institutions of higher education in South Africa to reflect the demographic realities of the broader society. In this regard, transformation at this level means that a deliberate exclusion of some races and language groups contradicts the building up of a new social order. When numbers are reflective of the society, then substantial transformation becomes necessary. This recognizes that diversity can either be a source of tensions or chance to unify different races and language groups. It becomes a source of tensions when prejudices, stereotypes that students bring into the institutions are allowed to continue. This is where social cohesion becomes an imperative of transformation. With this background, I now discuss social transformation efforts at the Universities of Johannesburg and Witwatersrand.

3.7.1 Transformation at the University of Johannesburg

The precise definition of transformation at the University of Johannesburg is “an ongoing, dynamic and qualitative process to enhance the development of knowledge for responsible citizenship” (University of Johannesburg transformation center, 2011, p.6). The imperative of transformation at this institution was necessitated by the emergence of the phenomenon of diversity in terms of racial and language group social composition that changed in the post-1994 era. One would assume that responsible citizenship in this context mean that students are inculcated with the norms of tolerating diversity (racial and language) as a process of social cohesion.

The University of Johannesburg was formed as a comprehensive institution of higher education in 2005. This came about as a result of a merger of Rands Afrikaans University, Technikon Witwatersrand and two campuses of Vista University, that is, Soweto and Daveyton (Mail and Guardian, 2009). By 2009 the University of Johannesburg had 70% black, 19% white, 4% Asia and 3% colored students (Bunting, 2002). This racial diversity also extended to the fact that all language groups were now accommodated at this institution. This was a radical change from

formerly a white (race) and Afrikaans (mono-racial and language institution) to multi-racial and multilingual university.

It is crucial to realize that from its inception, the university adopted inclusivity as its concept for transformation, as this is indicative of the need to manage diversity. Inclusivity encompasses academic as well as social aspects of the institution. One could deduce that for the University of Johannesburg, diversity means recognition of the academic and social aspects of the institution. Apparently, there is not much that specifically targets the transformation of a student body into a cohesive society.

Following a series of what were then referred to as ‘outbreaks of racial violence’ in 2008, the University established a Transformation Steering Committee and Transformation offices. The steering committee’s task was to “create new value system and cultural ethos in our institution as part of a broader transformation programme” (University of Johannesburg Transformation Centre, 2011 p 3). To achieve this objective, the University management conducted a series of campaigns within residences in order to mitigate and reduce discrimination on the racial grounds. It is also worthy to note that this institution holds annual cultural days that are designed to inculcate values of tolerance of diversity thereby breaking prejudice and discrimination.

In conclusion, one could say that, the University of Johannesburg’s efforts towards social cohesion recommendable, given the sensitivity that accompanies issues to do with race and language in the broader society of South Africa. There were always attempts to create a sense of accommodating the racial and language differences. As noted above, intervention programmes were introduced to combat racism and other forms of discrimination which were not in line with the imperatives of the new social order.

Nevertheless, I do find that the University of Johannesburg’s efforts at transformation still need attention if they are to bring about adequate social cohesion. Firstly, the designation of this task to a Transformation Office is insufficient. This is what I have already pointed out, that the term ‘transformation’ is too broad and ambiguous. This inevitably leads to a loss of focus in so far as urgent and pertinent issues to do with racial and language fragmentation are concerned. Of equal concern is the intermittent approach of the programmes that are intended to combat racism and other forms of discrimination. Equally, such programmes appear to be reactive rather than

proactive. The building up and sustenance of a new social order needs to be rigorous and consistent. This is discussed in the last chapter of this dissertation that deals with the preferred model and approach to student body diversity regarding social cohesion.

3.7.2 Transformation at the University of Witwatersrand

In the apartheid era, the University of Witwatersrand was categorized as an English-medium white liberal institution of higher education. To the extent that it was regarded as an open university, Witwatersrand admitted a limited number of black students. Rothberg observes that, “during the days when there were quotas on numbers of black students who could attend university, Wits did whatever it could to show opposition” (Rothberg, 2012, p. 20). Despite this description, there was minimal diversity in terms of race and language during the apartheid era.

The above description gives a picture of an institution that to some extent resisted the apartheid dictates of black student’s exclusion. However, transformation at the University of Witwatersrand is defined in demographic terms. To this end the university “maintains an admission policy that actively create diversity within the university’s student population and bring it in line with the country’s demographics” (www.wits.ac.za). The demographic emphasis on transformation saw the numbers of the formerly excluded race groups (black, Indians and coloreds) dramatically increasing in the post-1994 era. Rothberg for instance claims that, “since the end of apartheid, Wits has launched a concerted effort to develop a demographic profile that matches the national profile as clearly as possible” (Rothberg, 2012, p. 20). The efforts towards demographic transformation paid the desired dividends as by 2005, the social composition of this institution was to a larger extent reflecting on the society of South Africa.

Like the case of University of Johannesburg, the University of Witwatersrand underwent demographic transformation. However it should be noted that attempts have been made at the substantial level. According to Cross and Johnson (2008), the demographic representation was extended to the University governance. My interpretation of this is that, such demographic representation in forums like the Student Representative Council and other social bodies, implied that the social values of the all races and language groups were given due attention. To this end, there is a Diversity office within the institution. My reservation of this office is that since it deals

with wide ranging of diversity issues, it becomes difficult to narrow its mandate to focus its attention on the student body diversity, an issue I consider urgent in this dissertation.

3.8 Concluding remarks

My conclusion after this discussion on social transformation is that, both the demographic and substantial levels are of equal importance. Transformation encompasses a change in the shape, form, structure of something. That change should also go beyond form, by addressing the social values, common perceptions and norms of an institution. In relating this to higher education, there seem to be inadequacy concerning social transformation that emphasizes correcting the numerical composition and common social values. Numbers are corrected when an institution reflects the broader reality of society. At a social values level, the implication is that all practices that sustained fragmentation along race and language are eliminated within the institution. For example, it has been noted in this chapter that the disguise of cultural identity that was the ideology of the apartheid era, gave birth to the situation where institutions were generally composed of one race and language group. Accordingly, social transformation in the post-1994 era means that new social values, practices and norms are put in place within the student body diversity in order to create social cohesion. It is in taking into consideration the challenges that are posed by social transformation that the following chapter discusses and offers a critical exposition of the framing of student body diversity in South Africa.

CHAPTER FOUR

A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE STUDENT BODY DIVERSITY THEME

4.0 Introduction

In this chapter, I critically examine the framing of student body diversity within social transformation of higher education in South Africa. It is the aim of this chapter that such an examination may lead to the discussion on the relationship between student body diversity and social cohesion. The levels of transformation that were discussed in chapter three are given attention in order to relate them to student body. The discourse of this chapter is that it begins with the rationale of student body diversity. This rationale is a critical step as it inserts student body diversity within the framework of social transformation. After this, the chapter discusses inclusiveness and exclusiveness social transformation has been within higher education. The dilemmas of moving beyond demographic transformation are extensively covered in this chapter. In addition, the objective of this chapter in discussing student body diversity is also to explore and discover ways in which student body diversity has achieved or not the demands of the new social order.

4. 1 Rationale for student body diversity

The post-1994 student body diversity is meant to foster racial integration and multilingualism within higher education as indicators of social cohesion. In the apartheid era, ideology was used to design and justify separation of races and language groups in institutions. The inference that could be drawn out of this separation is that, the white race was superior to all other races; therefore, it was not “proper” to study along with other “inferior” racial groupings (Reddy, 2004). Generally this ideology ‘worked’ to the extent that most institutions of higher education implemented this and applied it as a criterion for admission. As a result, institutions of higher education were generally composed of one race and language.

Given the background of a racially and linguistically fragmented higher education in the apartheid era, it became the goal of transformation of higher education to dismantle an ideology

of racial and language fragmentation in the quest for social cohesion. Student body diversity is part of the broader efforts for constructing the new social order. The new ideology for the new social order was to realize a non-discriminatory society. In the social order;

Evidence suggests that a common denominator of all the policy initiatives outlined above was their emphasis on the principles of non-racism, non-sexism, democracy, redress and a unitary system of higher education (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2008, p. 328).

Besides the principles of non-racism and non-discrimination as noted in transformation policies, the student body diversity was inserted as an imperative within transformation agenda. As an imperative, it implies that institutions were compelled to abide by it. This imperative is noted as that, “the composition of the higher education system’s student body must over time begin to reflect the demographic reality of the broader South African society” (Department of Education, 1997, p. 2). With this imperative, races and language group begun to converge in the institutions of higher education. Similarly Mdepa and Tshiwula are of the view that, “the country had no choice but to address issues related to the inclusion of diversity in higher education” (Mdepa & Tshiwula, 2012, p. 19). Diversity in higher education is an acknowledgment and realization that the ideology of separation and fragmentation as propagated in the apartheid era could no longer be sustained as it contradicted the social principles of the new social order.

The rationale of student body diversity in transformation is that, “higher education is a national government competency, whereas all other levels of education system are a functional area of concurrent national and a provincial competency” (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2008, p.328). Student body diversity in higher education as a result of falling under the national government in South Africa makes it a critical area for building a new social order. Since this department falls directly under the competency of the national government, higher education is a seminal point to nurture and uphold the national objectives of the creation of the new social order. The policies of the transformation of higher education in the post 1994 are crafted towards the creation of this new social order.

The higher education transformative policies put in place were meant to achieve change that is reflective of the transition in the society. It is in this regard that student body diversity was inserted in the transformation agenda of the higher education. The line of argument is, therefore,

student body diversity must fit in the broader framework of the political transition from apartheid era to the post-1994 democratic dispensation.

Consequently, “there is a critical need for all social institutions under the guidance of the democratic Constitution to engage in the project of giving birth to a new society imbued with the values and principles of an enlightened, modern and democratic constitution” (Nkomo, Chisholm and McKinney, 2004, p. 1). Social cohesion within the student body diversity forms part of this process of building up a new society that is in line with the demands of the democratic constitution.

Primarily, student body diversity tends towards the building of a social order in higher education. It is a social order that is founded on social values and principles of non-discrimination on race and language. This in turn creates coherent institutions of higher education. The failure to establish the principles of non-discrimination may indicate that student body diversity is not managed well. It is noted that in all the instances of racial and language tensions that have occurred in the post-1994, prejudices and lack of common social values underlies such incidents (Department of Education, 2008). Such incidents occur when racial and language student groups are brought in to study under one institution, without the necessary conditions that promote social cohesion at an ideological and social values level.

The critical argument is built around the observation that while demographic racial and language transformation might have occurred thereby creating ‘convergence’ of diversity, this theme seems to fall short in the facilitation of the social cohesion. This argument is built around race integration and language inclusion as the two crucial elements that could have extensively addressed in the new social order. Institutions of higher education are points where races and language groups converge of diversity. Bunting argues that, “a main aim of universities is that of widening the cultural and intellectual horizons of students, and of promoting in them honest scholarly thought and inquiry” (Bunting, 1994, p. 20). There is therefore, a racial and language diversity that converges in the institutions of higher education. It is this convergence of diversity that supposedly took place in South Africa after the 1994 political transformation.

From the above context, the phenomenon of student body diversity was realized in South Africa. The argument in this dissertation is that in the post-1994 transformation of higher education, the

student body diversity theme was not only meant to build structural multi-racial and lingual institutions of higher education, but that was also meant to foster social values, common norms and practices of interactions cross races and language groups. It was meant to foster participation, building trust, harmony, and shared form of lives. Accordingly, transformation of higher education in the post-1994 cannot be limited to the demographic inclusion of those students who were excluded in the apartheid era. The following section of this dissertation discusses the racial and language demographic inclusion that occurred as a result of the theme of student body diversity within transformation of higher education.

4.2 From racial and language exclusion to demographic inclusion

The theme of the student body diversity facilitated the construction of the new social order in the institutions of South African higher education landscape. In my view, this new social order is currently characterized mainly by demographic social inclusion along race and language. In this way, transformation possibly occurred as a transition from racial and language exclusion to a demographic inclusion of race and language groups. One could argue that at this level of transformation (demographic inclusion) the old social order that sustained higher education appear to have been destroyed. According to Woodrooffe, “post-apartheid social reform was specifically aimed at deconstructing the established social order in efforts to promote a new racially and ethnically neutral South Africa” (Woodrooffe, 2011, p.171). This social reform of student body diversity enabled many students (demographics) to access higher education across racial and language divides.

It was mandatory that within the broader scope of transformation, the racially and linguistically fragmented higher education system abolished. The abolishing of fragmentation is important in order to realize the new social order that is characteristically non-discriminatory. The policies that were introduced in transformation therefore, were designed to make higher education accessible to all students without regard to their racial and language characterization. In line with this, “a major transformation condition proposed by the 1997 Education White Paper was that the participation rates of Africans, colored and women must increase” (Cloete & Bunting, 2000, p.14). The increase in participation rates of the Africans, colored and women resulted in the realization of the student body diversity.

The transformed student body diversity had the fundamental effect of changing the racial and language social composition of the institutions of higher education. The transforming mechanisms of this theme are that “as a social force in society, diversity has the potential to alter the complexion of a population and require change in societal institutions” (ASHE, 2006, p. 1). Through this theme higher education became racially and language inclusive for these had ceased to be criteria to consider in the admission process. Hay notes that student body diversity, “opened access for the marginalized groupings of the population and to ensure greater academic success” (Hay, 2008, p. 936). Institutions of higher education opened their doors to students of all races and this in turn created multi-racial and multi-lingual institutions.

The desegregation policies of the post-1994 era in higher education resulted in remarkable demographic racial and language transformation in institutions of higher education. The two terms that are mostly used to denote numerical racial transformation in higher education are enrollment and head count. Accordingly, Mdepa and Tshiwula notes that “in 1993, 40% of all students were African (191 000 students) and 52% were black; by 2008, African enrollment had risen to 64, 4% (514, 370) and black enrollment stood at 78% of the overall enrollment” (Mdepa and Tshiwula, 2012, p. 22). Enrollment comes across as laying emphasis on the initial process of students’ admission into higher education. It also gives the impression that students could now freely choose an institution of higher education, without any discriminatory policy constraints as was the case under apartheid. Soudien observes that there was an increase in the headcount of students from previously marginalized groups. Accordingly, “participation rates of black students increased between 2000 and 2007 from 10% in 2001 to 12% in 2006 for coloreds from 8, 5% to 13% and Indians 42% to 51%. The participation of white students in higher education remained stable at 59%” (Soudien, 2010, p. 884). These numerical figures do indicate that there was a ‘demographic revolution’ within the institutions of higher education. There was a movement from mono-racial to multi-racial institutions of higher education. Seemingly, such a significant increase in the enrollment of students of different races and language groups within such a short space is recognized as a major attainment by the scholars discussed in this paragraph.

I draw two propositions from this remarkable numerical racial and language diversity increase. Firstly, the fact that many students who were previously excluded could apply and be admitted in

such great numbers, only serve to expose the divisive apartheid policies in higher education. According to Mdepa and Tshiwula, “it was a criminal offense for non-whites to register at a white university without state permission” (Mdepa & Tshiwula, 2012, p. 20). By extension, it was criminal for students to meet and mingle across races, diversity was indeed an offence. Segregation was legislated and enforced in higher education.

The second observation is that the deracializations of higher education institutions policies were remarkable to the extent that students could have access to the institutions of their choice. Most of the institutions of higher education responded positively or obliged to the demands of transformation that called upon them to introduce student diversity. Erlich suggests that student diversity assisted in the realization of the “social democratization of higher education” (Erlich, 2004, p. 578). I concur with Erlich to employ the concept of social democratization as it succinctly denotes the democracy that has taken place in the institution of higher education. Democracy is here used in the minimal sense of ‘freeing’ the physical space of institutions so that they are made accessible to academically qualifying students.

The social democratization of the institutions of higher education is best understood in the broader context of the constitution of the new social order. According to Vally, “a founding principle of South Africa’s constitution is common citizenship and equal enjoyment of an array of citizens’ rights including freedom of belief, religion, expression, assembly and association” (Vally, 2007, p.39). This remarkable racial and language demographic transformation enabled citizens (students) to freely associate and assemble within the institutions of higher education. To the extent that students of different racial and language characterization could share the same academic lecture halls, toilets, libraries, sports playing fields, and many other facilities that are available in higher education institution, indicate some form of social inclusion. This social inclusion is premised on the fact of common citizenship, as enshrined in the new constitution for the new social order. The student body diversity “decriminalized” multi-racial and multi-lingual association and assembly in contrast to the apartheid era.

4.3 From demographic inclusion to racial and language exclusion: An exposition of the inadequacies of student body diversity

The current framing of student body diversity in the transformation agenda of higher education is not normative. In other words, this theme does not offer the norms, values and common principles that can facilitate the realization of social cohesion. It has been demonstrated in this dissertation that the segregationist policies of apartheid higher education were not a ‘numbers’ game’, but were informed by underlying social values and ideologies. It therefore, becomes imperative that in the construction of the new social order in the post-apartheid era, diversity should not have been framed and limited to “demographic reflection of the changes taking place” (Department of Education, 1997, p. 2). The student body diversity theme is framed in the demographic approach where the emphasis is laid on the numerical representation of all the races in the social composition of institutions of higher education (Badat, 2009, Department of Education, 1997). A normative theme, is supposed to prescribe the values and principles that members of an organization or society ought to uphold and abide by in order to realize a common good. The inadequacies of the demographic model of transformation theme of student body diversity are apparent if one considers the fact that the demographic composition does not necessarily result in common binding values in the institution of higher education. In the context of South African higher education therefore, this theme could have deduced those principles of the new social order and apply them to the institutions of higher education as part of transformation. However, this sub-section shows that such social norms seem to have been left to the discretion of the governing authorities of institutions. The national government has occasionally come up with such norms as reactionary acts to intermittent eruptions of intolerance events in the institutions of higher education (Department of Education, 2008). Demographic transformation appears to be inadequate to construct a new social order in the institutions of higher education.

The critical realism methodology of research is used to critique the theme of student body diversity in the transformation agenda of higher education. This methodology asserts that societies do not just emerge from nowhere, but are a deliberate process of human activity that involves critical reflection. Such human activity could manifests itself in the form of

transformative policies designed to create a better social order as is presumed in the higher education. Neimann notes that;

Environments are socially constructed, the culture of institution reflects what is inherent to the participants in what they value, how they define their environments and how they construct that environment in terms of what it could become (Niemann, 2010, p. 1004).

The social order within the institutions of higher education is apparently a product that is constructed through the human activity in the form of policies. Where there were one-race and language group institutions of higher education under apartheid era, the implication is that given community value system was probably established to suit that race. In the post-apartheid era therefore, multi-racial reality in the institutions of higher education facilitates the construction of a social order that reflects the fact of diversity in terms of race and different languages. The endeavor in this section is to discuss the inadequacies of this theme to construct the new social order in the institutions of higher education.

