



HAL
open science

Education, Democracy and Decentralisation

Ingrid Bamberg

► **To cite this version:**

Ingrid Bamberg. Education, Democracy and Decentralisation: Education Policy Reforms in South Africa (1994-2004). IFAS Working Paper Series / Les Cahiers de l' IFAS, 2006, 8, p. 91-106. hal-00799120

HAL Id: hal-00799120

<https://hal.science/hal-00799120>

Submitted on 11 Mar 2013

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



**TEN YEARS OF
DEMOCRATIC
SOUTH AFRICA
TRANSITION
ACCOMPLISHED?**

BY

AURELIA WA KABWE-SEGATTI,

NICOLAS PEJOUT

AND PHILIPPE GUILLAUME

Les Nouveaux Cahiers de l'IFAS / IFAS Working Paper Series is a series of occasional working papers, dedicated to disseminating research in the social and human sciences on Southern Africa.

Under the supervision of appointed editors, each issue covers a specific theme; papers originate from researchers, experts or post-graduate students from France, Europe or Southern Africa with an interest in the region.

The views and opinions expressed here remain the sole responsibility of the authors. Any query regarding this publication should be directed to the chief editor.

Chief editor: Aurelia WA KABWE – SEGATTI,
IFAS-Research director.

The text herein presented as well as back issues of *Les Nouveaux Cahiers de l'IFAS / IFAS Working Paper Series* are available on the IFAS website:
www.ifas.org.za/research

IFAS – Research
PO Box 542 – Newtown 2113
Johannesburg – RSA
Tel: +27 (0)11 836 0561
Fax: +27 (0)11 836 5850
Email: secretariatrecherche@ifas.org.za

Institut français d'Afrique du Sud, Johannesburg, 2006
(*Les Nouveaux Cahiers de l'IFAS / IFAS Working Paper Series* N°8).
ISSN: 1608 - 7194

SUMMARY

For the past ten years, South Africa has been progressively coming out of the apartheid system. Although all ties with the former regime have been severed completely, managing the heavy structural legacy has made the transition a difficult as well as an ambivalent process - difficult because the expectations of the population contrast with the complexity of the stakes which have to be dealt with; and ambivalent because the transition is based on innovations as well as continuities.

The contributions gathered in this book will try to clarify the trajectory of that transition. Offered analyses share a critical look, without complacency nor contempt, on the transformations at work. Crossing disciplines and dealing with South Africa as an ordinary and standardised country that can no longer be qualified as being a “miracle” or an “exception”, gives us an opportunity to address themes that are essential to understanding post-apartheid society: land reforms, immigration policies, educational reforms, AIDS...

This issue of IFAS Working Papers is the translation of a book published with Karthala publishers to celebrate 10 years of the Research section of the French Institute of South Africa (IFAS) and to highlight its major contribution to constructing francophone knowledge on Southern Africa.

RÉSUMÉ

Depuis dix ans, l'Afrique du Sud sort progressivement du système d'apartheid : si les ruptures avec l'ancien régime sont nettes, la gestion d'un héritage structurel lourd rend cette transition à la fois difficile et ambivalente. Difficile car les attentes de la population contrastent avec la complexité des enjeux à traiter. Ambivalente car cette transition est faite d'innovations et de continuités.

C'est cette trajectoire que les contributions réunies ici tentent d'éclairer. Les analyses proposées partagent un regard critique sans complaisance ni mépris sur les transformations à l'œuvre. Le croisement des disciplines et le traitement de l'Afrique du Sud comme un pays ordinaire, normalisé, sorti des paradigmes du « miracle » ou de l'« exception », donnent l'occasion d'aborder des thèmes essentiels à la compréhension de la société post-apartheid : réforme agraire, politique d'immigration, réformes éducatives, sida...