The preceding section has shown that in the post-1994 era, there was a significant demographic change in the institutions of higher education. This was in tandem with the imperatives of transformation which spelt out that the social composition of institutions of higher education should “mirror” the demographic reality of the broader South African society (Department of Education, 1997). Hypothetically this means that if black people make 80%, white 9%, Indians 5% and colored 5%, of the total population in the broader South African society, then this demographic reality should be reflected within the institutions of higher education. Such a situation was obviously contrary to what apartheid era was, where the minority races and language groups would constitute the highest representation, while the majority races and language groups would be least represented within the institutions of higher education. The demographic transformation might have apparently been attained; however, in the context of South Africa, this is not enough. The context of apartheid South Africa was one of racial and language group fragmentation, which subsequently created ideologies of racial superiority and inferiority (Woodrooffe, 2011). The post-apartheid South Africa sought to build a new non-discriminatory social order. This section has shown it is inadequate to apply only demographics as the benchmark of transformation of higher education that also seeks to build a cohesive social order in the institutions of higher education.

Transformation of the student body from one of mono-racial and lingual to diversity may not address and change the fundamental ideologies and social values that sustained the higher education landscape under apartheid. The justification to address such ideologies and values is found in the realization that a transformed higher education enables the “acquisition, development and inculcation of the proper value orientation for the survival of the individual and the society” (Idogho, 2011, p. 269).

The social objectives of higher education are the transmission of social values and political ideologies that form the core basis of the society, thereby building social cohesion. In line with this, there are two social processes that transformation could push forward in the post-1994 South Africa. These processes are racial integration and multilingualism, as in their endeavor to address race and language issues.

4.4 Racial integration

Racial integration is critical in the new social order so as to break the barriers that have been systematically created in the old order. There are two seemingly contrasting definitions of the process of racial integration. The first one asserts that, racial integration is an acknowledgement of diverse racial and language groups within an institution, but allows groups to continue separate existence (Divala & Mafumo, unpublished). This definition suggests that integration does not go beyond the level of physically bringing together the diverse student body. On the other hand, Harber argues that;

Racial integration is not just a matter of physical proximity among members of different groups in the same school, but of positive intergroup contact and a gradual erosion of cleavages and conflict occurring on the basis of race and ethnicity (Harber, 1998, p. 112).

Thus for Harber, racial integration challenges the basic concept of race as a point of difference. It challenges the assumptions, prejudices and attitudes that different race groups may hold against other groups. To some extent, Harber’s definition entails bringing students together at a social level.

Nevertheless, the combination of both physical and social proximity is in my view, what constitutes racial integration. Ultimately, it entails the destruction of racial and language group barriers that are determined by race, resulting in intergroup interactions within the institutions of higher education. Therefore, a model of transformation that ends at demographics, bringing all races to study under one institution may be inadequate to meet integration as a goal for the new social order. Racial integration requires that the students' social values, principles, assumptions and beliefs undergo transformation as well (Department of Education, 2008). Group interaction is determined by the attitude and values that student's hold against those who are racially different from them. Naidoo (2010) observes that "racial integration needs major changes of deep seated attitudes and behavior patterns among learners and teachers of minority and majority groups and in the institutional patterns and arrangements of (higher education institutions) schools" (Naidoo, 2010, 123). The changes in attitudes and behavior patterns may have to address the prejudices, fears and intolerance that have been instilled in the student community over a long period of time. Transformation that results in racial integration has essentially to occur within the institutional culture, where the divisive tendencies that were inculcated in the apartheid era are to be eradicated.

The institutional culture that has undergone racial integration accommodates those students who were previously excluded. To this end, racial integration results in racial inclusivity as opposed to exclusivity. Conversely, racial integration implies some degree of absorption. In other words, there is a racial or language group that is absorbed or 'swallowed' by the other. However, this important feature of absorption, in the context of South Africa, could be misleading as it gives the impression that there should be certain groups that are absorbed into an already existing institutional culture that does not necessarily have to change. It gives the impression that a given group is 'joining' or getting the membership of an already established organization.

Racial integration addresses issues that go beyond demographic transformation. There is an observation that;

Integration means schools changing to meet the needs of all children enrolled, fostering meaningful interaction among learners in the classroom, on the playground and in extramural activities, as well as instilling a human rights culture (Nkomo, Chisholm and McKinney, 2004).

This perspective of racial integration as given in terms of social values of student body could possibly result in the formation of an integral community that does not discriminate on racial lines. It is therefore, the submission in this dissertation that a demographic transformation model of the student body is possibly inadequate in terms of values that can dismantle race domination in the institutions of higher education. Race is not only a biological characterization, but it is vested with values, power and domination. In the apartheid era, the race construct was designed in such a way that there was a superior and inferior race (Reddy, 2004). Racial integration has the potential to eradicate racial and language group stereotypes within the institutions of higher education. Racial diversity poses the challenge of integrating racial diverse student body. I would opt for a situation where integration means bringing together different pieces (groups) that once existed separately.

4.5 Multilingualism

Language is not only a means of communication, but has a relational capacity within it. Languages have the capacity to enable people to establish relationships. Nekhwevha argues that, “language habits are determiners of social relations as their role in shaping culture” (Nekhwevha, 1999, p. 503). Consequently, languages have the potential to create inclusivity among people. On a contrasting note, languages can also be used to exclude other people especially those who are not familiar to it. In the apartheid era, higher education was structured according to language. It should be recalled that language was, under apartheid, a political tool employed to create white racial dominance over other races. The segregationist policies of higher education in the apartheid era, gave prominence to English and Afrikaans as *lingua-franca* languages, in which business of education was to be conducted in. This obviously disadvantaged those students who were non-speakers of these two languages.

In order to create an inclusive social order, the post-1994 democratic dispensation recognized eleven spoken languages as official. Making a language official means that it has been “adopted to carry out the business of the state” (Kamwangamalu, 2010, p. 2). It is this official adoption or addition of the previously unrecognized nine languages that facilitated multilingualism in the higher education institutions. Multilingualism involves supporting and treating all languages at an equal level. The 1996 Constitution of the political dispensation after apartheid era recognized

languages that were relegated by the apartheid system of higher education. By making these eleven languages to be official, the necessary conditions for student diversity in the institutions of higher education were created. This was a shift from the apartheid era, where only English and Afrikaans were recognized as languages for communication within the education system and the broader South African society.

In view of the above context, the Language Policy for Higher Education was adopted in 2002 so as to address the legacy of apartheid on language use in higher education. According to Madiba, “multilingualism is recommended in this policy as a means to ensure equity of access and success in higher education, in contrast to past colonial apartheid education policies that left a legacy of inequality, exclusion and failure” (Madiba, 2010, 327). Multilingualism is the equal use in institutional service delivery of the officially recognized languages within a given society. Miller contends that, “language policy can be used as an instrument to unify people instead of an instrument of division” (Miller, 2003, p. 35). In apartheid, higher education was structured along language lines that did not accommodate any form of diversity in this regard. There were institutions that served English, Afrikaans, and ethnic language speakers. Greenfield notes that “language policies in South African education have historically been inextricably woven within the fabric of larger socio-political realities and have supported the interests of those in power” (Greenfield, 2010, p. 517). In recognition to this, the promotion of multilingualism in institutions of higher education is in tandem with the new social order. The politics of language in the apartheid era was to create an ideology that students can only be in institutions of their language groups.

In conclusion to the above two social processes, it could be drawn that both the racial integration and multilingualism have their own weaknesses as they relate to social cohesion. Racial integration as discussed above limits the point of fragmentation to race as physical pigmentation. It proffers a solution that would want to erase the reality of race. To narrow the source of conflicts to a race or language group seem unsatisfactory. For example, do black students hold prejudices simply because they are black? The same criticism is applicable to multilingualism that seems to purport that fragmentation in institutions of higher education can be eradicated by mere promotion of the previously excluded languages. It is in cognizance of these weaknesses

that I discuss the concept of Rainbow nation in institutions of higher education as a possible model for social cohesion.

4.6 Rainbow institutions of Higher Education

The student body diversity enabled the creation of multiracial and multilingual institutions of higher education in the post-1994 political dispensation. This diversity is usually referred to as the rainbow nation. The concept of rainbow institutions of higher education is a reflection of what appear to have transpired in the broader society after the collapse of apartheid governance. With the fall of apartheid, the new social order was metaphorically termed as the rainbow nation to signify the fact that the once racially and fragmented society, was now integrated and unified. The critical need for harmony presupposes that in the previous order, there was disharmony as typified by the racial fragmentation in the apartheid era. The first President of the democratic social order in South Africa, Nelson Mandela aptly phrased this rainbow concept as “many cultures, one nation”. The racial and linguistically barriers that once shaped both the broader society and higher education landscape were ‘eradicated’. It is primarily for this reason that student body diversity was inserted in the transformation agenda of higher education so as to realize a rainbow nation. This imperative was framed as a reflection of changes in the broader society (Department of Education, 1997).

The failure of a demographic model of transformation in the theme of student body diversity for social cohesion, seem to manifests itself when the ideal rainbow metaphor is taken into account. Such inadequacy to construct a new social order in the institutions of higher education comes to the fore with the recognition that rainbow nation cannot only be constructed at a demographic level but also at social values and principles that are shared. Rainbow nation is a metaphor intended to persuade people to be loyal and committed to the ideals of the new social order. The concept of rainbow nation carried with it the fact that the new social order within the institutions of higher education can enable the students to embrace diversity. Different race and language groups presumably make up the rainbow institutions of higher education in South Africa.

In equating the rainbow institutions of higher education and the demographic model of student body diversity, it becomes apparent that numbers may not necessarily make a cohesive rainbow

institution. Analogically, one could argue that it is not the number of colors (green, red, yellow) that make up a rainbow. What makes a rainbow is the fact that these colors are joined, inseparable and therefore, constitute one cohesive unit.

4.7 Dilemmas of social cohesion in Higher Education.

This section discusses the conceptual dilemmas that arise in the attempt to achieve social cohesion in the institutions of higher education. The point of departure in exploring these dilemmas is the assertion that social cohesion is characteristically communitarian. On the other hand, the current student body diversity theme has been framed and limited to demographic composition of racial and lingual social composition of institutions of higher education. The dilemmas that are discussed here arise primarily in the attempt to create a coherent community of students in the higher education. Seemingly, there is tension between the social values of a cohesive community of students and the mechanisms of building up such a community. How is a community of students in a higher education institute constructed without necessarily oppressing the individual racial groups to which students belong? Is it not possible to violate, suppress and annihilate the individual racial group identification in the process of constructing institutional identification? These seem to be the basic explorative questions that inform the discussions on the dilemmas that surround social cohesion in the institutions of higher education.

I have chosen race and language as social instruments that were used by the apartheid government to divide the higher education landscape. In the post-1994 transformation of higher education, social cohesion is a constitutive element of student body diversity. This implies that language and race conceptions had to be transformed so that they cease to be barriers of social cohesion, but are turned into instruments of cohesion. This section looks at the dilemmas that arise owing to the need for social cohesion. Social cohesion is vested in values and principles that must not only be upheld, but must be shared by the student community in higher education.

4.7.1 Unitary institutional culture

The first dilemma of realizing social cohesion in the institutions of higher education is the identification and building of a unitary institutional culture. Transformation compels institutions

to equally change their social cultures. Within apartheid, institutional cultures of racially and linguistically homogenous institutions reflected the cultures of a given race and language group that occupied that institution. However, with the theme of student body diversity in the transformation agenda of higher education, a culture that accommodates this diversity is unavoidable. According to Nekhwevha, “culture is both a way of life for a people within which they make meaning, confront difference and initiate change” (Nekhwevha, 1999, p. 492). In this dissertation, discussions have pointed that the political dispensation that follows the collapse of apartheid system and resulting in the creation of multi-racial institutions, diversity has compelled the emergence of a culture that reflects these demographic changes.

The assertion here is that transformation of higher education in the new social order could have resulted in a given culture within the institutions of higher education. Badat asserts that;

Institutional culture encompasses ideas, values, norms, laws, policies, regulations, rules, structures, organization, mechanisms, instruments, processes, procedures, actions, practices, conventions, habits and behaviors (Badat, 2009, p. 456).

These norms that Badat observes as the critical components of institutional culture are present in any given institution. There were there under the apartheid higher education landscape. However social cohesion’s primary objective is to realize an institutional common culture that accommodates the racial and linguistically diversity that arose owing to student body diversity theme. Social cohesion may assist in the development of an institutional culture that could eradicate alienation and exclusion of students based on their racial or language group.

The dilemma is in the creation of common norms, values, and principles that can be adopted and practiced by the whole student body in its diversity. Diversity which implies different race and language groups congregating under one institution poses challenges in so far as developing a common agreed culture is concerned. There could be a possibility of creating an institutional social culture without necessarily suppressing the racial group cultures in which individual students may associate with.

The practical implications of social cohesion may be in the form of common social values that the student community abide by and uphold. Is it therefore, possible to create an institutional social culture that does not oppress language and racial groups? How does social cohesion in the

institutions of higher education break down racial and language segmentation which is a legacy of apartheid? A unitary institutional social culture can give a sense of the new identity where students recognize themselves as belonging to an institution of higher education. This new identity is different from the one in apartheid social order because students began to identify an institution of higher education by their race and language group.

I make a distinction here between institutional social culture and institutional structural culture. Institutional social culture is the social practices in terms of values such as, tolerance, trust and respect that are commonly practiced within an institution. This culture has to be internalized as a value, and it is also an ideology. On the other hand institutional structural culture is the external formal common norms that all students are expected to follow as dictated by the institutional academic time-table. These include, for example, the lecture time-tables, lecture halls, libraries and all facilities offered at an institution of higher education. All institutions of higher education have a structure from which their daily discourse takes form. Arguably, the student body diversity has enabled the development of a unitary institutional structural culture.

Social cohesion could occur at the level of institutional social culture. Social cohesion is a social process which “refers to the extent to which a society is coherent, united and functional, providing an environment within which its citizens can flourish” (Department of Education,). Social cohesion can imply that there should be a unitary institutional culture in which the student community shares participation in. Culture is generally understood as life values, principles and norms that a given people within a society live by and practice. Some people may argue that in the institutions of higher education, the fact that there is student body diversity where campus physical space is shared, therefore, to an extent there are common social values shared as well. However, to equate the sharing of physical space in institutions to shared social norms seems to be minimal understanding of culture. Considering these complexities, the dilemma of creating an institutional social culture through social cohesion is rather evident.

It is of significance within the demands of social cohesion to develop common institutional social values. However, there can be a conflict of interest between unitary institutional culture and the already established racial and language group culture. While social cohesion within institutions of higher education would attempt to destroy discriminatory racial and language group practices, given the fact that there was racial segmentation under apartheid, this process

can contradict the values and norms of the supposedly democracy in which institutions of higher education now functions. Students can still freely choose to remain within their racial groups, practicing discriminatory attitudes.

This dissertation submits to the view that the conflict of a unitary institutional social culture that encompasses students and the established racial and language group cultures is critical within the framework of social cohesion. It is a conflict between the universal and particular social culture within the ‘one roof’ institution. Social cohesion attempts to improve racial and language group contact, thereby reducing discrimination that is based on race and language groups. It equally makes an effort to eradicate social segmentation as was the case under apartheid. The dilemma however, still remains, given the observation that in the case where the common social norms are imposed, then such a situation contradicts basic tenets of democracy. It becomes a dilemma when one considers that for social cohesion to be realized, it is necessary that the common social norms are not only proposed but imposed as well.

With this discussion, apparently the notion of a unitary institutional social culture is a contestable issue. What further complicates this issue is the fact that within a liberal set-up, the idea of establishing an institutional social culture is secondary and is of little relevance. Students enroll at institution in order to obtain higher education qualifications for their own private good. Embracing the values of social cohesion for the common good may not be their priority. In any case, institutions of higher education are ranked in accordance with their institutional structural culture and not so much on social values transmitted within their institution. Inferably, what appears as the common good in institutions of higher education is the acquisition of academic qualifications, not the social benefits of establishing a unitary institutional culture.

4.7.2 Institutions of higher education as social formation sites or academic sites

The question that arises here is whether institutions of higher education ought to promote social cohesion. Is it necessary to have an institutional social culture? If it is necessary, does this not create conflicts in so far as making the institution of higher education a social rather than an academic site? I argue in this dissertation that in the given historical context of South Africa where policies and ideologies were made to advance the social segregation agenda, it is

important for institutions of higher education to advance social cohesion as part of the efforts to realize the new social order. In this regard therefore, social cohesion in the institutions of higher education falls within the broader goals of the ideal non-racial and non-discriminatory society pronounced in the constitution of South Africa (Cross, 2004). The theme of student body diversity cannot be limited to demographic reflection, but to the facilitation of social cohesion values and norms.

There is a dilemma that is related to the core business of the institutions of higher education in as far as social cohesion is concerned. The aims of higher education transformation are given in broad terms that higher education should be transformed to achieve the demands of the new social order. “In South Africa today, the challenge is to redress past inequalities and transform the higher education system to serve the new social order, meet pressing national needs and to respond to new realities and opportunities” (Department of Education, 1997, p. 2). It is from a conceptual analysis and understanding of these terms like national needs and new realities that institutions of higher education can take the forms in terms of what needs to be emphasized within the institutional culture.

From my view, there are two perspectives that are embedded within institutions of higher education namely. Firstly, institutions of higher education can be regarded as social formation sites. The second perspective is that they can also be regarded as academic sites. The social formation site posits that, higher education institutions can be places where students acquire social norms that will enable them to interact with other people with discrimination.

The institution as a social site formation perspective regards educational institutions as places where social values and principles are imparted. In the context of a diversified student body, the assumption is that a student acquires social values of tolerating, trusting and relating to those who are different from him or her in terms of race and language. In addition, a diversified student body may be a strategic and conducive environment where the student’s social cultural scope is widened as he or she interacts with many other different students.

On the other hand, higher education institutions as academic sites is a perspective that sees institutions of higher education as places that imparts scientific knowledge, literacy and industrial skills acquisitions so as to meet the economic needs of the society (Woodrooffe, 2011).

Institutions of higher education from this view are primarily to empower the students so that they contribute to the economic development of the country. The basic function of institutions is the acquisition of academic knowledge that will assist students to widen their chances of securing better job opportunities.

These conflicting positions inform the imperatives of student body diversity. I must point out that in most instances, this distinction between social and economic site is not as clear cut as this exposition has attempted to suggest. Usually, there is interplay of the two positions; however, in most cases these positions determine the outcome of the process of education. If one adopts the position of institutions as social formation sites, it could become easier to locate the need for social cohesion as a social objective of transformation of higher education. However, the position of institutions as academic sites does priorities the notion of diverse students accessing higher education, mainly for academic qualifications.

Drawing from the two contra-positions, the contest here centers on making institutions academic community or social community. Academic community is a level where the primary focal point in the institutions is academic studies for marketability in the employment. Student within the academic community can share all the facilities that an institution offers without sharing the social forms of life. Within the academic community, the end is knowledge as a private good. On the other hand the social community shares social norms, behaviors and values. Social forms could be shared in terms of cultural clubs, sporting codes, political groups, student council organizations and other social clubs that are found within the institution. While acknowledging this distinction between social and academic community may be ambiguous, this has a bearing in so far as social cohesion is concerned. Social cohesion demands that institutions go beyond academics to develop social values that may bind the student body in its diversity. These positions have implications on whether institutions can enforce social cohesion.

4.7.3 Institutional capacity to enforce social cohesion norms

The capacity to enforce social cohesion in the institutions of higher education may be compromised by the inadequacy of authority on the part of institutional management. The norms of social cohesion require social regulation; they need some form of authority that oversees

students adhere to these norms. However, a dilemma arises here in the sense while an authoritative ‘policing’ figure for social cohesion is needed, this can violate the students whose primary objective is to acquire academic knowledge. There is therefore a conflict between management as academics and management as custodians of norms of institutional culture. There is a link again with the contest on institutions either as social formation site or academic institution.

In the post-1994 context of South Africa, the governance of institutions of higher education is caught in a dilemma of promoting high quality of education and promoting the vision of social cohesion. It is acknowledged that higher education can be a vehicle to assist in the construction of the new social order. For instance, it is affirmed that “education should ensure a minimal foundation of internalized values in all members of the society’ (Heyting, Kruithof and Mulder, 2002, p. 381). The internalized values of social cohesion that includes racial and language integration are of paramount importance in the institutions of South African higher education. In as much as social cohesion is needed, it becomes a dilemma if one could enquire whether it is the obligation of the institutional management to enforce social cohesion. Are the people in the management of institutions employed primarily to see to it that the diverse body of students is socially coherent or that the students graduate? While the economic needs like imparting the scientific knowledge in order to meet the demands of the new social order are critical, the legacy of racial and language fragmentation also need urgent attention in the form of social cohesion dictates.

The dilemma on the institutional capacity borders on two critical areas within the management of the institutions of higher education. Firstly, this arises from the basic question of the role of the institutional management in the sense that the management usually views their primary role as that of ensuring that institution produces academics that are relevant and fit for the economic needs of the nation. This duty entails that management concentrates on the adherence on institutional structural culture. The outcome of producing for instance, technological and engineering graduates determines how the management runs the institution. In this way, anything may be considered to fall outside the parameters of education for economic needs are given peripheral attention. Discussing the merger between the University of North West and Potchefstroom University of Christian higher education, Woodrooffe notes that, “university

officials decided to use three official languages – Setswana, English and Afrikaans as mediums of instructions and to conduct official university business” (Woodrooffe, 2011, p. 177). While institutions may intend to promote multilingualism, it becomes challenging for the university management to enforce languages that may not be used for engineering lectures. The institution of higher education may not force students to learn these three languages so as to ensure social cohesion. The difficulties that are associated with social cohesion institutional policy intentions and the reality as continual racial and language fragmentation may be partly due to the fact that institutional management is caught up in the dilemma of the conflict inherent within their roles.

4.8 Concluding remarks

It is a conclusive observation that transforming the student body from what it was under apartheid to the post-1994 higher education landscape is a process not a once off event brought into reality by policies. Within this process, it is of significance to note and acknowledge the progress that has been achieved in changing the social composition of institutions of higher education. Numerically the racial and language groups are now reflecting the demographic reality of the broader society. However, the discourse of this chapter has raised the point that laying too much emphasis on numbers has inadvertently led to negligence on the level of practices and values. It becomes a problem therefore, when racism and language discrimination persist in the new order. It becomes also an issue that needs redress when students deliberately avoid mingling and socializing with those who are not of their race. It is an observable phenomenon in the institutions of higher education that for instance, students as if its natural, move in groups according to race and language groups. It has also come to the fore that attempting to break this pattern through socially cohesive practices leads to dilemmas. What kind of model of transformation that can strike a balance between individual values and community values? It is the assertion in this dissertation that these dilemmas can be narrowed to ideologies of comprehensive liberalism and political communitarianism.

CHAPTER FIVE

COMPREHENSIVE LIBERALISM

5.0 Introduction

The ideology of comprehensive liberalism is applied in this dissertation to understand how individuals create space for themselves in a society. The individual is generally at the center of comprehensive liberalism as it grants him or her rights. The main theme of this chapter, therefore, is to explore and discuss comprehensive liberalism in so far as it relates to transformation of the society. The primary reason for this discussion is to ultimately appreciate the dilemmas that arise in the attempt to realize social cohesion in the institutions of higher education in South Africa. It is envisaged that through this discussion of comprehensive liberalism, its sufficiency or insufficiency to meet the social goals of student body diversity will be exposed. The relation between comprehensive liberalism and social transformation is given due attention in this chapter. Since comprehensive liberalism is a derivative of the general liberalism tradition, the focus in the first subsection is on the general features of liberalism.

5.1 Interpretations of liberalism

Liberalism is a concept that has many different interpretations depending on what one puts emphasis on. This makes the endeavor to come up with a clear definition seem elusive. The problem of attempting a definition of liberalism is the question of what to include and exclude. However, what seem to be generally applicable to different interpretations is that its core emphasis is on how individual ideas affect behavior, the equality and liberty of individuals. The protection of individuals from excessive state regulation is the other basic tenet of liberalism. These key concepts of liberalism will be given due attention in the following subsections. The interpretations of liberalism are drawn from the classical and liberal democracy.

The classical liberalism is associated with Locke who argued for the individual autonomy by stating that “men are born free to order their actions and dispose their possessions and persons as they see fit” (Stumpf, 1993, p. 293). The essential feature of classical liberalism is the individual

and private property. There is an emphasis on private property as that which man acquires through his labor. To the extent that ownership of private property is based on acquisition, private property is exclusive. The impression that one gets in classical liberalism is individuals are so disconnected the most important matter is ownership of private property. There is no degree of commonality in any way, since an individual prioritizes what he or she considers essential to meet his or her needs.

On the other hand, liberal democracy is a version of liberalism that upholds the basic liberties of the individual. Furthermore, it recognizes that such individual basic liberties are above the collective members of a society. The individual is accorded his basic rights that include freedom of association, speech, private property rights and is not supposed to be exposed to illegal incarceration. In national affairs, individuals have the right to choose their political leaders through a process of casting a vote in a ballot. One could say that in this interpretation of liberalism, the individual is given these basic rights in order to protect him from the abuse from the majority. These basic rights are sometimes referred to as civil liberties. The liberal democratic dispensation chiefly occupies itself with the concern of establishing and putting in place political values that can be shared by diverse groups within institutions. In addition, liberalism affirms that “all members of the society have rights that protect them against each other and against the arbitrary state” (Dryzek & Dunleavy, 2009, p.23).

Despite all the above different versions of liberalism, I find Colburn (2010)’s version to be satisfactory. Colburn notes that “liberalism is the political philosophy that is committed to the promotion of individual autonomy” (Colburn, 2010, p. 1). Individual autonomy is one of the fundamental features of liberalism as it stands in contrast to other political ideologies. It advocates the centrality of the rational individual who possess the inalienable property of freedom to choose the way he or she wants to live life. It is in this understanding of liberalism, that comprehensive is located.

5.2 Comprehensive liberalism

Perhaps in order to appreciate comprehensive liberalism, one needs a general overview of political liberalism. Waldron defines political liberalism as an ideology “that insists that the

articulation and defense of a given set of liberal commitments for a society should not depend on any particular theory of what gives value or meaning to human life” (Waldron, 2002, p. 91).

Though there are laid down precepts, political liberalism maintains that there should be no mono-approach to points of reference. I do get the impression that political liberalism tries to avoid the imposition of an objective theory on the critical constituents of liberalism. For the advocates of this, it is best when it is left to the individual on what it means to be committed to a liberal value.

Now turning to comprehensive liberalism, all values and practices that an individual holds in his independence from the others are of importance. Comprehensive liberalism is a derivative from the liberal tradition. Waldron contends that comprehensive liberalism advocates that, “it is impossible to adequately defend and elaborate liberal commitments except by invoking the deeper values and commitments associated with some or comprehensive philosophy” (Waldron, 2002, p. 92). The comprehensive liberalism requires the individual to abide by the basic tenets of liberalism. However, it should always be noted that this commitment to a theoretical set of liberalism is ultimately aimed to serve the individual as he takes precedence over any other constituent of the society.

This section has shown that the focal point liberalism is the individual. Attached to this, is his or her property that is acquired through labor. Comprehensive liberalism goes on to allocate the individual with civil liberties that entitle him or her to expression, association and the press. This subsection has given a general overview of the classical to the comprehensive understanding of liberalism. It has come out that differences in these interpretations can be narrowed to points of emphasis. For instance, classical liberalism puts emphasis on the individual’s natural rights to freedom and the acquisition of private property. On the other hand, the liberal democracy brings the point that the individual is demanding his or her rights from others. In this dissertation, liberalism is discussed from a comprehensive perspective. Comprehensive as already noted embraces all the facets of the individual life. One could discuss it in education, since this also forms part of the life of the individual.

5.3 The key constituents of comprehensive liberalism

There are key constituents of comprehensive liberalism. In this dissertation, they are referred to as key constituents because they form the basis upon which comprehensive liberalism distinguishes itself from other political ideologies. These are individual liberty, individual good, concept of equality and minimal state. I now turn my attention to each before I offer a critical appraisal of these concepts.

5.3. 1 Concept of individual liberty

The concept of individual liberty is arguably the chief component of comprehensive liberalism. In some literature, liberty is used interchangeably with freedom (Barry, 2000,). In this dissertation, I am also applying these two words in the same sense. Liberty is the absence of outside controlling influences, constraints and coercions (Thayer-Bacon, 2006). For Barry, an individual is free “to the extent that his or her actions and choices are not impeded by the actions of others” (Barry, 2000, p. 191). A situation where constraints are absent and the individual can carry out his or her decision without external influences is in this way regarded as an indicator mark of liberty.

The conceptual incoherence of defining individual liberty as the absence of constraints or coercion is evident when one takes into account the objectives of liberty. In the absence of constraints, what does the individual do with his liberty? Is it a guarantee that when individuals are given liberty they will pursue goals that do not bring harm to one self? In an attempt to ‘resolve’ the dilemma that is created by the issue of constraints, reference is made to the two concepts approach to liberty as propounded by Berlin. In the two concepts approach, liberty is either viewed from a negative or positive approach.

Berlin describes negative freedom or liberty to refer to a context where an individual is free *from* interferences, obstacles or impediments that may be imposed on him by any given structure. What is of defining importance in negative liberty is the “area within which the subject – a person or group of persons – is or should be left to do or be without interference by other persons” (Berlin, 1995, p. 92). Thayer-Bacon argues that “freedom *from*, focusses on individual rights as natural rights and emphasizes the need to protect those natural rights, for they belong to

individuals prior to the formation of political governments and social relations” (Thayer-Bacon, 2006, p.20). This suggestion gives an explanation that negative freedom gives priority to individual over the state. In other words, the individual comes prior to the state. For Mill, negative freedom is an indispensable right of an individual as he argues that “it is the right of mankind to pursue that to which their will directs them without obstruction from an outside force” (Stillwagon, 2011, p.352). This freedom is realized as a result of other people or social structures ceasing to impose any restrictions or obstructions on an individual so that he or she is able to pursue the possibilities that may be available to him or her. This entails that structural oppressive tendencies that deny freedom to an individual are removed.

On the notion of positive liberty, Berlin contends that this “derives from the wish on the part of the individual to be his own master” (ibid). The decisions on the discourse of one’s life are determined and carried out by that person without some external pressure. Positive liberty is in this way, a freedom *for* some action that needs to be accomplished. What are individuals free for? When they are granted liberty, what are they supposed to do with? These are the questions that one can draw and formulate from the positive freedom as explained by Berlin.

Within comprehensive liberalism, when an individual is said to possess liberty, he or she will be unrestrained by external coercive influences. In other words, there are no barriers that can either limit or deprive one of liberty. Attached to individual liberty is the capacity to self-governance, which implies implementing decisions that correspond to one’s preferences in life. Self-governance refers to a situation where individuals are able to choose and act in a ways that they consider to meet their desired outcomes.

From the above description, one gets the impression that this type of liberty is inconsiderate of other individuals. Where are the limits of such individual liberty? In the institutions of higher education, is it an exercise of individual liberty when students are engaged in social practices that discriminate on race and language group? In this given context, under what circumstances is it justifiable to curtail an individual’s liberty? It is these associated questions that form the theoretical contradictions present in the concept of individual liberty.

5.3.2 Concept of individual good

The individual good is exclusively that which is designed to meet the intentions of the individual. It is exclusive to the extent that its attainment, consumption and disposal are at the dictates and in accordance with the individual. For example, higher education can be viewed as an individual good when the individual student desires it for the sake of meeting exclusive benefits.

The individual good is closely linked to the concept of individual liberty as discussed above. The link is apparent when consideration is given to the fact that an individual with liberty presumably chooses what is good for him or her (Narveson, 2003). The values that individual upholds are designed to achieve his good. An individual student within the diverse body holds social values that he or she judges as essential in achieving higher education. Similarly, this is also applicable to values that are in accordance with choice of a group to socialize or not socialize with. However, what is of significance about the individual good is that it is dictated by information or social education. In other words, it is not something that is static, but can be altered with the availability of information. This point on permutations of information or social education on individual good is discussed further in the last chapter of this dissertation.

5. 3.3 Concept of equality

Comprehensive liberalism puts emphasis on the concept of equality. Taking it from a literal perspective, equality poses a requirement that people should be accorded the same treatment. The supposition of equality is that there is a standard measure by which all individuals are dealt with. One could further argue that equality brings with it the concept of universality where that which applies to one individual, is applied to all. In some instances, this will be referred to as impartiality, which implies that there are no unmerited positions that individuals find themselves in. Impartiality that demands that all are fairly treated is a constituent of the concept of equality. The justification of ensuring that all are equal in treatment is that;

People's fate is determined by their choices, rather than their circumstances. If I am pursuing some personal ambition in a society that has equality of opportunity, then my success or failure will be determined by my performance, not by my race or class or sex (Kymlicka, 2002, p.58).

The concept of equality as described by Kymlicka removes social circumstances as determining factors to the individual's access to opportunity. Furthermore, whatever circumstances the individual may be in, equality as a constituent of comprehensive liberalism acts as a mechanism that affords everyone the chance to pursue that which they desire. What Kymlicka suggests is that, for instance, an individual who comes from a Zulu language group cannot be denied entry into an institution of higher education, because of the circumstantial fact that she or he is affiliated to that language group.

The above presentation of equality is simplistic given the contentious issues that surround this concept. There are two objections that can be raised against the concept of equality. The first objection is the criteria that can be employed to determine the marginalized who need to be 'uplifted' so equality is achieved. Clayton suggests that "equality requires individuals to assess whether they are disadvantaged compared to others in light of their own distinctive convictions" (Clayton, 2002, page 11). Consequently, referring to one's conviction as a determinant source of equality and inequality is a contradiction in terms. Equality cannot be reduced to a subjective process of determination. It has to be objective rather than relative, since it should contain a general standard.

The second objection to equality is that it can ultimately lead to the pitfalls of egalitarian liberalism. Egalitarian liberalism is characteristically marked by the need to create equal opportunities for all individuals. It becomes the task of the state to "offer all citizens their autonomy and live up to the egalitarian promises giving them respect" (Pistone, 2010, p. 1). Egalitarianism makes equality to become a distributive principle, thus the presupposition is that there are political liberties that have to be shared equally among individuals. To this end, Rawls's conception of equality is crucial for this dissertation. Though the Rawlsian conception will be given attention in this chapter, it is worthy to note that, for him, equality was the necessary condition to be attached to individuals.

In conclusion, my view is that the concept of equality is contentious. Equality implicitly requires that there is a conventional standard that is used to determine those who have more and those who have less. Once this has been determined then the process of sharing that may result in equality is instituted. This makes the establishment of equality rather difficult.

5.3.4 Concept of the minimal role of the state

The advocates of comprehensive liberalism argue that in order for people to enjoy their liberty, there should be a minimal role of the state in the affairs that concern the individual. Thayer-Bacon observes that, “political philosophers such as Locke and Rousseau argue that the role of the state is to protect the individuals from others, otherwise to stay out of individuals’ lives and allow them to live as freely as they choose” (Thayer-Bacon, 2006, p. 19). The state is ultimately is reduced to be a passive observer to the conduct of the individuals.

The minimal role of the state as advanced by comprehensive liberals is an indicator of how they value the individual liberty over and above anything else. In situations where the state tries to abuse individuals through policies and legislations, the concept of minimal state may curtails this by the protection of the individual liberties. However, a theoretical contradiction that is present in this concept is the presupposition of the state within comprehensive liberalism is a suggestion that individuals are not loosely connected. The state is a collection of individuals who to some extent are willing to forego their individuality and congregate to form a state. The implicit contradiction that is found here is that for a state to be formed, it requires individuals who are active participants, yet this could mean that they have to give up their liberty in order to join.

5.4 A critique of the constituents of comprehensive liberalism

The above subsections have shown that what underlies comprehensive liberalism is the individual. The centrality of the individual is stretched to the extent that some scholars in their critique of comprehensive liberalism have labeled this as ‘excessive individualism’ that has no strong connections with the other members of the society (Colburn, 2010, Stewart, 1995). Individualism can either be a positive or a negative feature within this political ideology. It is positive when it leads individuals to live productive lives, whose ripple effects are beneficial to the broader society albeit loosely connected. Conversely, individualism can be negative when it becomes exclusive to the extent that the realization of building a society becomes non-feasible.

Comprehensive liberals employ the term ‘coercion’ as an indicator of the presence or absence of liberty. This term is rather ambiguous. Berlin contends that, “coercion is the deliberate interference of other human beings within the area in which I could otherwise act” (Berlin, 1997,

p. 91). To be coerced in this regard, possibly means the presence of some form of a persuasive power that makes an individual act in a manner that otherwise he would not have acted, had this persuasive power been absent. In this dissertation, however, a distinction is made between what would be termed constructive and destructive coercion. Such a distinction is crucial so that it becomes clear that coercion does not always negate an individual's liberty but in some instances can also enhance it.

Constructive coercion is when a persuasive power is availed and enables the individual to make preferences that make his or her life better. This power tends towards the individual good. To construct in this instance means to build an individual's life. Constructive coercion is for, example, the educational campaign that encourage individual students to attain higher education so that their chances of securing better employment increased. Taking into account the advocates of comprehensive liberalism, coercion would imply that an individual would not have made a choice to pursue higher education had its benefits not been made available to him or her in terms of information (Lessnoff, 1999).

Destructive coercion is the persuasive power that forces an individual to make choices that are not beneficial to his or her good. Destructive coercion negates the individual good. Accordingly, destructive liberty is "any use of coercion that infringes upon an individual's control of her person or property and thereby abrogates the basic condition for the emergence of mutually beneficial social interactions" (Mack and Gaus, 2004 p.116). I regard engaging in discriminatory social practices as destructive coercion.

5.5 Comprehensive liberal model of social transformation

With the above discussion on key concepts, the search for a comprehensive liberal model for social transformation can be explored in this subsection. This dissertation in dealing with social transformation, has already noted that societies undergo radical processes of change owing to social values and norms. While social transformation can either result in a negative or positive change, in this dissertation, the latter is adopted. It is a positive change that relates to comprehensive liberalism. The quest in this subsection is to relate comprehensive liberalism and social transformation as an effort towards an alternative model.

The central point of comprehensive liberalism is the individual. To this end, the liberal equality as propounded by Rawls is appropriate in the discussion of the individual that participate in the process of social transformation. This is primarily because for Rawls, in order to realize social change then individuals have to seek their good as they enter the new social order (Rawls, 1998, 190). The initial point to enter new social order is a position of fairness that is characterized by a veil of ignorance. From this hypothetical situation where individuals do not know what they stand to benefit, Rawls that maintains rational people will choose two principles as the basis of the new social order. Rawls notes;

Firstly, each person has an equal right to the most extensive schemes of equal basic liberties compatible with a similar scheme of liberties. Secondly social and economic inequalities are to meet two conditions: they must be (a) to the greatest expected benefit of the least advantaged (b) attached to offices and positions open to all under conditions of fair opportunities (Rawls, 1995, 212).