Ces Cahiers sont la traduction d'un ouvrage paru chez Karthala en 2004 à l'occasion des dix ans d'existence du pôle recherche de l'Institut Français d'Afrique du Sud (IFAS) afin de souligner sa contribution majeure à la construction des savoirs francophones sur l'Afrique australe.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Normalising Reportson South Africa, <i>by Aurelia Wa Kabwe-Segatti, Nicolas Pėjout and Philippe Guillaume</i>	5
CHAPTER 1. Who Is Governing the “New” South Africa? Elites, Networks and Governing Styles (1985-2003), <i>by Marianne Séverin and Pierre Aycard</i>	13
CHAPTER 2. “Big Brother” in South Africa? e-Government and Panoptic Control During and After Apartheid, <i>by Nicolas Pėjout</i>	39
CHAPTER 3. From Free Housing Policy to the Payment of Rates and Taxes in South African Cities (1994-2003): The Cape Town and Port Elizabeth Cases, <i>by Marianne Morange</i>	57
CHAPTER 4. Can We Speak About Effective Land Reform in South Africa?, <i>by Ward Anseeuw</i>	77
CHAPTER 5. Education, Democracy and Decentralisation: Educational Policy Reforms in South Africa (1994-2004), <i>by Ingrid Bamberg</i>	91
CHAPTER 6. Crossing Frontiers, Changing Trajectories? Renewal of Literature in Post-Apartheid South Africa, <i>by Donald Moerdijk</i>	107
CHAPTER 7. The Reappearance of the Khoesan in Post-Apartheid South Africa: Invention of Tradition and National Reconciliation, <i>by François-Xavier Fauvelle-Aymar</i>	125
CHAPTER 8. Linguistic Diversity in South Africa or How to Transform a Factor of Division into a Tool for Nation - Building?, <i>by Michel Lafon</i>	141
CHAPTER 9. Reformulating Immigration Policy in Post-Apartheid South Africa: From the Aliens Control Act of 1991 to the Immigration Act of 2002, <i>by Aurelia Wa Kabwe-Segatti</i>	171
CHAPTER 10. HIV/AIDS in South Africa 1990-2004: Governmental Logic and Social Mobilisation, <i>by Judith Hayem</i>	179
APPENDICES	205
Maps	
Webliography	
Acronyms and Abbreviations	
Authors	

chapter five

education, democracy and decentralisation

education policy reforms in south africa (1994-2004)

ingrid bamberg

ABSTRACT

The post-apartheid South African government has set up a new comprehensive legislative framework aiming at democratizing and deracializing the education system. Through various institutional arrangements promoting decentralization, like the School Governing Bodies (SGBs), the population can fully participate in the management of schools. This democratization intends to increase the access to and the quality of education, in a broader move towards the diminution of inequalities in the schooling environment. Nevertheless, the evaluation of such interventions reveals a mixed picture.

RÉSUMÉ

Le gouvernement sud-africain de la période post-apartheid a mis en place un nouveau cadre législatif d'ensemble visant la démocratisation et la déracialisation du système éducatif. Différents dispositifs institutionnels reposant sur la décentralisation, comme les « School Governing Bodies » (SGBs), ont permis aux populations de participer pleinement à la gestion des écoles. Cette démocratisation veut augmenter l'accès à l'éducation et en améliorer sa qualité, dans le cadre plus large d'une réduction des inégalités dans l'environnement scolaire. Néanmoins, l'évaluation de telles interventions renvoie une image mitigée.

Ten years after the first democratic elections, South Africa has dismantled all the apartheid structures that weighed down the educational system, whereby education was separated according to racial categories and territorial divisions, consolidating white minority supremacy while merely offering the remaining population a mediocre and ossifying education. South Africa took up the challenge of merging into a unique system the nineteen educational administrative departments under apartheid¹ and of establishing a common educational culture. However, reality shows that successive reforms did not meet the success expected and did not reach fully their objective concerning access to quality education, equity, reduction of inequalities or even more, democratisation.