With the above overview of Rawls' liberal equality, there are constitutive elements that can be used to transform a society. Firstly, there is individual liberty as denoted by the explanation that the two principles are chosen by rational individuals. Choice or preference is an inseparable tenet of liberal equality. The converse of this argument is that individuals are moving from a state where they were denied the chance to make individual choices.

Secondly, when one follows the arrangement of the new social order as advocated by Rawls, individuals are accorded all the basic liberties, "which are the pattern of rights and duties, powers and liabilities established by a practice" (Rawls, 1998, p. 188). The supposition is that they are moving from a state where basic liberties were not guaranteed. There is always an argument in comprehensive liberalism that social stability is only guaranteed when individuals have all the necessary liberties that enable them to pursue life interests. When individuals are denied basic liberties, then chances are that the new social order may not be sustained.

Within liberal equality, the society can be transformed on the basis of the justification to attain the individual good. Rawls' argument for individual good is that individuals "know their own interests more or less accurately" (Rawls, 1998, p.189). Social transformation is in this context motivated and determined by what individuals stand to benefit in the new social order.

5.6 Post-1994 South African comprehensive liberal higher education construction

In the general understanding, comprehensive liberalism refers to the political system which prioritizes individual rights. With this in mind, it follows logically that a comprehensive liberal society is one in which individual rights comes prior to the collective. Given this background on comprehensive liberalism, one could argue that the social context in which the student body diversity theme for social cohesion is discussed in this dissertation is a comprehensive liberal democratic dispensation. The first democratic elections in South Africa in 1994 marked the end of legislated racial and language fragmentation and the beginning of comprehensive liberalism. (Bunting, 2002). The implication is that the post-1994 social order was characteristically liberal. Mickelson, Nkomo and Smith argue that;

The abolishing of apartheid in South Africa meant that after almost a half-century of state-sanctioned white supremacy and ethnic separation in virtually every public institution, South Africa was now officially envisioning itself as a democratic, ethnically (and racially) diverse society striving to eliminate ethnic and gender privilege (Mickelson, Nkomo and Smith, 2001, p. 2).

South Africa, therefore, identified itself with democracy and set out to uphold democratic principles as the indispensable political norms. The beginning of democracy is in this way the starting point of the construction of the new social order.

The characteristics of this new social order in South Africa manifested themselves in the form of human dignity, a non-racial and a non-discriminatory nation (Napier, Lebeta and Zungu, 2000). These values that were to be the benchmarks of a democratic social order were all contained in the new constitution that was to govern the democratic nation. A democratic nation could be referred to as based on a system of governance that upholds the civic rights of the individuals who compose such a nation. The South African comprehensive liberal society was to be constructed on the basis of individual rights, and an end to institutionalize racial and language segregation. Consequently, it contained aspects of individual liberties that guaranteed equality.

The second notion of comprehensive liberalism acknowledges individual student liberties, but also attaches and locates individual student freedom within a social context. Student body diversity will imply that individual students are located within the broader social student body. The institution of higher education can become not only a place where the individual student can

acquire academic credentials but also accrue social norms and values. Such acquisition of social norms is made possible by the realization that higher education is both an academic and social vantage point.

The comprehensive liberalism that recognizes the individual student as located within the society acknowledges that rights beyond individual space. A University of Witwatersrand student, for example is a member of the broader social group that is referred to as the institution. Individual student rights are by no means subsumed by the mere fact that the student belongs to the broader social institution of the university. There is recognition that in an institution of higher education in which these individual student rights are protected, there is diversity in terms of racial and language groupings. McDonough and Feinberg affirm that “by creating conditions of equality, freedom and tolerance for the diverse ways of life, liberalism facilitates different forms of group recognition and affirmation” (McDonough & Feinberg, 2003, p. 393). This brings the possibility that within comprehensive liberalism, individual students can still uphold their individual rights, while at the same time establishing interactions with fellow students from other race and language groups.

The role of the state is to protect the individual rights and groups (racial, cultural) that individuals belong to. The neutrality of the state can be demonstrated by the role it plays in the transformation policy formulation and implementation. In South Africa, the state, “decided which social expectations and needs to include in the higher education agenda and how to include them” (Cloete, 2002, 24). However, the post-1994 state took a liberal approach, whereby it assumed a supervisory role to both the process and implementation of the policies of transformation. The state did not dictate terms so as to come up with a predetermined outcome as was the case with the apartheid government. The comprehensive liberal approach is to target the individual, to offer him freedom through transforming structures that defined students in terms of racial and language groupings.

Rawls’s theory of justice that seems to come out of his notion of comprehensive liberalism does contain the notion that individual freedom has social attachments. He sets out to “defend some general principles governing the basic structure of the society” (Waldron, 2011, p. 774). In order to come up with fair principles that will govern the society in a manner that gives individuals basic liberties. Rawls’ hypothetical situation of the original position is characterized by

ignorance (Meadon, 2009). The presence of ignorance of what individuals stand to benefit in the new social order is a necessary condition for justice as fairness. Rawls was of the idea that “all social primary goods – liberty and opportunity, income and wealth, and the bases of self-respect – are to be distributed equally unless distribution of any or all these goods is to the advantage of the least favored” (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 55). In accordance with this theory, resources are to be distributed to individuals on an equal basis.

According to Rawls, firstly the individual is to be accorded all basic freedoms that correspond to freedoms that others also hold. The second principle is that;

Social and economic inequalities are to satisfy two conditions, first they are to be attached to offices and positions open to all under conditions of fair equality of opportunity and second, they are to be of the greatest benefit of the least-advantaged members of the societies (Rawls, 1995, 213).

It is these principles that Rawls advances as binding the individuals who form the social structure of the new social order. What this implies is that individuals’ rights and preferences are prior to the society. The formation of the society is therefore based on the agreed principles that satisfy individual aspirations and objectives in the new social order.

Dworkin defines liberty “as the absence of constraints placed by a government upon what a man might do if he wants to” (Dworkin, 1995, p. 184). What is essential according to Dworkin is that in the construction of a society, the government’s core business is to remove the impediments to man’s freedom. It is the assumption within the new democratic dispensation that institutionalized discrimination on race and language came to an end with the end of apartheid. The state removes constraints taking into account the fact that man has a right to basic liberties. The right to liberty to attend higher education institutions of one’s choice is implicit in the student body diversity theme for social cohesion. However, this could bring the contestations that surround transformation. Is transformation only regarded as such because it involves the removal of constraints to freedom? One could argue that apartheid policies were equally a transformative since they gave liberty to people to do what they want, albeit sectional population.

The political settlement of 1994 that ushered in democracy was a movement from the minority to the majority rule. This was a transition from a government that basically respected the minority racial rights over and above the majority to a new dispensation where all citizens were now

afforded equal rights. The new social order seems to give primary importance to the individual liberties as the bedrock upon which its political structure rests.

5.7 Comprehensive liberalism in Higher Education institutions

The individual students who are members of institutions of higher education possess comprehensive liberalism. This contention arises because students are entering an institution with their values, perceptions and norms. It is these values that form the criteria of who they establish relations with and who not to. As noted earlier in this dissertation, higher education institutions have comparatively higher diversity in terms of race and language. It is with this background that a discussion is made on the comprehensive liberalism in the institutions of higher education. The supposition is that institutions are liberal to the extent that it is not their business to get involved in the social values of the individuals as long as they do not interfere and infringe others.

In the post-1994 era, South African institutions of higher education became comprehensive liberal institutions as they ceased to be instruments of propagating divisive policies. Under apartheid, institutions of higher education were said to be instrumentalist because their “core business was to be the dissemination and generation of knowledge for a purpose defined or determined by the socio-political agenda” (Bunting, 2002, p. 66). The socio-political agenda of apartheid was the promotion of racial and language group fragmentation (of which many institutions of higher education participated in). In the transformed education system, the aim is to facilitate social cohesion. This shift in terms of the political framework of institutions of higher education is significant for this dissertation. In view of such significance, the dilemmas for social cohesion in the student body can be appreciated with the given political ideology that the institutions hold. Institutions of higher education became comprehensive liberal institutions to reflect broader South African society had equally become a comprehensive liberal democratic society.

In order for higher education institutions to fit in the new social order and receive social legitimacy, they had to change their social composition from racially and language homogeneity to multi-racial. According to Jansen, “universities were preoccupied with asserting autonomy

against the constant interventions of the apartheid state to regulate and maintain racially and ethnically separate universities” (Jansen, 2004, p.296). This need to change is explicit when one considers the implications of the theme of student body diversity. Student body diversity entails that universities were now accessible to all individual students irrespective of their race. “Transformation of higher education system must reflect the changes that are taking place in our society and to strengthen the values and practices that are taking place in our society” (Department of Education, 1997, p 3).

Transformation initiated the creation of universities as mini-societies, since they had to uphold the comprehensive liberal values as enunciated in the transformation imperatives. Transformation is claimed to be democratic in nature as Harber contends that “the government has introduced policies which are more democratic in terms of both access and provision by ending the principle of racial segregation” (Harber, 1998, p.571). Accordingly, transformation of higher education seems to be about numerical change in terms of racial and language group composition and language, but to create cohesive social institutions of higher education. Such social creation began with the observation that, “traditionally “white” institutions have increased the participation of “black” students previously excluded from their campuses or present only as small minorities” (Mckinney & Pletzen, 2004, p. 159). It is in accepting all races and language groups that transformation resulted in the creation of multi-racial and lingual institutions of higher education. The once predominantly one race and language group universities disappeared with the repealing of the student body diversity theme. A new society has, therefore, been created in the higher education institutions.

The contention in this dissertation is that transformation consequently created institutions that employed comprehensive liberalism. This meant that, unlike pre-1994 where institutions of higher education were purveyors of apartheid social value, they can no longer force individual students to accept and live by social values that are dictated by the state. Liberal comprehensive institutions are in this context an end product of comprehensive liberalism that begun in 1994. While diversification of the student body might have been realized, social cohesion becomes problematic. This is because there are several elements of comprehensive liberalism that are not compatible with social cohesion as is shown later in this dissertation.

In liberal comprehensive institutions of higher education individual liberties for the student are upheld. The individual student's rights to self-determination and their value system may not be infringed upon by the collective structures within institutions of higher education. According to Pistone, "every individual can basically live their own lives as long as they do not interfere with another's freedom" (Pistone, 2010, p.172). There are no external constraints to be imposed on the individual student. Such liberties are extended to group affiliation as individual students in their freedom and informed choices can relate to any language and racial group they so like. Comprehensive liberal transformation of higher education could be, therefore, viewed as an attempt "to construct a model of public order spacious enough to secure maximum freedom for everyone" (Legutko, 2008, p. 9). The maximization of individual students to have access to institutions of their choice, who they want to interact with and not interact with, becomes the benchmark of the comprehensive liberal transformation of higher education institutions. So there is ambiguity between choosing a racial and language group to associate with and the idea of discrimination. How does one separate the two?

In the comprehensive liberal set up, the institutional management's minimal role is to ensure that individual students are afforded all the chances necessary so that they achieve academic success. In this way, liberties to mingle and relate to their racial and language groups are respected by the institutional management. Consequently, the institutions of higher education cannot "invade" the individual space to force him or her to break the racial and language barriers. In this regard, it is argued that "color blind" approach is adopted as a sign of state neutrality towards all citizens. It is presumed that from this approach there is a possibility of fair treatment of citizens without necessarily regarding their racial or language groups (Issak, 2010, Kymlicka, 2002). Within comprehensive liberal university the emphasis is on individual rights such as liberty, equality and association.

5.8 The tension between comprehensive liberalism and social cohesion

The preceding section has shown that transformation of higher education in South Africa resulted in the formation of liberal social institutions of higher education. Such liberal formation was in tandem with the broader liberal political ideology that was adopted at the collapse of apartheid in 1994. Liberal transformation of higher education created and enabled higher

education institutions to be spaces that were available to all race groups. However, transformation at the level of structures (racial composition of institutions of higher education) was not sufficient and an end in itself. Such insufficiency is clear, taking into consideration the fact that higher education institutions were meant to promote the social values of a new social order.

There are seemingly contradictions that exist between comprehensive liberalism and social cohesion. The need for social cohesion pronounced through the White Paper on Education (1997) notes that, “transformation requires that all existing practices, institutions and values are viewed and rethought in terms of their fitness to the new era” (Department of Education, 1997, p 2). The existing practices that the transformed education system needed to address those that were prevalent under a fragmented higher education system in the apartheid era. These practices have to do with racial and language discrimination. The Ministerial Committee on Social Cohesion (2008) for instance, identified racism as the biggest threat to social cohesion. This committee notes that;

While racism, like other forms of discrimination, is based on prejudices, and fear, what distinguishes it is the ideology of white supremacy, which serves as a rationale (Department of Education, 2008, p.3).

When one takes into account that race was used as an instrument of division and the propagation of the apartheid system of governance, it becomes logical that post-1994 identified it not only as a threat to social cohesion, but to the political stability of multi-racial institutions of higher education.

Given this background, the first contradiction that arises in an attempt to foster social cohesion in a comprehensive liberal institution of higher education is the methodology of socialization. The institutional environment is an outcome of the process where students as participants are involved (Niemann, 2010). Considering the values that are within an institution, the process of socialization becomes the mechanisms by which social environments are constructed within the institution. The point is that within the comprehensive liberal set-up of the institutional social culture, it is rather challenging to foster socialization of the previous racially fragmented institution.

The difficulty comes about in trying to find a way of imparting social cohesive values without infringing on the individual rights of association that students hold in a comprehensive liberal institution. Socialization here involves the process of inculcating the multi-racial and lingual student body with social values that will enable them to interact, respect, tolerate and relate to language and racial diversity. These values are necessary for social cohesion that sees transformation going beyond racial and language numerical composition to the creation of a non-racial social order. There is therefore, a tension between creating and sustaining the individual space and the social space within the comprehensive liberal institutions. Transformation of higher education is designed to rectify both the individual and social spaces that were defined in terms of race and language group.

The relevance of social cohesion presupposes in the past there was social incoherence. The values of social cohesion include social integration, social inclusion, common identity and participative community. Social cohesion has elements of interactions that eventually bring about a degree of belonging to the group (Mann, 1970). Ultimately, social cohesion is constituted by a feeling of attachment or sense of belonging to the group.

The point of contention is that in order for social cohesion to be realized within the comprehensive liberal institution, the student needs to develop a set of values that enables him or her to cooperate within the broader community of the institution. Stanley notes that the other characteristic of social cohesion is that it is a “total sum over a population of individuals’ willingness to cooperate with each other without coercion in the complex set of social relations needed by individuals to complete their life courses” (Stanley, 2010, p.). Social cohesion explained in this way may mean that individual students are required to willingly to form a higher education institution community.

The second contradiction that arises in the comprehensive liberal institutions as they attempt to foster social cohesion is the mechanism of breaking the underlying racial and language group superiority. Individual students may possibly still identify themselves more as belonging to a racial and language group rather than the broader social community of higher education. Transformation’s intended outcome is to create a non-discriminatory society within the institutions of higher education. However, Tabane and Human-Vogel note that such a creation of non-discriminatory society is caught up with the inherent contradictions that exist between the

individual and the group. They argue that creation of the new social order is “informed by a desire to overcome the divisions of apartheid past by pursuing policies and strategies that will promote the achievement of social cohesion without denying space for various identities” (Tabane and Human-Vogel, 2010, p. 1). Without the social cohesion within the student body, transformation of higher education can be reduced to demographic transformation. Unfortunately, “transformation could be reduced to a process of making space for black people to be represented in the structures of the institutions without the underlying make- up, culture and values of the institutions changing in a fundamental way” (Naidoo, 2010, p. 123). Racial and language groups have been a symbol of power or subordination in the South African history. Taking this into account, the implication is that institutions of higher education in the post-1994 era are confronted with the need to put to an end racial and language group identification that is motivated by power dominations.

The third challenge that arises in the context of comprehensive liberal institutions of higher education is that though they may have good internal policies for social cohesion, it is difficult for them to enforce them without becoming authoritarian. This in a way creates a situation where there is a mismatch between policy intention and what transpires daily in the campus life. Jansen in his inaugural speech at the University of Free State pronounces that, “every white student would learn to speak Sotho and every black student Afrikaans” (Jansen, 2009, p. 437). While language can be a powerful tool for social interaction across race, one wonders how the enforcement of such a rule can be realized. It is an individual right for a student to speak freely his or her language, yet in this case, learning and speaking other people’s language could bring students closer, thereby breaking racial group barrier. Language use is very critical, given the fact that under apartheid, institutions of higher education were not only divided along race, but were structured along language as well. There were institutions of higher education for Afrikaans (Rand Afrikaans University), English (University of Witwatersrand), Zulu (University of Zululand), as examples (Bunting, 2002). Diversity would imply that transformed institutions are both multi-racial and multi-lingual. Institutions could be having policies of learning different spoken languages, especially for medical students who in most cases will interact with patients of various languages, but it is rather difficult to implement such policies in a comprehensive liberal context.

5.9 Possibility of social cohesion within comprehensive liberal approach to social transformation

Transformation of higher education is part of the agenda of reordering the society, whereby such reordering implies the unification of a once fragmented society. Waghid notes that in education “numerous policy documents have been promulgated which chart out South Africa’s commitment to move away from its segregationist and racially divided political and educational past” (Waghid, 2002, p. 1). Transformation of higher education could be a way of social reconstruction. Higher education had to align with the political change that had taken place in the country and “education became an instrument for expressing the new social order’s values and achieving its goals” (Jonathan, 1997, 17). With this individual emphasis, this section will explore the possibility of social cohesion within the comprehensive liberal political ideology in so far as this could relate to the transformation of higher education in South Africa.

Comprehensive liberalism is located in the process of policy formulation of transforming higher education. The apartheid policies for higher education were unilaterally crafted by a government with the sole objective of instilling language and racial fragmentation. Bunting argues that, “the National Party government put in place legal constraints to prevent institutions designated for the use of one race group from enrolling students from another race group” (Bunting, 2002, 60). Therefore, apartheid policies for education were not done through the process of consulting and gathering different views from higher education stakeholders. It follows that there were not comprehensive liberal, but dictatorial as they emanated from the incumbent government alone. However, this differs with the post-1994 process of transformation in which the comprehensive liberal element was incorporated in the process of policy formulation through consultation. In attending to this, Badat notes that “the white paper on higher education was the outcome of a highly participatory and democratic process that succeeded in forging a national democratic consensus on the principles and goals of higher education” (Badat, 2004, p.23). This process of inviting different stakeholders in the drafting of new transformative policies for higher education could be related to the Rawls’ liberal equality discussed earlier in this dissertation.

One of the goals of higher education transformation is to change institutions that were composed of one race and language so that they can enroll students across these divides. According to

Badat, “the extent and pace of the deracialization of the student body and of many institutions must be a source of pride and celebrated as a considerable achievement” (Badat, 2004, p.20). Deracialization here implies that grouping individuals according to race and language is abolished and individual students could apply and gain access to higher education institutions on the basis of academic merit. Racialization of institutions of higher education was not only for structural and administrative purposes, but it had an underlying ideology. That ideology was of white superiority, which did not permit social interaction across the different races that constitute South Africa. Deracialization becomes therefore, a dismantling mechanism to the system of racial and language superiority or inferiority. In addition, deracialization could be a comprehensive liberal confrontation to institutional structural racism. In this dissertation the assertion is that student body diversity in as far as it promotes deracialization of higher education institutions, is applying the comprehensive liberalism ideology. It is for this reason that transformation of higher education is underpinned by the social principles of equality and addressing the past inequalities that were based on race and language (Department of Education, 1997).

The goal of social cohesion is integrating races and language groups that were separated in the apartheid era. Such integration is done at the level of common social values and norms. Taking into account comprehensive liberalism, there is recognition that the individual freedom is found within a social context. It is acknowledged that “all have the same capacity for self-governance, individually and as part of the community” (Silberman, 2010, p. 3). Bearing this social dimension of comprehensive liberalism, it follows that individuals must respect not only their rights, but the rights of others as well. Consequently, this should create a non-discriminatory society within the campus, where students respect each other’s racial differences. Sweet contends that;

Liberty must be held by all, it is an ideal which we may not restrict in application to men of one race, or creed, of one blood, or culture, denying it to all men of other races, other bloods and cultures (Sweet, 2010, p. 182).

This understanding of comprehensive liberalism may enable one to appreciate that individuality cannot be separated from the collective. Social cohesion is possible in this context where the

individual students understand and appreciate that what they consider as individual liberties are also liberties held by others.

5.10 Concluding remarks

Comprehensive liberalism concerns itself with the protection of fundamental individual human liberties. The basis for such a position is that human beings are supposed to possess equality. It is that equality that should enable them to receive fair and equal treatment from the state and its institutions. Consequently, comprehensive liberalism is incompatible with any form of discrimination. It is argued that “discrimination is a practice of ideas and beliefs that had the effect of sustaining unearned privilege and disadvantage of impeding groups from performing to their full potential” (Department of Education, 2008, p. 25). It is this practice of discrimination that was so evident in the apartheid era.

Transformation of higher education in South Africa, within the comprehensive liberal model attempted to rid racial and language discrimination, and by so doing created a new social order within the institutions of higher education. This chapter has shown that institutions became comprehensive liberal, as they began not only to admit diverse (racial and language) students on academic merit, but upheld their individual fundamental rights. While comprehensive liberalism can be conformity with the broader South African society, a dilemma is inadvertently created in institutions of higher education as they attempted to foster social cohesion. The post-1994 institutions of higher education had to promote social cohesion in order to address the ideology of racial and language discrimination as was the case in the apartheid era. Transformation that ends at structural level (numerical representation or demographic reflection) may not be enough in a country that inherited the legacy of racial and language fragmentation. It has been shown that whilst there could be some incompatibility between comprehensive liberalism and social cohesion, owing to liberalism’s emphasis on individuality, there are possibilities that comprehensive liberalism could facilitate social cohesion. Comprehensive liberalism could enhance social interactions across races. This is because one of the basic tenets of comprehensive liberalism is the ability to relate and tolerate racial and language differences. Evidently under apartheid, higher education created racial and language polarization, hostility and suspicions. It is, therefore, the submission of this chapter that the student body diversity theme could be

employed in the comprehensive liberal political dispensation to correct racial and language polarization, hostility and suspicions. The quest for this dissertation is to find an alternative model for student body diversity that will promote social cohesion on the argument that transformation needs to take place at the level of social values and principles, thus going beyond racial and language numerical representation which is often referred to a new social demographic reflection in the policies of transformation of higher education in the post-1994 era.

CHAPTER SIX

POLITICAL COMMUNITARIANISM

6.0 Introduction

The main objective of this chapter is to explore and establish the concept of community within the institutions of higher education in South Africa. In this regard, the variant conceptions of communitarianism are discussed as development towards political communitarianism. I chose to focus on political communitarianism because as noted earlier, the dilemmas that surround social cohesion in the institutions of higher education are of political ideological nature. Political communitarianism is discussed in as far as it relates to social cohesion in the institutions of higher education. This discussion looks firstly at the place of the individual within the community. The tension between an individual and community that has been noted in the previous chapter, takes another form in this chapter. After this, I will relate the common good and individual good since they are the determining factors of political communitarianism. The last parts of this chapter will relate the conceptions of political communitarianism to the process of social transformation as it occurred in the post-1994 era. This will culminate in the insertion of the debate on higher education's transformation towards the building up of the phenomenon of community in the institutions of higher education.

6.1 Conceptions of communitarianism

The general feature of communitarianism is the concern for a social order where individuals are collectively bound by a given set of social norms, values and practices (Isaak, 2011). It should be realized that these norms are held at the level of the community, so that all individuals become active participants. Isaak contends that, “communitarian philosophy seeks the active engagement of the individual in creating a healthy social condition where appropriate” (Isaak, 2011, p. 320). Individuals are engaged to the extent that there is something that they are actively involved in. To this end, a commitment towards keeping the social norms is ‘demanded’ from each participant so that the community is in that way kept in form.

Furthermore, Kymlicka also observes that, “communitarians are united by the belief that political philosophy must pay more attention to the shared practices and understandings within each society” (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 209). One could argue that taking from Kymlicka’s explanation of communitarianism, the debate should not so much be about whether people are bound in a given community, but about the very practices that define their community. That individuals live within a community is a given reality that needs little attention (Wiredu, 2008). Taking this into account, communitarianism is the practice of living out the community life that is structured along the conventional political norms.

The distinctive feature of communitarianism can be narrowed down to the social arrangement where the community is prior to the individual. In a communitarian arrangement the interests of the individual are inserted in the broader agenda of the community. The subordination of the individual autonomy may be interpreted as a denial of individual autonomy. However, Whipp argues, “communitarians do not deny the value of autonomy but shift the focus of political or public decision- making to the community as the foundation and meaning of authority” (Whipp, 2004, p. 119). It is from the above description of the communitarianism that the ideology of political communitarianism is drawn out.

To sum up this subsection, communitarianism is a political ideology that stresses an individual as a component of a given political community. Communitarianism therefore, advocates the thesis that what essentially binds people is not so much of the race or group language, but the political values and norms. Such political values can be designed to preserve the community in its present, or as means to attain the ideal community state. The political values in the community go beyond the confines of race or language barriers. For instance, in the new order of South Africa, access to higher education is a political value that extends beyond the racial or language barriers. The presence of political values is a necessary condition for the establishment of political community.

6.2 The conception of the political community

The basic feature of political communitarianism is a community that has common authoritative political values and norms. The essential component of a political community is the

establishment of political values that are designed to protect the community (Whipp, 2004). In this dissertation, political community is discussed with the background of a social composition that is diverse. One could posit a political community that has white, black or Indian students (race), or Zulu, Sotho, or English (language) as the diversity structure. There are three essential elements of a community.

Firstly, the defining characteristics of a community are that there are shared common political norms, values and practices. For Taylor, “the core characteristics are the set of persons who compose a community who have beliefs and values in common” (Taylor, 1993, p. 26). What therefore distinguish a community from any other human entity are political values and norms that are held in common. Political values as those that define the power relations within a given social set up. In this context where non-racial discrimination is promoted as a political value, the message is that there is or should be no form of superiority or inferiority that is allocated to any member of the community based on race or language group. Political values define the acceptable practices that all members need to live by. An example is that, once members of a community agree that racism is not a good social practice, such a value is consequently held in common. Accordingly, that which is held in common as shared beliefs, become inevitably the standard upon which adherence and commitment is demanded from members.

The second basic tenet of a community is the ability for its members to establish relations that are unlimited by barriers that are in contrast to the common political values that are held by the members. The defect that arises because of the inability to establish relations is succinctly summed by Taylor who argues that;

A collection of individuals might share a wide range of strongly held beliefs and values yet live in considerable isolation from each other, pursuing common ends not by dealing directly with each other, but through the agency of the state or appealing to some formal code or ideology (Taylor, 1993, p. 28).

The possibility of different compositions of the community pursuing the common good in isolation justifies the significance of relations. Furthermore, permutations of the second tenet of a community are that to some extent, community offers a suitable environment where relations that are inter- group in character are established. If a community is composed of white, blacks and

Indians students, then one would expect a situation where a white can befriend a black student and vice-versa.

Thirdly a community has an element of reciprocity among its members. Reciprocal element is that when an individual does something good, then he or she in return expects others to value that accomplishment (Wagner, 2008). To illustrate this, if a black student attempts to relate to a white student then the acceptance of such initiative should be reciprocated at the level of common membership and not rejected on the basis of race. In this way the element of reciprocity highlights that in a community, there is exchange of expectations.

6.3 Conception of the common good

The distinctive feature of communitarianism is common good. In some literature (Whipp, 2004, Peterson, 2011), there is an interchange of the use of common good and public good. It is of technical importance to note that, common or public refer to “the sense of willing co-operation among individuals to make a cohesive unit towards to attention the concept of public good” (Stanley, 2006, 47). This explanation of common good in terms of cooperation is of fundamental importance in this dissertation in the sense that there is an aspect of collective effort to attain the common good. Common good is an objective goal that a given community sets to achieve. The location of the common good is within the collection of individuals.

From cooperation, there is a dimension of members of the community as recipients of the benefits that emanate from achievement of the common good. The explanation for benefits is defended by Jonathan who proffers that, “public goods are those things which a society must combine to provide collectively, simply because everyone benefits from their existence but no one can supply them individually” (Jonathan, 2004, p.40). The enjoyment of a common good is ideally supposed to be shared and distributed equally among members of the community. To explain this, the post-1994 South Africa is an appropriate example. Taking the Rainbow Nation metaphor as indicating the new social order, the assumption is that common good is non-discrimination on race and language lines. The benefits that accrue from this new social order are that no one experiences the social discrimination on racial and language lines.

While Jonathan's definition of public good brings the significant element of collectivity, it can be challenged as insufficient and ambiguous. This is because its implication is that whatever people cooperate in doing becomes a public good. One could argue therefore, that there was some element of cooperation in the policies of higher education under apartheid and a considerable number of people benefitted as well. For argument's sake, can institutions that complied with Apartheid government to discriminate on race and language be regarded as having been cooperated as defined under common good?

The common good is both normative and prescriptive. It is normative because it gives the general standard or canon of social values, principles, norms and behaviors upon which the society has to adhere to in its collectivity. Eze argues that norms are contained in the common good because by its very nature it "is a collective pursuit of an end shared by the membership of a community" (Eze, 2008, p. 387). The argument for norms is that they act as guidelines upon which members are supposed to follow in order for a community to reach the intended goal. It is equally prescriptive in the sense that community members are expected to conduct their lives in accordance with the common values that the community endorses as those that can enable the collective society to reach and attain the common good.

According to Kymlicka, the common good is "a substantive conception of the good life which defines the community's way of life" (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 221). Kymlicka's proposal assumes that the framework of standard goodness is found only in what is collective. The community defines and advances the good to its members. In turn, the members are expected to align their individual aims to the common good. Understood in this way, the common good is the standard upon which all the individual preferences and interests are evaluated and measured. Individual preferences should be in accordance with the imperatives of the common good and not the other way around where common good has to be in accordance with individual preferences. Controversial as it may seem, this understanding of the common good, implies that there is something that is appealing to the whole given society, its value and worthiness is agreed upon by the society. This understanding also means that the common good is the total sum of all individual preferences, should be superior or it should take precedence over and above the individual.

The common good is always in the collective because more than one individual is able to attain success that is defined in terms of collection. Common good is worthy pursuing on the assumption that its attainment brings social stability since its goodness is applicable and appreciated by all (sometimes most) members of the society. It is for this reason that some academics will even go further to assert that common good by its nature is ranked above all other individual preferences (Kymlicka, 2002). The debate on individual against the common good that arises out of this assertion is dealt in the section that follows.

Petersen gives an understanding of common good as “what belongs to everyone by virtue of the common humanity” (Petersen, 2011, p. 22). This basic explication of the common good, affirms the universality and a sense of ownership of that which is referred to as common good. All members of a given society are entitled to the accessibility, use, consumption, and enjoyment of the common good. In order to arrive at the common good, Petersen insists that there is “a requirement for citizens to look beyond their own individual private self-interests and towards those of the wider community in their thoughts and actions” (Petersen, 2011, p. 25). The common good creates a sense of ownership. Members of the community have to come to a point where a sense of belonging to that which is a common good is attained. There is an implicit need for members of the community to take responsibility of the common good. Such responsibility implies that an individual is willing to embrace the common values, norms and practices that sustain the common good. If it is a vision of the organization that there should be no discrimination among its membership, then ownership implies that individuals who constitute that community must appreciate the value that is inherent in non-discrimination practices. Subsequently the sense of ownership leads to the sense of belonging. Individual members of the community have to possess the notion of belonging as being important and valuable members of the community. Common good understood in this manner brings to the fore the fact that it has a social element to it (Rehg, 2007). The social element is that individuals are connected, bound, live and interact with each other.

The common good posits that there are values that go beyond the individual. The social element puts emphasis on the idea that in a society, there is a realm that goes beyond individual interests, preferences and pursuits. Petersen makes a distinction between moral and political notions of understanding the common good. He highlights that, “moral notions presupposes and involve the

existence of essentialities and bonds between citizens within a particular community. Such bonds result in the moral obligations that are connected to a particular conception of the good life, in terms of communal political engagement” (Peterson, 2011, p. 22). Moral norms act as social conventions which members of a given community are expected to abide by. On the other hand, the political notion of the common good covers the agreed upon conception of a system of governance, laws, policies, distribution and accessibility of public goods, justice and general welfare of the society. The political notion of common good invariably encompasses the issues of power relations within the society.

The common good has a purpose that is meant to benefit members of a community. It is this purpose that renders common good to be regarded as inclusive. In this way, the objective of the common is to “create an enabling environment and the needed social conditions for the survival and fulfillment of individual members of the group itself” (Ukpokolo, 2011, p. 239). The resultant situation where individuals and the group can survive, eventually leads to social integration as opposed to social fragmentation. For Ukpokolo, there are three critical constituents that facilitate the realization of the common good. Firstly, all fundamental rights of the individuals that make a society must be accorded and respected. Secondly, the individual’s basic liberties are guaranteed. Thirdly, there should be inter-subjectivity, whereby individuals can also interact with other members of the given society without resorting to discrimination (Ukpokolo, 2011). Common good serves people with the same advantage, in other words, ideally members of the society stand to accrue benefits from the realization of common good.

There is a relationship between the individual and the society that he or she belongs to, that is manifested through common good. The relationship arises because, “common good is a social bond that holds a group of people together in an association they both understand themselves to be part of and value” (Rehg, 2007, p. 8). This relationship comes about because common good is binding to all members (Etizione, 2002). It is primarily for this reason that the need for social obligations and social responsibility occupies a critical position when dealing with common good (Zhang, 2010, Munkler, Herfield, Karsten and Fischer, 2002). Social obligations are inevitable because “people are members of a family, clan, and political community” (Zhang, 2010, p.141). Through the common good, an individual is bound to align his preferences to match the social expectations. It is assumed that with this conformity, the realization and maintenance of the

social order is guaranteed in the sense that the aggregation or collection of individual goods results in the common good, which is good for all (O'Brien, 2008).

The common good is an objective reality that demands a social disposition to attain it. The objectivity in this instance is that the common good is something that is beyond the individual domain. For instance, the new social order in South Africa is a common good that is objective because it is something that presumably is intended by members of the society. Karstein, Munkler, Herfield and Fischer are of the view that, "common good signifies normative orientation for action relating to the community" (Karstein, Munkler, Herfield & Fischer, 2002, p. 345). It is norms, values and objectives that are pursued at a community level. The normative orientation of common good brings paternalism whereby, there should be mechanisms, rules or statutes to safeguard the pursuit of the common good against individual or sectional violations. Rehg is of the idea that "the judgment that it is common may not simply be imposed on members in an authoritarian manner, but somehow must involve their input and free affirmation" (Rehg, 2007, p. 7). While free affirmation is or must be upheld within the common good framework, however, an authoritative structure is needed so as to curtail the individual extremes to their freedoms, thus eventually contradicting the precepts of common good. Paternalism is "a style of government, leadership and management in which the desire to help, advises and protect may neglect individual choice and personal responsibility" (Ukpokolo, 2011, p. 241). According to the notion of paternalism within common good, the absence of a controlling, coercive or persuasive mechanism makes it difficult to attain common good.

6.4 The place of the individual in the community

The place of the individual within communitarian political ideology is a critical issue that ultimately gives it a distinctive character. The debate revolves on what, between the community and the individual occupies a prior position. Generally, there is an affirmation that a community as an indispensable tenet of communitarianism is a collection or aggregate of closely connected individuals. The general assumptions by communitarians are that excessive individualism is not compatible with social order (Barry, 2000). The location of the individual is, from the communitarian perspective, within the community.

Communitarianism asserts that the individual is an indispensable constituent of the community and consequently he or she draws her identity from community. The defining character of the individual is drawn from community as he or she remains an attachment to the collective. However, in as much as this may appear controversial, but an individual in this regard draws social identity from the community that he is a component of. Such individual cannot at any point revoke his attachment to a community.

The extreme perspective on the individual's position in the community goes to the extent of advancing the idea that individual's ambitions should be in tandem with those of the community. Within this view, Constantinos observes that;

Life plans become important for an individual only if they relate that individual to the micro-socio-political or macro socio-political ties that he or she tries to pursue or disengage him or herself from (Constantinos, 2006, p.692).

The suggestion that Constantinos is making is that the worthiness of an individual's plans can only be assessed and evaluated against what the community holds. Conversely, the implication is that the community values should equally correspond to individual values. In cases where there is a contradiction, then it is the individual who has to conform to the community norms.

The individual is taken as a social self who cannot be imagined to sustain himself outside the norms and activities of the community. Communitarians emphasize that individuals are connected to the community through political and social values. The inference that can be drawn from this assertion is that being an individual is to belong to a given community. This interpretation that ontologically connects the individual with the community resonates with the African concept of *Ubuntu*. In discussing the *Ubuntu* phenomenon, Eze notes that, "the community must therefore make, create or produce the individual, for the individual depends on the corporate group" (Eze, 2008, p. 387). The individual is required to uphold the common norms and values that arise from the community of which he or she is part. In other words there is commitment to the norms and social values that are demanded of the individual.

Interpreting the place of an individual in the community, the impression is that there is an extreme emphasis on the issue of identification. The individual can only be identified with the community that he or she comes from. Such identification is in practice shown through the

norms and values that are generated and transmitted by the community. What is important to note is that the location of the individual in the community is pronounced by the social values. It is the sole responsibility of the community to produce and disseminate these values. Inevitably values are transmitted to individuals who become their custodians. The participation in the norms of the community leads eventually to political obligation.

6.5 Political obligation

There is a relation between the individual's place in the community and the common norms, practices and values that one is obligated to adhere to. The presence of common shared political values and beliefs within a community lead to the issue of political obligation. In regard to this issue, individuals who constitute a community are required to submit to a legitimate authority. While political legitimacy is not strictly part of the discussion in this subsection, it is of vital to note that a legitimate authority is one whose ascendancy to power is done through the correct laid down procedure. Consequently, political obligation cannot be separated from political legitimacy. This is done so that rules, policies and norms that emanate from a politically legitimate authority are accorded political obligation.