¹ In 1953, the Bantu Education Act was promulgated, separating the Black from the White educational system on "racial" grounds. In 1963, the Coloured Persons Education Act and, in 1965, the Indians Education Act, created a distinct system for Coloureds and Indians. The conditions and quality of education were predetermined and differentiated according to individuals' "racial" membership. Although they were left to themselves, Bantustans and "Independent States" were subjected to the forceful control of the central State whereby the latter decided on the main principles of their educational policy and granted them a budgetary allocation. Each racial group and each territorial unit then had its own education administrative department.

FROM NEW LEGISLATION TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EDUCATIONAL POLICY

A LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK MEANT TO DEMOCRATISE EDUCATION

Under apartheid, each educational department was autonomous as regards functioning, financing, administration and teaching methods and programmes. The level of financing, the teaching and learning conditions as well as the level of educational expectations were higher for the white populations than for the other groups. At the height of apartheid, between 1965 and 1975, the budget for Blacks' education represented 10% to 20% of that for Whites' education; in the mid-1980s and at the beginning of the 1990s, it represented 60% (Unterhalter 1991). The teaching and learning conditions of the Blacks were deplorable: excessive numbers of students, badly trained teachers and a shortage of staff, dilapidated or nonexistent premises and lack of teaching materials. White students clearly benefited from much better conditions: a low ratio of students per teacher and per class, availability of laboratories, libraries, sports grounds, and administrative personnel. It is from this context of great economic and social disparities that, in 1994, South Africa transformed its divided educational system into a single and decentralised system, placing at the centre of its reforms the eradication of discrimination.

Absorbing the multiple regional and local structures that existed under apartheid within a unique system required to elaborate a new organisational approach and define clearly the role and place of education within a developing South African society. The first years of educational transformation were thus dedicated to implementing a set of laws and policies guarantying national unity and the coherence of the new educational system.

Various laws were passed to establish the roles of the different entities of the educational system as well as their relations (National Education Policy Act, 1996), the regulation of the rights and obligations of students, the functioning, organising and financing of schools (South African Schools Act, 1996), the different teaching cycles (Further Education Act, 1998; Higher Education Act, 1997), the teaching profession (Employment of Educators Act, 1998), to guarantee the rights of adults to basic education and training (Adult Basic Education and Training Act, 2000), and to ratify the unified learning system by instituting a national framework standardising qualification levels (South African Qualification Authority Act, 1995) and teaching contents (Curriculum 2005, 2001).

The laws and directives of the educational policy have the merit of offering a solid framework to the implementation of an educational system that then enables each individual to develop his/her capacities and potential, make a full contribution to society and thrive in it. Irrespective of their content, these laws are in perfect harmony with the national objectives of democracy, access to education, equity, reduction of inequalities and quality education, giving their worth back to schools.

■ *DEMOCRACY AND PARTICIPATION, A NEW MODE FOR CALLING
OUT TO SOCIETY*

The educational reform is naturally based on the need for renewal and the necessity to mend the damage done by decades of apartheid. It is deeply rooted in a readjustment process relying above all on the suppression of any discrimination in social organisation. According to the regulation in force, the principle of non-discrimination must find expression in every domain: through an efficient public service with clean practices, ensuring equal treatment to all, and also through the consultation and participation of each individual in the affairs of the nation. With this aim in view, the State takes on itself the double requirement of recognising diversity as well as difference in order to treat every citizen equitably, and to consolidate national unity.

It is on these foundations that the politico-administrative landscape is organised, into which the educational system fits: a “decentralised and co-operative governance” system that makes both the national (central government) and provincial (provincial governments) levels in charge of the legislation on education and the administration of the educational system, and play an equal role in these two domains. Thus, by virtue of the autonomy at its disposal, the provincial level is not under the line of authority of the national level. In the field of education, the nine autonomous provincial ministerial departments must implement their own educational policy, while applying national standards so as to reach the objectives of the overall educational policy. This politico-administrative model makes it possible, in particular, to take into account the geographical, economic and cultural particularities of each province and to remedy potential omissions or gaps from the national level likely to hinder their full development.