Political obligation is, therefore, a mechanism that ensures that the set norms adhered to. In order to enforce obligation, a community will lay out punitive measures for those members who deliberately violate the dictates of the common political values. For instance, if non-discrimination is a political value; in as far as it promotes the concept of racial equality, a member of the community who acts in a racist manner, can be charged as offending the set political value. It is in abiding by the common political values that a community is realized and sustained.

Political obligation has its inherent tensions that stem from the fact of adherence. This point is aptly summed by Barry who notes that;

People invariably are situated in social contexts which are not inexplicable in terms of their preferences: we do not choose the rules under which we live but in fact receive certain norms and roles which make social life possible (Barry, 2000, p. 23).

In other words, individuals are expected to abide by the social norms that they may not necessarily agree with after a critical reflection. Given this scenario, one could argue that political obligation within the community facilitates the imposition of values and norms upon members.

The justification of political obligation resides in the individual's quests to attain that which is also good for him. The presupposition is that the community in its "structure of traditions, values and practices" (Wiredu, 2004, p. 335) is tailored towards the good of its members. Individuals inevitably are politically obliged to submit to the community dictates because they are the ultimate benefactors. However, there are instances where individuals are equally justified to exercise political disobedience, which in this context stands as an anomaly to political obligation. Be that as it may, what is common in both political obligation and political disobedience is legitimacy and illegitimacy of the authority respectively. These two contrasts lead to the tension that is constitutive of communitarianism, thus common and individual good

6.6 Common good and the individual good

There are differences in emphasis between the individual and common good theory. The first one is that the common good theory is social, implying that it takes into account all members of a given society. As the above section has indicated, the common good is that which is valued and pursued by members of the given society. Its commonness is in the fact that it brings members' objectives and aspirations to convergence. The common good theory asserts that individuals are members of a society who by the fact of belonging have something that binds them together.

The common good theory requires an objective mechanism that acts as a form of control applying coercive or even punitive measures to members in the society. Such an objective measure ensures that members of a given society align their conduct in accordance with the common good. In this way common good is objective in its control mechanism.

On the other hand, individual good is framed and limited to individual aspirations and values. Values that strive towards individual good are informed by the individual's rationality (Kymlicka, 2002). This presentation of individual good highlights the point that it is the individual who has the control and determination over that which he or she aspires to.

Accordingly, the individual good theory emphasizes the individual autonomy. Individuals are independent from each other, they pursue their interests, preferences and objectives as free individuals. Individual good theory emphasizes the subjective control mechanisms. The individual is in charge of himself or herself.

6.7 Common good in relation to social transformation in South Africa

There is a relationship between social transformation and common good. The process of transforming a society is presumably to facilitate the means to attain the social goals. As pointed out in the chapter three that dealt with transformation, societies undergo change that is supposed to result in a state that all members want. Such changes can take place owing to deliberate political interventions through policies that are crafted to bring about new social values, principles and the system of governance. Taking this observation into account, social transformation is therefore a process of realigning the social values so that they correspond to the new values of the new social order.

At this juncture, it is significant to note that transformation is not always linear. It may not always tend towards the common good. There could also be a possibility that the laid down policies of transformation are not adequate to facilitate the kind of transition to an envisaged new social order. Inadvertently, inadequacies lead to the continuation and entrenchment of practices that were meant to be addressed. However, in successful transformation that tends towards the common good the dissolution of old undesired values takes place. To this end, Huschka and Mau contend that;

When institutional and social structures undergo significant changes, as in times of social transformation or accelerated societal modernization, established patterns of social organization are likely to lose their integrating qualities (Huschka & Mau, 2005, p. 467).

The essential part of transformation that is dictated by a common good is that values that do not correspond to a new social order are either aligned or are eliminated.

In order for social transformation towards the common good to achieve its objectives, social structures play a significant role. To elucidate this role, “social structures or organization

comprise of components with specific functions in the organization. Accordingly, social structures are organizations in which human beings participate” (Dekker & Schalkwyk, 1995, p. 7). Within a society, social structures are education institutions, the political government, security services and social services to mention but a few. These social structures are of significant value because they are meant to be the custodians and vessels of the values and the principles that the new social order stands for. For instance, educational institutions can be used to teach the students citizenship and social values. By so doing, educational institutions become active participants in the broader framework of social transformation. They perform an instrumental role within the society as far as social values are concerned. In the case of transformation, they are supposed to reflect the changes that would have taken place in the broader society.

Within the society, social structures are to serve the new social order as the common good. In South Africa, the creation and realization of a non-discriminatory society is given as the common good to be pursued by the citizens (Constitution, 1996). Taking this into account, the imperatives of the new social order are that values and principles that contradict the establishment of this new social order as the common good are not only challenged, but are abandoned. It is therefore, the submission of this chapter that socio-political transitions do create the necessity of the common good that is binding and is valued by members of the society.

One of the characteristics of the common good is that its universality. To this end, a common good cannot serve the interests of a few within a society, because if that happens then it ceases to be common. Within the society, the common good is not designed for sectional interests. Sectional interests are there to meet the needs and aspirations of a given group within the society, be it a racial or language group.

Social transformation is closely linked to the common good. Policies that the state put in place are apparently meant to facilitate that all institutions within the society align themselves so as to serve the common good. In South Africa, according to Mapesela and Hay, “the victory over apartheid in 1994 set policy makers in all spheres of public life the task of overhauling the social, political, economic and cultural status of institutions of higher education in South Africa in order to bring it in line with the imperatives of a new democratic order” (Mapesela & Hay, 2005, p. 111). The transformation of higher education appears to be meant to overhaul the structure that

sustains the apartheid system of governance. It is in recognition of this fact that one can affirm that common good and socio-political transitions are inseparable. It must be noted, however that it does not necessarily imply that socio-political transition results in the establishment of the common good. Sometimes political transition causes the abandonment of the common good. This is prevalent in the societies that experience political upheavals, unrest and civil wars.

6.8 Common good in Higher Education in South Africa

The institutions of higher education are essential parts of the society. Within the social structure, they have a significant role to play. It is in view of this, that higher education transformation is linked to the common good of a given society. Kozminski suggests that, “higher education is one of the key vehicles that transport new ideas into the minds of the people, be it universal, globalized and local, or cultural specific” (Kozminski, 2002, p. 366). The institutions of higher education are potential spaces where students from different social backgrounds can meet and share different life forms. Social ideas and values are exchanged across racial and cultural divides. While it is possible that people in the broader society can live separate lives, divided according to race, class and geographical locations, however, at an institution of higher education, students in their diversity are bound to share together at least the geographical space of their institution. This inadvertently makes the institution a strategic point to promote or derail the common good. Higher education could promote the common good among student body through economic and social ways. Brennan and Naidoo argue that higher education serves the economic role when it produces skilled labor necessary for economic development (Brennan and Naidoo, 2008). In addition, Metz points out that through higher education, “students think critically about the possible ways of life, to create wealth that would enable citizens to achieve the goals and participate in democratic self-governance” (Metz, 2009, p. 179). Higher education may enable the students to open up to possibilities and challenges that life in general offers. Such endeavors eventually benefit the society in the sense that the academic research that goes on in the institutions of higher education often times offer solutions to human difficulties. By producing medical doctors, engineers, lawyers and teachers, higher education promotes the common good from an economic perspective. Socially, higher education through curriculum and general student body socialization can inculcate values and principles necessary for a democratic

living. This is referred to as the social benefit of higher education as a common good (Brennan & Naidoo, 2008). This dissertation concerns itself with the social benefits of higher education as it promotes the common good. The social benefits here refer to the institutional culture of the higher education.

Higher education institutions can promote the common good by the process of transformation. Transformation is necessary taking into account that previously, institutions were located in a social order that did not permit or discourage the promotion of the common good. In this regard, transformation can change the undesirable oppressive and discriminatory values, norms and perceptions that are salient in institutions of higher education. Badat notes that, “transformation is the intent of dissolution of existing social relations and institutions, policies and practices and their recreation and consolidation into substantially new” (Badat, 2009, p. 456). A transformed institution of higher education addresses and changes discriminatory, oppressive and divisive ideas, policies, practices and norms that the institution might be practicing. In this way, the new social order adopts non-discrimination as the common good is achievable in institutions of higher education. What is essential within transformation is;

The collective, mutually shaping pattern of institutional history, mission, physical settings, norms, traditions, values, practices, beliefs and assumptions which guide the behavior of individuals and groups in an institutions of higher education and which provide frames of reference for interpreting the meanings of events and actions on and off the campus (Museus, 2007, p. 30).

The collective life of an institution where individual members can participate in and have a sense of belonging is of paramount importance to institutions of higher education. There is the notion of transition within transformation as for example, the Cape Peninsula University’s mission statement asserts that, “transformation implies a transition or shifting from the particular (existing) state to a desired end state. Inevitably the transformation journey also calls for dislocation from comfort zones and experimenting with new ideas and novel situations” (Cape Peninsula University of Technology). This supposes that social values that were in the old order need to be discontinued so that a new social order will be realized. This is applicable to institutions that historically used to practice legislated discrimination on race and language. The creation of socially cohesive multi-racial institutions of higher education could be possible through promotion of common good through transforming old cultural institutional practices.

From the transformation that involves a change in the institutional social values and norms, higher education can promote common good by developing and nurturing shared values that the student body in its diversity can identify with and relate to. These shared beliefs and values can be promoted as common good because they bring the diverse student body to the realization that a common life that is not discriminatory is a possibility. Thus, with the development of the institutional culture that is accommodative and receptive to its diverse members, a community of the student body is created whose characteristic is not only in numerical composition but a shared social value system. The significance of such an institutional culture for student body as a common good is;

To create a sense of belonging, what vision and mission are what the people value and expect from their leaders and colleagues, what they identify with, what will make them move collectively towards taking united ownership of the future of their institution or at least part of it (Nieman, 2010, 222).

This institutional culture ought to be promoted as a common good since it creates a sense of identifying with the institute on the part of the student. Since there will be a common good in the form of institutional culture, individual students do not feel isolated in the institution but on the contrary have a sense that they belong to the whole.

6.9 Criticism of the common good theory

There are several negative elements of the common good within the broader project of constructing a new social order of multi-racial institutions of higher education. In order to appreciate these negative tendencies and dangers of the common good, it is important at this juncture to insert the common good within its broader context of the community. The common good theory supposes the existence of a community, where individuals are bound together and share some life forms. Common good is located in the context where there are social values that bind a community (Ukpokolo, 2011).

Given the above notion of community, the first criticism of common good is that it is rather difficult to come up with a consensus on what essentially constitutes the common good. This controversy is more pronounced in a multi-racial institution of higher education where different race and language groups might have their own conflicting perceptions of that which is worthy

pursuing at a community level. Within a multi-racial institute, Braimoh, Osiki and Makoe argue that, “higher education involves enculturation that is – picking up the behavior, values and norms of a social group and adopting its belief systems to become a member of a culture” (Braimoh, Osiki & Makoe, 2010, p. 123). Within an institution of higher education, there is a conventional culture that the student body participates in. This is undisputable if culture is defined simplistically as an aggregate of values and norms that people of a given society live by. However, within the broader transformation agenda of higher education, general vision demands that certain values are promoted, while others are relegated. Values that ought to be promoted are those that entrench social cohesion within the student body, while those that are divisive are discarded.

It is in this context, that institutions need to develop a culture that is not only accommodative to diversity, but also promotes social cohesion. This is where disagreements arise with the common good approach. The disagreements could revolve on the values, principles and norms that should guide the institutional culture of a given institution. In the context of this dissertation, the notions of the new social order, the social cohesion and transformed student body diversity could take different meanings. The mission statement for social cohesion at the Cape Peninsula University of Technology for instance states that, “a new order has been heralded in at an institution if there is a critical mass with the community concerned which is bent on collaboration, unity of purpose and a common destiny” (Cape Peninsula University of Technology, p.1). This statement that supposes unity of purpose and a common destiny could be interrogated in terms of how it accommodates the difference of opinion on these concepts from individual students who constitute its social composition. The absence of such an interrogation at any individual level, difficult as it seems, could be presumptuous, thus consequently falling into the trap of imposing the meaning and interpretations of common good on individual students. If different race groups are assigning different meanings to these essential terms, then the practical consequence of such a scenario is that students could continue living ‘racially fragmented’ lives within a supposedly transformed multi-racial institute. The difficulty of the common good, therefore, is its very point of departure, the starting point owing to the possibility that students might not even agree on what essentially is common good.

The broader sphere in which the common good finds its relevance and applicability is the concept of the community. However, within a multi-racial institute, the notion of community is itself a contested issue. This is because generally, a community has binding force on its members. Furthermore, the approach to social cohesion within a multi-racial and multi-lingual institution is also contestable. For Fourie, “the presence of different groups in the organization with different values, norms and behavior make the forging of a new organizational structure quite problematic” (Fourie, 1999, 277). The contestation of community is evident within the realm of what constitutes a community and how to create or forge ties that strengthen a community. The common good find its expression in the context of a community that shares some forms of life, practices, values and norms. In higher education, students might not appreciate the concept of establishing communal ties with anyone or with other racial groups. The necessity of a community with its emphasis on common good cannot be taken as a given fact. This makes social interaction difficult and unattainable, yet interaction is one of the critical constituents of the common good. The over- emphasis of social interaction as a significant indicator of belonging to a community can make students to simply conform to institution. Theobald and Wood, for instance, go to the extreme of elevating the common good over and above the individual as they assert that “no individual can possibly find identity apart from others” (Theobald & Wood, 2009, p. 13). It is such extreme position on common good that makes individuals vulnerable to abuse by the majority as it enforces the pursuit of the social order as a common good.

Taking into consideration a hypothetical situation, where students might have agreed and adopted an ideal social order as a common good applicable to all, the difficulty arises in the normative practices or means to pursue that common good without necessarily infringing on individual students rights. There could be instances where methods to implement the pursuit of the common good could negate the individual good. There are chances that the promotion of the common good within a given institution could be undertaken to the detriment of the individual student.

In order to sustain the values and principles of the common good, there is a need that its constituent individual members are patriotic. Patronizing could mean that individuals are coerced to be loyal to and abide by the values and norms that the community pronounces as those that are

necessary to lead the community towards the common good. Ukpokolo notes that, “the group or social system in which he or finds himself or herself has the primary responsibility of ensuring that the system works for the common good of the individual members and the smaller group that make it up” (Ukpokolo, 2011, p. 240). Individual members are obliged to ensure that the community, in which the common good is inserted, survives. Such a survival is only guaranteed if individual members do not set out to violate the basic principles of the common good, because by doing so, the social stability is threatened. The criticism of patronizing the individual members is that it puts the “common good first before the individual goods” (Ukpokolo, 2011, p. 241). In the instances where individuals intend to pursue their individual goods that might contradict the common good, such pursuits are viewed in negative terms like, selfish-interest or self-centered at the detriment to the common good. The community is vital to the individual since it safeguards him or herself against external threats. An individual can pose as a threat to community stability when he or she ceases to be patriotic to the common good. This conceptual understanding of patriotism within the community has negative effects on the individual because the community is not tolerant to the dissenting individual opinion.

6.10 Concluding remarks

Political communitarianism as discussed in this chapter intimately links the individual with community. Individuals are components of a community and cannot live in isolation from other members. However, it has been noted that for this to be feasible, common social norms that come along with a binding social force are needed. Consequently, it is from this force that political obligation arises when individuals are expected to uphold that which the community considers worthy aspiring towards. Communitarianism reckons and affirms that individuals are in essence, members of a community.

Regarding the above emphasis on membership, transformation of higher education in South Africa has been related to the political communitarianism. The objective in exploring this relationship was to find where transformation and communitarianism can be combined to facilitate social cohesion in the institutions of higher education. In this chapter it has come out that social cohesion is an extremely important part of transformation. What has become evident in this discussion is that political communitarianism advances the establishment of common

social norms, practices and values as the foundation of any institution of higher education. Such norms have the potential to build a cohesive institutional community in the context of student body diversity. Nevertheless, it has also been demonstrated in this chapter that in the process of enforcing common social norms, the pitfall of political communitarianism in the institutions of higher education is that it can easily suppress individual practices and values. There is a need to develop an ideology that will strike a balance between individual and community values.

CHAPTER SEVEN

TOWARDS CIVIC-REPUBLICAN STUDENT BODY DIVERSITY: CONCLUDING REMARKS AND SUGGESTIONS

7.0 Introduction

The argument in this dissertation is that the framing of current student body diversity in the institutions of higher education in South Africa is inadequate to promote social cohesion. This social cohesion implies inter-group interactions across race and language. I have argued that student body diversity is inseparable from social cohesion. However, because of the emphasis on demographic reflection, the process of socially transforming institutions of higher education from racial and language fragmentation to a socially cohesive (in terms of common social values) seem to have been rendered inadequate. In order to build socially cohesive institutions as demanded by the constitution (1996), the common social norms are necessary for a new social order. However in attempting to realize social cohesion at common social values (substantive transformation), the dilemmas at a political ideological level arise. In this conclusive chapter I suggest a model of social transformation which is composed of both demographic and substantive values. I am convinced that this model will not only cater for the political ideological dilemmas but also result in socially cohesive institutions of higher education. I begin this model by discussing its justification which revolves on the inadequacies of both the comprehensive liberalism and political communitarianism. Civic-republicanism is discussed as a derivative of republicanism. In order to attain a model of civic republican student body diversity, the concept of civic values in social cohesion education is given attention. Finally the elements of civic-republicanism are debated as they occur in the social transformation of higher education in South Africa.

7.1 Justification for civic-republican model

Before going deeper into the exposition of the civic-republican model for student body diversity, I see it as necessary to justify my preference for this model. Generally, chapters five and six have shown the inadequacies of comprehensive liberalism and political communitarianism ideological models. Comprehensive liberalism's inadequacy is centered on its emphasis on individualism. It equally limited the role of institutional management to establish and enforce social cohesion norms within the diverse student body (Bull, 2008). On the other hand, political communitarianism appears to offer a better platform for the development of social values necessary for social cohesion. However, its inadequacy is that, it defines the individual only as far as he or she is attached to the community.

It is in consideration of these inadequacies of comprehensive liberalism and political communitarianism that, I now develop a civic-republican model of student diversity as an effective model for social cohesion. Civic-republicanism gives a balance between the delicate point of values of individual student and institution as a community. Since civic republicanism is a derivative of republicanism, I briefly discuss the political ideology of republicanism in the following sub-section.

7.2 Republicanism

The two essential features of republicanism are publicity and self-governance. Publicity refers to the fact that what is done in a republic is presumably designed for the good of all the citizens of state. From the goodness of the public, it logically follows that the citizens are expected to willingly participate in the affairs of the republic (Murphy, 1994). On the other hand, self-governance is that the state has the autonomy to govern itself and make decisions that are not externally influenced. The common social norms and practices are passed on by those with the governing authority on behalf of the good of all the members of the society. Accordingly, republicanism supposes that there is space that is beyond group affiliations, it stretches the possibility of establishment of civic rights and virtues that any community can build on. It is in this manner that republicanism advances the proposition that life forms are institutional, to the extent that they can be shared within the context of an institution.

The establishment of relational ties within the republicanism is an essential component of republicanism. Such relations are described as non-exploitative to individuals' racial or language group affiliation. In republicanism, "individuals are relational beings, not reducible to communal life, but a being whose freedom, capacities, powers are amplified because of his reliance on social relations that make life possible" (Thompson, 1989, 156). One could argue that given the emphasis on relations, the social order is such that though individuals establish relations, without necessarily being 'consumed' in the euphoria of the community, there is a balance between individual and community relations within republicanism.

Murphy is of the idea that the individual is only guaranteed of security and a sense of stability, when he or she puts effort in the good of the community. He argues that, "private interests can only be protected in an atmosphere which assures the hegemony of the public interests, otherwise a single, powerful faction will dominate the republic and the liberty will end" (Murphy, 1994, p. 315). Active participation in the dictates of the social order is the manner in which citizens put efforts in the good of the community.

Republicanism advances the theory that social institutions can assist in the transmission of the values that the society considers to be compatible with its objectives. To this end, Thompson argues that, "republican theory is deeply concerned with the ways individuals are shaped by social relations; (and) their concern is to maintain a healthy public realm in which individuals have access to" (Thompson, 2011, p. 152). This republican acknowledgment that institutions are vital in the social formation of the individuals implies that it becomes incumbent on the leadership to verify what kinds of values are imparted within institutions. There is a need to be specific and emphasize the civic components of republicanism, so that students become custodians of civic values that necessitate social cohesion.

7.3 Civic-republicanism as a model for sustainable social cohesion in higher education: A deliberative process.

The civic- republicanism student body diversity is a derivative of the republicanism as expounded in the above sub-section. Civic-republicanism is a model student's body diversity where commitment is made to the civic values that are necessary for social cohesion as a critical

component of transformation. The most important characteristic of civic-republicanism is that is deliberative. It is in recognition of this that Seidenfeld's description of civic republicanism as "embracing an ongoing deliberative process of all cultures, values, needs and interests to arrive at the common good" (Seidenfeld, 1992, p. 1528) is appropriate. Deliberative process is an important term for social cohesion.

According to Bashir, "a deliberative process is a political framework by which citizens can discuss their beliefs and values and through deliberation find common ground on the important issues they face as a community (Bashir, 2012, p.175). The argument for civic-republicanism as a deliberative process is therefore, that the diverse student body can have a platform to share what they consider values from their racial and language groups. This dissertation suggests that social cohesion offices and social cohesion education may act as such platforms. It is in this these platforms that "deliberation renegotiates preferences and values through shared modes of political arguments and thus can span a wide range of social and cultural differences" (Olson, 2011, p. 528). The advantage of deliberative process is that it involves critical reflections on social values that students hold. Through critical reflection, there is a possibility that a process that "leads to voluntary changes of preferences expressed by the majority" (Tucker, 2008, p.345). Deliberative process has the potential to mitigate the disruptive tendencies of civic republicanism as it tends towards the common good.

This model of student body has several implications in as far as the students as members of a community are concerned. The first is that civic-republicanism may facilitate public participation in the public realm of the institution. I characterize public realm of an institution as its social aspect that concerns itself with how student life is outside the lecture theatres, but within the institution. To this end, I suggest ways in which a civic-republican model can be attained. My suggestions focus on the establishment of social cohesion and offices that specifically deal with diversity among students within institutions of higher education. However before discussing the role of social cohesion offices, I turn my focus to the possibility that civic-republicanism can disrupt the "normal" life discourse in the institutions of higher education.

7.3. 1 Civic-republicanism as disruptive to regular norms

In order for social cohesion to take place, the model of civic-republicanism will be implemented as a mechanism that will likely be disruptive. It may disrupt the commonly held social norms and practices that are responsible for events of discrimination. This disruptive tendency is aptly summed by Waltman (1998) who argues that “a society cannot survive without either the imposition of order from above or the people acting in such a way that they do not need regulations (Waltman, 1998, p. 94). Though there is a deliberative process that may agitate the adoption of social values, there is a possibility that some students within the institution can resist such values.

A new model of student body diversity such as civic-republicanism as proposed in this dissertation has the possibility of creating some chaos in the beginning. This chaos may arise owing to the disturbance of regular social practices and values that the student body holds (Yaqoob, 2011, Tabane and Human-Vogel, 2010). To illustrate this point, students may not be viewing higher education institutions as social formation, but rather solely as academic sites. This therefore, may mean putting into place drastic compelling students to attend social cohesion lectures. Similarly, disruptiveness may come in ways to implement social interactions as values promoted in social cohesion lectures. To sum up this subsection, the critical point to note is that civic-republicanism as a model may at first be disruptive as a process of facilitating social cohesion.

7.3.2 Social cohesion education

The point of departure is that the envisaged new social order in South Africa can only be realized when higher education institutions perform their critical roles as social formation sites. In other words, institutions deliberately advance the social objectives that are necessary for the new social order. Apartheid had a systematic social exclusion in the higher education landscape. Given this context, there is equally a need for a systematic social cohesion within the higher education institutions given the current reality of student body diversity, so as to correct the historical legacy of racial and language fragmentation. However, it has been established in this dissertation that this social cohesion that is necessary for the new social order needs more than

demographic transformation for it to occur. The process of numerical deracialisation is not adequate to address fragmentation that arises owing to conflicting social values that the student body may be holding on to.

The higher education's efforts towards a systematic building of a new social order could be strengthened by the introduction of social cohesion studies. Having identified the inadequacy of the demographic transformation model, the social cohesion studies will compliment this, thereby coming up with communitarian liberal student body diversity. The focus of these studies will be to address the negative racial and language perception, norms, values and stereotypes that are prevalent within the diversified student body. The negative perceptions and norms hinder racial group interactions, thereby perpetuating discrimination. Such studies could be established by combining all the studies offered at higher education level that seek to impart social norms to the student body. In this regard, studies like citizenship, cosmopolitanism, human rights, cultural and peace education could all be brought together to form the social cohesion education. In my view, the current studies that constitute the social cohesion education seem to be disconnected from each and thereby lack focus.

In this suggestion, participative citizenship education could be taught within the institutions of higher education from the perspective of social cohesion. To this end, students are taught to embrace their citizenship status as active participants in the new social order. As noted earlier in the chapter five, individual good can be altered through the availability of information. The implication is that students may enter institutions of higher education with what they consider individual values to attain individual good. However, participative citizenship education can assist in correcting some of these individual values which are essentially prejudices. To illustrate this point, a student may enter higher education institution with a 'value' that dictates one to associate with his or her racial group only. He or she might not view this as discrimination but loyalty to, and a sense of security within one's racial and language group.

7.3.3 How social cohesion education can resolve the dilemmas

In this dissertation, it has become evident that, because of racial and language diversity that is found in higher education, institutions are strategic points to build cohesive society. Furthermore

there is enough literature to testify to the fact that remarkable demographic transformation has already taken place in institutions of higher education (Badat, 2004, Bunting, 2002). Given this scenario there is contention that, “education is arguably one of the most important sites through which to advance and contest new visions of a post transition society” (Jansen, 2007, p.232). The advancement of the new social order (post transition society) can be achieved by a social cohesion education that broadens transformation to imply an individual who is part of the collective.

The social cohesion education aims at efforts of building a socially inclusive society in South Africa. This inclusivity extends to embrace diversity in terms of race and language within higher education. To this end, Badat notes that, “South Africa’s new democratic government committed itself in 1994 to transforming higher education as well as the inherited apartheid social and economic by institutionalizing a new social order” (Badat, 200, p.40). Through social cohesion education, the commitment to the common good as the new social order is imparted to the students. Such studies can mediate between the political dilemmas that this dissertation has noted. The tension between political dilemmas of comprehensive liberalism and political communitarianism that are presents in so far as social cohesion is concerned can be resolved when liberalism and communitarianism are combined. In this regard, the courses like cosmopolitanism, democracy education; citizenship, cultural and peace education are all taught with a view of emphasizing the individual as a member of the community. Accordingly, transformation of higher education cannot be limited to demographic reflections, but extends to the substantial common social values.

7.3.4 Social cohesion offices

In order to give urgency to issues of social cohesion at a civic substantive values level, I suggest that institutions must establish social cohesion offices. This is in the model of International offices that supposedly deal with international students within higher education in South Africa. I am aware that most institutions have Transformation offices, while others have Diversity offices (www.wits.ac.za). However, a closer look at these offices shows that their duties are rather broad to include any form of transformation. My idea of social cohesion offices in this dissertation is that they specifically focus on student body diversity, by developing civic values necessary for

social cohesion. They also can be mandated to do research work on social cohesion that seeks to bridge the racial and language divides created under apartheid. Lastly, there can be made responsible to give ongoing civic formation. On the orientation days, they can be charged to teach tolerance within diverse student body.

7.3.5 Orientation day: An opportunity for induction of civic values

As practical means to attain social cohesion through civic-republican model in a diverse student body, the orientation day is a critical opportunity where common social values can be imparted to the students. Views on what information needs to be disseminated on the orientation day differ depending on where the institution lays its emphasis on. Most institutions take this day as an introduction to the academic life. In this way the students will be given a tour of the academic lecture halls, libraries, sports fields and other physical facilities that strictly have to do with the academic life of the institutions. It is my contention that while taking orientation day as an introduction to academic life is crucial especially to a first year student, neglecting the social values of the institution on this day is indeed a disservice towards social cohesion. In as much as orientation days are significant days as “openers” for a first year student in academic life, equally so they may also be a day to open new relationships across other races and language groups within institution of higher education. It also should be a day of where common bond, and tolerance are fostered to build a society in which people do not consider each other to be cultural strangers” (Woodrooffe, 2011, p.175). Tolerance of diversity is an essential component of social cohesion in the context of white, black, Indian and colored students sharing the institution of higher education. It is my submission in this dissertation that, tolerance is a social value that can be acquired through the social cohesion education.

The orientation day, can be treated as an induction day on issues to do with diversity and group interactions. This is important considering that for some students; this is the first day where they most probably encounter other students who are racially and linguistically different from them. This first time encounter with diversity is possible given the zoning principles that exist in the lower education institutions. At this juncture that the social values that enable orientation towards diversity relations can be inculcated in the student body. The process of socialization into racial diversity should be given ample time on the orientation day. This socialization refers

to the process of imparting social norms like racial tolerance, relations and instilling the principles that all students, irrespective of their racial orientation, are socially equally.

The practical method of socialization towards diversity on the orientation day can be done through seminars that are offered on this day. Such seminars can be conducted by officials who would come from social cohesion offices that are within the institution. The main message to concentrate on this day is to bring out clearly the social objectives of the institution as building a new social order that emanates from the 1996 constitution of the Republic of South Africa. The aim is that transformation should not only be limited to demographic level, but also at common social substantive values that all students ought to adhere to in order to bring about the new social order. It is my suggestion that through civic participation, the institutions of higher education become social formation sites.

7.4 Higher Education institutions as social values formation sites

In South Africa, institutions of higher education's social functions comprise all social values that are necessary in order to establish new social order. The institutions of higher education need social values, norms, practices and principles that facilitate social cohesion. Higher education institutions in the post-1994 political dispensation cannot afford to neglect the promotion of social values that lead to social cohesion in the institutions. This is primarily because, "the post-apartheid education in South Africa is based on the constitution of the Republic" (Act 108 of 1996). Among its aims are to heal the divisions of the past and improve the life of all citizens (Msila, 2011, p. 74). Judging from this imperative, the healing of the past, which in this dissertation may be attained through social cohesion, implies the eradication of fragmentation at social values level in the institutions of higher education. Arguably, institutions need to continually realign themselves to fit the demographics of the student body. However, it is significant to appreciate that the change in demographic composition needs also to be complimented by change in social values within the institution.

On multi-lingualism, it is the submission in this dissertation that substantial transformation can agitate for the promotion of languages that are regarded as official within 1996 Constitution of South Africa. Such languages were marginalized under apartheid. It is my opinion that

demographic transformation has only made them to be regarded as official, yet they have remained practically outside the daily functions of most institutions of higher education. They are hardly used as languages for official business, be it for entrance tests or even general manuscripts in the campus. In order for higher education institutions to be effective social formation sites, they need to actively promote the use of other languages besides English and Afrikaans. There must be a movement from apartheid practices of social exclusion (on language use) to social inclusion as an imperative of the new social order. What has come out in this dissertation is that the social inclusion that is a result of demographic transformation is inadequate to promote social cohesion. To this end, in my view, one crucial and urgent step that needs to be taken is the promotion of African languages in the institutions of higher education. It is acknowledge that generally in the post-1994 dispensation, institutions of higher education have made some efforts towards multilingualism. However given the significance of language as an instrument of division under apartheid, it is of vital importance that substantive steps are instituted in higher education so that language becomes conversely an instrument for social cohesion in the post-1994 era.

On a practical level, my proposal under the civic-republican model is that the institutions of higher education make it compulsory to offer elementary courses in the previously excluded languages to the first year undergraduates across all faculties. The idea is to remove fragmentation and prejudices that are based on language differences within the institutions. The dilemma between comprehensive liberalism and political communitarianism can be resolved here by the need to correct the language imbalances of the past and also embrace diversity. It is this diversity that is sustained by civic values that eventually leads to the concept of ‘Rainbow’ within institutions of higher education.

7.5 The harnessing of the Rainbow concept in Higher Education

The metaphor of rainbow nation as the new social order can be applied to the institutions of higher education. The Rainbow institution represents a combination of comprehensive liberal and political communitarian student community. This is so because the colors that constitute a rainbow stand in their individuality yet have combined to form a coherent entity. In the context of higher education therefore, there is an observation that transformation has facilitated rainbow

institutions. Rainbow is a reflection of different colors that have been brought together to form one entity, thus an institution of higher education that is both multiracial and multilingual. Accordingly, the metaphor of rainbow denotes diversity. It is this diversity that can be used as an opportunity to foster social cohesion among the student body. Hay and Mapesela state that diversity can be, “a channel for deepening of the opportunity for heterogeneous people to interact, to enhance critical thinking, to solve problems and to change attitudes towards racial issues” (Mapesela and Hay, 2005, p. 115). It is this interaction across racial and language lines that will bring about social cohesion. In order for this to be attained the student diverse body should be the custodians of the social values, norms and principles that encourage social cohesion.

7.6 Civic-republicanism and social transformation in institutions of higher education

Civic-republicanism model of student body diversity is the most effective way to promote social cohesion in higher education in South Africa. Social cohesion as referring to inter-racial group interaction is critical in the institutions of higher education in South Africa. Within transformation of higher education, student body diversity is given in terms of demographic reflections.

Transformation of higher education in the post-1994 era structurally disbanded the mono-racial and language institutions of higher education by inserting the student body diversity theme in the transformation. It has come out in this dissertation is that when something is transformed at a structural level (demographic reflection imperative), a change may not necessarily occur at an ideological level. In this regard, institutions of higher education need to continue the process of social cohesion on the level of race and language because it is not enough to simply assimilate racial and language diversity. The concentration on demographic transformation in my view can perpetuate this division in another form. In this way students could share across racial and language lines, the physical life forms, like, lecture halls, library and many other facilities that are offered in higher education institutions. Transformation can exist at a formal level without occurring at a content level. Content level is the area of social values and practices that can either promote social inclusion or promote social exclusion. However what has come out in this

dissertation is that the structural transformation which manifests itself in the demographic reflection imperative (Department of Education, 1997) is inadequate to promote social cohesion. Consequently, it is in the attempt to promote social cohesion that the dilemmas arise.

This dissertation has shown that there are political ideological dilemmas that arise in attempting to promote social cohesion in the institutions of higher education in South Africa. These dilemmas revolve around the seeming tension between higher education institutions as academic or social sites. Such tensions are informed by the political ideologies of comprehensive liberalism (institutions as academic sites only) and political communitarianism as social formation sites). It is in this regard that through the critical analysis of the student body diversity theme in the transformation of higher education in South Africa, this dissertation has indicated that social cohesion goes beyond demographic transformation. The demographic model of transformation needs to be accompanied by complementary social values within the institutions of higher education. In other words transformation has to be composed of demographic and social values change. The inescapable fact is that for social cohesion to happen in the institutions of higher education there is a need for a paradigm shift where institutions are regarded as social formation sites.

In order to attain a model of student body diversity that is both demographic and also substantive in terms of common social values that leads to social cohesion, the impartation of social values becomes imperative. It is from this appreciation, that the social cohesion education will be inculcated to the student body diversity, as this would have legitimized the fact that institutions of higher education are not only there to produce academics and skilled labor for the market. In the context of South Africa, institutions of higher education can get more involved in the business of social formation of the student body.

7.7 Final concluding remarks

Transformation of higher education in South Africa cannot afford to neglect social cohesion at a substantive level. Bearing this in mind, it is necessary to instill students with values that not only respect diversity, but equally enable them to associate with those of different color and speak different language. In this dissertation, I have argued that, doing this has its inherent political

dilemmas, where institutions cannot force social cohesion. However, since the political ideologies of comprehensive liberalism and political communitarianism seem to bring dilemma in relating student body diversity and social cohesion, this dissertation has shown that civic-republicanism model offers an effective model. Within civic-republicanism, individual student's liberty is given for the good of the community, while at the concurrently, they are free from destructive constraints.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Akoojee, S. & Nkomo, M. (2007). Access and quality in South Africa: the twin challenges of transformation. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 21(13), 385 – 399.

Archer, S, M. (2010). Perspectives in critical realism and relational sociology: Complementarity and synergy. *JCR* (9.2), 199-207.

- Ayers, D, F. (2011). A critical realist orientation to learner needs. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 61 (4), 311- 357.
- Badat, S. (2009). Theorising institutional change: Post-1994 South African Higher Education. *Studies in Higher Education*. 34(4), 455-467.
- Barry, N. (2000). *An introduction to modern political theory*, New York: St Martin's Press.
- Bashir, B. (2012). Reconciling historical injustices: Deliberative democracy and the politics of reconciliation. *Res Publica* (18), 127-143.
- Berlin, I. (1996). Two concepts of liberty. In R. M. Stewart. *Readings in social and political philosophy*. London: Oxford Press.
- education. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 42(7), 1469 – 5812.
- Bozalek, V., Carolissen, R., Leibowits, B, et al. (2010). Engaging with difference in Higher Education through collaborative inter-institutional pedagogical practices. *South African Higher Education*, 24(6), 1023-1037.
- Braimoh, D., Osiki, J, O, & Makoe, M. (2010). The empowerment to transformation: A capacity building model for academics in distance Higher Education institutions in Africa. *European Journal of Educational Studies*, 2(2), 119-130.
- Brennan, J. & Naidoo, R. (2008). Higher Education and the achievement (and/or prevention) of equity and social justice. *Higher Education*, (56), 286- 302.
- Brennan, J. (2008). Higher Education and social change. *Higher Education*, (56), 381-393.
- Bull, L, B. (2008). A politically liberal conception of civic education. *Studies in Philosophy of Education*, (27), 449-460.
- Bunting, I. (2002). The higher education landscape under apartheid. In N. Cloete, Fehnel, R, Massen, P etl (Eds), *Transformation in higher education: Global pressures and local realities in South Africa*. pp 58 – 86.
- Castles, S. (2001). Studying social transformation. *International Political Science Review*, 22(1), 13-32.
- Cloete, N. & Moja, T. (2005). Transformation tensions in Higher Education: Equity, Efficiency, and development. *Social Research*, 72(3), 693-714.
- Cloete, N. and Bunting, I. (1999). *Higher education transformation: Assessing performance in South Africa Volume 3*, Pretoria: Centre for Higher education Transformation

Colburn, B. (2010). *Autonomy and liberalism*, New York: Routledge.