Correlatively, the educational policy takes into consideration the organisational, financial and developmental constraints of the school offer which regional and sub-regional levels must confront. That is why complementary structures are found at each system level, some

administrative, others representative, intervening to various degrees in the management of education and putting on the scene actors from diverse networks. The Ministers of Education at national and provincial levels elaborate policies and delegate to the education ministerial departments the administration of the system, from national to school levels. Thus, for more efficiency, but also for laying down the foundations of the new educational system, the mode for calling out to society has been redefined: representative, political or civil society representative structures enable the democratic participation of all in educational issues, from national to school level even.

Indeed, these mechanisms were also elaborated to meet the strong social demand. At the time of implementation of a unique and decentralised system, part of the white population claimed the right to keep the participative system from which it already benefited and which gave it extended powers in terms of school administration and control. As to the populations that were disadvantaged under apartheid, they demanded structures that would allow parents and other local educational actors to legally take part in the decision process of the school as well as all school matters. At the time, parents from non-white schools could only benefit from alternative structures (i.e. Parents-Teachers Associations in primary schools and Parents-Teachers-Students Associations in High Schools) that were not legally recognised and that only allowed the limited involvement of concerned actors.

In fact, these associations could only exercise a consultative role and had very little room for manoeuvre. They intervened more in the management of problems than in the actual running of the school. In addition, they were distributed unequally in the country and were practically non-existent in rural areas (Sithole 1994). Schools were run in an authoritative manner by principals who, officially, were the only ones who could make decisions. Schools were, for most, endowed with a committee consisting of the principal and local co-opted key figures and, depending on the existing political hand in the region of the school, full powers were in the hands of the principal or those of administrative or traditional authorities (Nzimande & Thusi 1991).

That is why the local level holds an important place in the post-apartheid educational system. While municipalities are not involved in the management of education at local level, the South African Schools Act, in every school, establishes School Governing Bodies (SGB) or Management Committees in charge of making decisions and “promoting the interests of the school and taking the necessary steps to guaranty its development by supplying quality education to all school students” (RSA 1996).

These Management Committees consist, on the one hand, of elected members: parents (majority), teaching and non-teaching personnel and, in the case of high schools, students; on the other hand, they consist of co-opted community members. The school principal is an ex-officio member. In charge of recruiting teachers and the principal, fixing the amount of school fees, choosing the language used for teaching, the optional school subjects and the political and religious orientation of the school, the SGB manages the school as well as the finances. Elected for three years, SGB members must meet at least once every three months and minute the meetings that are, in principle, available to every parent. Representing a link between the school and the community, they must enable parents to express themselves and take part fully in educational matters.

SGBs are relayed by forums, from the school area to the provincial levels, informing the education provincial ministers' councils. Through this system, parents' voices are supposed to be carried all the way to the top and have a weight in the formulation and implementation of the educational policy.

■ ACCESS, EQUITY, REDUCTION OF INEQUALITIES AND QUALITY OF EDUCATION

While education was reserved for privileged populations under apartheid, the right to education is from now part of the Constitution as the fundamental right of every citizen (Article 29). In order to guarantee basic education right, the intent of the educational policy is above all to guarantee access to education as well as quality education and to guarantee equity throughout the entire educational system. It aims to make good the damage caused by apartheid, to reduce inequalities between the various layers of society and to ensure that everyone will benefit from quality education. The policy is therefore about making access equitable by increasing the school offer and improving the quality of education.

To this end, a financial system to “readjust” and standardise the educational offer has been implemented: an equitable formula makes it possible to determine the share of national income each province must receive according to its schoolable and schooled population, its educational needs, its rural population and level of poverty.

² In South Africa, schools can recruit and remunerate themselves additional teaching staff.