Constantinos, A. (2006) Communitarianism. *Renaissance Philosophy* (no other information available)

Cross, M & Johnson, B. (2008). Establishing a space of dialogue and possibilities: Students experiences and meanings at the University of Witwatersrand. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 22 (2), 302 – 321.

Cross, M. (2004). Institutionalizing campus diversity in South Africa higher education: Review of diversity scholarship and diversity education. *Higher Education*, 47, 387 – 410.

Daniels, D & Damons, L. (2011). I am more than just a coloured woman” Narrating undergraduate experiences at a historically white South Africa University. *Africa Education Review*, 8(1), 148- 168.

Department of Education. (1997). White Paper 3. A programme for the transformation of higher education. Pretoria. *Government Gazette*.

Department of Education. (2008). *The report of the Ministerial Committee into Transformation in Higher Education*. Pretoria: Department of Education.

Divala, J, J. (2005). *Citizenship Education in Malawi: A critique in defence of maximal citizenship*. Unpublished master’s dissertation, University of Stellenbosch, Stellenbosch.

Divala, J. J. (2008). *Is a liberal conception of university autonomy relevant to higher education in Africa?* Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Stellenbosch, Stellenbosch.

Divala, J.J. & Mafumo, T, N. In defence of a deliberative racial interaction model for managing race and racism in the South African Higher Education institutions. Unpublished article.

Dryzek, J, S. & Dunleavy, P. (2009). *Theories of the democratic state*. New York: Pelgrave macmillan.

Dryzek, J, S. & Holmes, L. (2000). The real world of civic republicanism: Making democracy work in Poland and Czech Republic. *Europe – Asia Studies*, 52(6), 1043- 1068.

Engelbrecht, P.(2006). The implementation of inclusive education in South Africa after ten years of democracy. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 21(3), 253-264.

- Erlich, V. (2004). The 'new' students: The studies and social life of French University students in a context of mass education. *European Journal of Education*, 39(4), 485-495.
- Evenden, J. M. (2012). Critical realism in the personal domain: Spinoza and explanatory critique of emotions. *JCR*, (11.2), 163-187.
- Eze, M. O. (2008). What is African communitarianism? Against consensus as a regulative ideal. *South African Journal of Philosophy*, 27(4), 386-399.
- Fataar, A. (2010). *Education policy development in South Africa's democratic transition, 1994 – 1997*. Stellenbosch: SUN MeDIA.
- Ferber, P. M. (2006). Critical realism and religion: Objectivity and the insider/ outsider problem. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 96 (1), 176-181.
- Fourie, M. (1999). Institutional transformation at South African Universities: Implication for academic staff. *Higher Education*, (38), 275-290
- Friedkin, N. E. (2004). Social Cohesion. *Annual Review of Sociology*, (30), 409-425.
- Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., and Borg, W. R. (2007). *Educational research: An introduction*, Boston: Pearson Press.
- Gillespie, M. A. (2001). Liberal education and liberal democracy. *Academic Questions*, 65 – 68.
- Greenfield, D. (2001). When I hear Afrikaans in the classroom and never my language, I get rebellious: Linguistic Apartheid in South African Higher Education, *Language and Education*, 24(6), 517-534.
- Griffin, M. A. (2011). Motivating reflective citizens: Deliberative democracy and the internal deliberative virtues. *Journal of Values Inquiry*, (45), 175-186.
- Harber, C. (1998). Desegregation, racial conflict and education for democracy in the new South Africa: A case study of institutional change. *International Review of Education*. 44(5/6), 569 – 582.
- Hay, H. R. (2008). If walls could speak: Reflections from visiting a South African Higher Education classroom. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 22(5), 935-947.
- Heyting, F., Kruithof, B., & Mulder, E. (2002). Education and social integration: On basic consensus and the cohesion of society. *Educational Theory*, 52(4), 381- 396.
- Huschka, D., & Mau, S. (2008). Social anomie and racial segregation in South Africa. *Social Indicators Research*, (76), 467-498.

- Idogho, P. O. (2011). Higher Education in Nigeria and the challenges ahead. *European Journal of Educational Studies*, 3(2), 269-276.
- Irwin, K., McGrimmon, T. & Simpson, B. (2008). Sympathy and social order. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 71(4), 379-397.
- Isaak, J. (2010). Balancing more than backpacks: Communitarian ideas applied to educational expeditions. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, 15(2), 3-12.
- Jansen, J. (2001). Explaining non-change in education reform after apartheid: political symbolism and the problem of policy implementation. In J. Jansen & Y. Sayed (Eds.) *Implementing education policies: The South African experience*, (pp 271 – 292). Cape Town: University Press.
- Jansen, J. (2007). The leadership of transition: Correction, conciliation and change in South Africa. *Journal for Educational Change*, (8), 91-103
- Jefferies, B. (2011). Critical realism- an empirical realist critique. *Manchester Metropolitan University Bussiness School Working Papers*, 11-01.
- Jonathan, R. (1997). *Illusory freedoms: Liberalism, education and the market*. London: Blackwell Publishers.
- Kamwangamalu, N. (2010). Vernacularization, globalization, and language economics in non-English-speaking countries in Africa. *Language problems and language planning*, 34(1), 1-23.
- Kozminski, A. (2002). The role of Higher Education in societies in transition within the globalized environments: Solid academic credentials and the challenges of building up of an institutional image. *Higher Education in Europe*, 27(4), 365-371.
- Kumar, K. & Oesterheld, J. (2007). *Education and social change in South Asia*. New Delhi: Orient Longman Private Limited.
- Kymlicka, W. (2002). *Contemporary political philosophy: An introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Legutko, R. (2008). What is wrong with liberalism. *Modern Age* (1), 7-14.
- Lessnoff, M. H. (1999). *Political philosophers of the twentieth century*. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers.
- Lewis, P, A. (1996). Metaphor and critical realism. *Review of social economy*, 54 (4), 487-506

- Lewins, K. (2010). A trauma of transformation: A closer look at the Soudien report. *South African Review of Sociology*, 41 (1), 127 – 136.
- Macedo, S. (1989). *Liberal Virtues: Citizenship, virtue, and community in liberal constitutionalism*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Madiba, M. (2010). Towards multilingual higher education in South Africa: The university of Cape Town's experience. *Language Learning Journal*, 38(3), 327- 346.
- Makgoba, M. W. (1997). From diversity to engaging differences: A novel approach to identity, knowledge production and curricular transformation. In N. Cloete, J. Muller., M. W. Makgoba, and D. Ekong, (Eds.) *Knowledge, identity and curriculum transformation*, Rondebosch: Maskew Miller Longman.
- Mann, M. (1970). The social cohesion of liberal democracy. *American Sociological Review*, 35(3), 423-438.
- Mapesela, M & Hay, H, R. (2005). Through the magnifying glass: A descriptive analysis of the possible impact of the South African higher education policies on academic staff and their job satisfaction. *Higher Education*, 50, 111 – 128.
- Marginison, S. (2011). Higher Education and public good. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 65(4), 411-433.
- McDonough, K. & Feinberg, W. (2003). *Citizenship education in liberal-democratic societies*. Oxford: Oxford Press.
- McKinney, C & Pletzen, V, E. (2004). This apartheid story we have finished with it: Students responses to the apartheid past in South African English studies. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 9(2), 159 – 170.
- Mdepa, W & Tshiwula, L. (2012). Student diversity in South African higher education. *Widening participation and lifelong learning*, Special Issue (13), 19-33.
- Meadon, M. (2009). Evaluating the Veil. *South African Journal of Philosophy*, 28(2), 171-177.
- Metz, T. (2009). The final ends of Higher Education in light of an African moral theory. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 43(2), 179-201.

- Mickelson, R, A, Nkomo, M, & Smith, S, S. (2001). Education, ethnicity, gender and social transformation in Israel and South Africa. *Comparative and International education society*, 45(1), 1 – 35.
- Miller, A, P. (2003). Language and power. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 5(3), 33-35.
- Mingers, J. (2000). The contribution of critical realism as an underpinning Philosophy for OR/MS and systems. *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 51(11), 1256-1270.
- Msila, V. (2011). Fighting for peace in the South African classroom: Peace education the missing link? *Problems of Education in the 21st Century*, (30), 74-86.
- Mulhall, S. & Swift, A. (1992). *Liberals and communitarians*, New York: Blackwell Publishers.
- Munkler, H. & Fischer, K.(2002). Common good and civic spirit in the welfare state: Problems of societal self-description. *The Journal of Political Philosophy*, 10(4), 416-438.
- Murphy, J, M. (1994). Civic republicanism in the modern age. *Adlai Stevenson in the 1952 Presidential Campaign*, (80), 313-328.
- Museus, S, D. (2007). Using qualitative methods to assess diverse institutional cultures. *New Direction for Institutional Research*, (136), 29-40.
- Naidoo, P. (2010). Three thousand words on race. *South African Review of Sociology*, 4(1), 120-126.
- Napier, D, P., Lebeta, V, T, & Zungu, P. (2000). Race, history, and education: South African perspectives on the struggle for democracy. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, (3), 445-450.
- Narveson, J. (2003). Political Platonism, liberalism and democracy. *Journal of Social Philosophy*. 34(1), 153-168.
- Ndofirepi, A. P. & Shumba, A. (2012). Disputed yet invaluable: Philosophical inquiry as theory in educational research. *Anthropologist*, 14(2), 141-148.
- Nekwevha, F. (1999). No matter how long the night, the day is sure to come: culture and education transformation in post-Apartheid South Africa. *International Review of Education*, 45(5/6), 491-506.
- Niemann, R. (2010). Transforming an institutional culture: An appreciative inquiry. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 24(5), 1003 – 1022.

- Nieto, S. (2009). *Affirming diversity: The socio-political context of multicultural education*. Boston: Pearson Publishers.
- Nkoane, M, M. (2006). Challenges facing South Africa's educational advancement. *International Journal of Educational advancement*, 6(3), 243-252.
- Nkomo, M.O., McKinney, C., Chisholm, L. (2004). *Reflections on School Integration: Colloquium Proceedings*. Cape Town: HSRC Press
- Ntshoe, M, I. (2004). The politics and economics of post –apartheid Higher Education transformation. *Comparative Education Review*, 48(2), 202-221.
- Olson, K. (2011). Legitimate speech and hegemonic idiom: The limits of deliberative democracy in the diversity of its voices. *Political studies*, (45), 527-546.
- Orbell, J, Zeng, L, & Mulford, L. (1996). Individual experience and the fragmentation of societies. *American Sociological Review*, (61), 1018 – 1032.
- Organization for Economic and Development, 2008. *Report*.
- Patomaki, H. & Wight, C. (2000). After post-positivism? The promise of critical realism. *International Studies Quarterly*, (44), 213-237.
- Pattman, R. (2010). Investigating 'race' and social cohesion at the University of KwaZulu Natal. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 24(6), 953-971.
- Peterson, A. (2011). The common good and citizenship education in England: a moral enterprise? *Journal of Moral Education*, 40(1), 19-35.
- Pistone, R, A. (2010). Struggles for modern education: Egalitarian liberalism and its quests for equal access to opportunity. *International Education Studies* (3) 3, 170 – 174.
- Praeg, L. (2011). Philosophy, and teaching (as) transformation. *South African Journal of Philosophy*, 30(3), 345-359.
- Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Reddy, T. (2004). Higher education and social transformation: South Africa case study. *Council on Higher Education Report*.
- Rehg, W. (2007). Solidarity and the common good: An analytical framework. *Journal of Social Philosophy*, 38(1), 7-21.

Rothberg, A. (2012). Beyond Black and white. *BizEd*, 1 (11), 20-21.

Sayed, Y. (2001). Post-apartheid educational transformation: policy concerns and approaches. In Y. Sayed & J. Jansen (Eds.), *Implementing educational policies: The South African experience*. (pp 250-270). Cape Town: UCT Press.

Schneider, G. C. (1997). From diversity to engaging differences: A framework for the higher education curriculum. In N.Cloete., J. Muller., M.W. Makgoba., and D. Ekong (Eds.) *Knowledge, identity and curriculum transformation* Volume 2. Rondebosch: Maskew Miller Longman.

Schutze, H, G, & Slowey,R. (2002). Participation and exclusion: A comparative analysis of non-traditional students and lifelong learner in Higher Education. *Kluwer Academic*, (44), 309-327.

Scott, G. and Letseka, M. (2010). Student inclusion and exclusion at the University of Witwatersrand. In M. Letseka., M. Cosser, M. Breier, and M,Visser., (Eds.) *Student retention and graduate destination: Higher education and labour market access and success*, Cape Town: HSRC Press.

Scott, D. (2006). *Education, epistemology and critical realism*. New York: Routledge.

Scott, D. (2010). Critical realism and statistical methods – a response to Nash. *British Educational Research Journal*. 33 (2), 141-154.

Seidenfeld, M. (1992). A civic-republican justification for bureaucratic state. *Harvard Law Review*, (165), 1511-1576.

Siberman, R. (2002). Introduction: The challenge of liberal education. *Journal of Education*, 3 (183), 1 – 6.

Siljander, P. (2011). What are we looking for? – Pro-critical realism in text interpretation. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 45 (3), 493- 510.

Singh, M. (2001). Re-inserting the ‘Public good’ into higher education transformation. *Kagisano:CHE higher education discussion series*,(1). Pretoria: Council on Higher Education.

Shipway, B. (2011). *A critical realist perspective*. London: Routledge.

Soudien, C. (2008). The intersection of race and class in the South African University: Student experiences. *South African Journal for Higher Education*, 22(3), 662-678

- Soudien, C. (2010). Grasping the nettle? South African higher education and its transformative imperatives. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 24(5), 881 – 896.
- Stanley, D. (2003). What do we know about social cohesion: The research perspective of the federal government's social cohesion. *Research Network*, 28(1), 5-17.
- Stillwagon, J. (2011). Between private and public: Recognition, revolution and political renewal. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 43(4), 351-364.
- Striano, N. (2009). Managing educational transformation in the globalized world: A Dewey perspective. *Educational Theory*, 59(4), 379-293.
- Strydom, A, H & Fourie, M. (1999). Higher Education research in South Africa: Achievements, conditions and new challenges. *Higher Education*, (38), 155-167.
- Strydom, J, F & Mentz, M. (2008). Should orientation for higher education teaching and learning be better? *South African Journal for Higher Education*, 22(5), 1088-1096.
- Stumpf, E. (1993). *From Socrates to Sartre: A history of philosophy*. New York: Routledge Publishers.
- Sweet, W. (2010). R. F. A. Hornie and idealist liberalism in South Africa. *South African Journal of Philosophy*, 29(2), 178 – 194.
- Tabane, R. & Human-Vogel, S. (2010). Sense of belonging and social cohesion in a desegregated former House of Delegates school. *South African Journal of Education*, (30), 491-504.
- Taylor, C. (1994). The politics of recognition. In A. Gutmann (Ed.). *Multiculturalism*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp.3-44; 60-70.
- Thaver, L, L. (2010). Institutional imperatives and feeling at home in higher education institutions: Giddens on trust and intimacy. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 24(1), 145-156.
- Thayer-Bacon, B. (2006). Beyond liberal democracy: Dewey's nascent liberalism. *Education and Culture*, 22(2), 19-30.
- Theobald, P & Wood, K, L. (2009). Communitarians and multiculturalism in the academy. *Journal of Thought*, Spring-Summer, 9-23

- Thompson, M, J. (2011). The limits of liberalism: A republican theory of social justice. *International Journal of Ethics*, 7(3/4), 151-171.
- Topping, R, S, N. (2008). St Augustine and the defence of liberal education. *The Dominican Council*, 10, 674 – 690.
- Tucker, A. (2008). Pre-emptive democracy: Oligarchic tendencies in deliberative democracy. *Political studies*, (56), 127-147.
- Ukpokolo, I, E. (2011). Between group mind and common good: Interrogating the African socio-political condition. *International Journal of Philosophy of Culture and Axiology*, 8(2), 235-252.
- Vally, S. (2007). From people's education to neo-liberalism in South Africa. *Review of African Political Economy*, (111), 39-56.
- Vass-Elder, D. (2007). Emergence and the realist account of cause. *JCR*, (42), 315- 338.
- Waghid, Y (2002). *Democratic education: Policy and praxis*. Stellenbosch: Stellenbosch University Press.
- Waghid, Y. (2009). Universities and public goods: In defence of democratic deliberation, compassionate imagining and cosmopolitan justice. In E.Bitze (Ed.) *Higher education in South Africa: A scholarly look behind the scenes*, Stellenbosch: SUN MeDia
- Wagner, P, & Karagianis, N. (2008). Varieties of agonism: Conflict, the common good, and the need for synagonism. *Journal of Social Philosophy*, 39(3), 323-339.
- Waldron, J. (2011). Socio-economic rights and theories of justice. *San Diego Law Review*, (48), 773-807.
- Wangenge-Ouma, G. (2010). Funding and the attainment of the transformation goals in South Africa. *Oxford Review of Education*, 36(4) 481-497.
- Watson, L, S & Watson, W, R. (2011). Critical, emancipatory, and pluralistic research for education: A review of critical systems theory. *Journal of Thought, Fall-Winter*, 63-77.
- Whipp, J, D. (2004). Jane Addams' social thought as a model for pragmatist-feminist communitarians. *Hypatia* 19(2), 118-132.
- Wilson, V. & McComack, B. (2006). Critical realism as emancipatory action: the case for realistic evaluation in practice development. *Nursing Philosophy*, (7), 45-57.

Wikgren, M. (2004). Critical realism as a philosophy and social theory in information science. *Journal of Documentation*, 61 (1), 11-22.

Wiredu, K. (2007). Social philosophy in post-colonial Africa: Some preliminaries concerning communalism and communitarianism. A key note address at Rhodes University, South Africa, 3th April 2007.

Woodbury, R, L. (2005). Hardening class lines: The erosion of social contract. *Journal of New England board of Higher Education*. (4),25 – 27.

Woodrooffe, D. D. (2011). When visions of the rainbow nation are not enough: Effect of post-apartheid higher education reform on social cohesion in South Africa. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 86 (3), 171 – 182.

Yaqoob, M. (2011). Education for social change: An evaluation of feminist education/ pedagogical model. *International Journal of Academic Research*. 5(3), 317 – 320.

Zachariadis, M., Scott, S. & Barret, M. (2010). Exploring critical realism as the theoretical foundation of mixed-methods research: Evidence from the economics of IS innovations. *Working Papers Series*. Cambridge Judge Business School.

Zhang, E. (2010). Community, the common good, and the public health care – Confucianism and its relevance to contemporary China. *Public Health Ethics*, 3(3), 259-266.

Internet Sources

University of Johannesburg. www.uj.ac.za

The Center for social Transformation at the University of Johannesburg

University of Witwatersrand. www.wits.ac.za

Social transformation at the University of Witwatersrand

www.criticalrealism.com