In order to standardise personnel expenditures, the pupils / civil servant teacher² ratio, as determined by each province, is from now on almost the same in all the schools of the country (Table 1). Surplus teachers in certain schools have been redeployed towards the neediest schools or invited to leave education. An annual budget allocation is also attributed to schools by the provincial departments of education to cover expenditures other than personnel-related; this allocation is calculated as per school wealth and socio-economic criteria, as per a second equitable formula consisting in granting 60% of the provincial allocation to 20% of the poorest, and only 5% of this allocation to 20% of the least poor. The State thus ensures that every school benefits from basic equipment and educational material. Thanks to a national register of needs, a priority system is established between the most disadvantaged schools to ensure that they benefit from additional aid.

Correlatively, the fight for access to education and the readjustment are lead at the human level: reducing racial inequalities by favouring, in addition to non-discrimination measures, positive discrimination by implementing measures promoting “traditionally disadvantaged” children in “traditionally privileged” schools. The educational policy is also playing on apartheid logic reversal through the dissemination, in the educational sphere, of new values such as solidarity, human dignity, acknowledgement and promotion of cultural diversity. In practice, this means developing pupils’ critical mind, tackling South African history as well as collective societal history comprehensively, and encouraging individuals to learn the various national languages to favour exchange.

In order to ameliorate the quality of educational offer and to standardise the level of teaching requirements and qualifications, the teaching programme (Curriculum 2005) has been revised entirely. The Department of National Education opted for a programme based on Outcomes-Based Education or OBE, focused on the pupils, their creativity and autonomy while giving teachers a new role. This programme must offer every pupil the same opportunities as regards accessing the labour market and meeting international objectives for performance and competitiveness, despite the importance of provincial disparities. Curriculum 2005 is also encouraging schools to be in tune with their environment and constantly interact with local communities, associations and enterprises. Indeed, the concern of those who devised this programme was to take into account local specificities, enabling individuals to exploit these and blossom in their own environment.

This system enabled South Africa to establish a viable unified and democratic educational system and to change the educational situation at the human level as much as the level of educational offer. The principle of non-discrimination has been assimilated by most educational actors; schools rehabilitation and development programmes as well as plans to

reinforce teachers and educational practitioners' capacities have been implemented and are running in every province. However, despite this indisputable progress, we need to qualify the social report.

■ MITIGATED SOCIAL REPORT

While decentralisation of the educational system is supposed to ensure democracy, recognise diversity and thus enable each province to manage their educational offer ideally, it has a negative effect on educational policy objectives. Due to the fact that it is reinforcing regional disparities, it is revealing not only of the difficulties linked to the homogenisation of the new educational system, but also of the ambivalence of the government's political and economic orientations.

Because of the provinces' responsibility as regards financing education, economic disparities have been impacting on the educational domain. Not only does the share in the provincial budgets allocated to education vary from one province to another, the provinces are also subjected to budgetary constraints imposed by the government. Indeed, the educational policy has been integrated in the national economic programme defined by the 1996 Growth, Employment and Redistribution Programme (GEAR) that was to facilitate the objectives of the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) formulated in 1994. According to the government, the GEAR was to be instrumental in accessing "a growing and competitive economy, creating employment for all, a redistribution of resources for equal opportunities, a society supplied with good health services, education as well as an environment into which households are safe and enterprises productive" (Department of Finance 1996, p.1). To this end, the government thus undertook to rationalise social expenditures that, in the sector of education, was translated into a reduction in the teaching staff and teaching expenditures.

Thus, it appears today that the share of the educational budget assigned to teaching expenditures and supposed to improve the quality of education is insufficient. More than 90% of the educational budget is indeed assigned to payroll. In parallel, during the mandate of the first democratically elected government (1994-1999), the share of the provincial budget coming from the national income has been mismanaged by the provincial governments in charge of dividing this share among the various ministerial departments. Due to the provinces' overspending in the educational sector, the central power was brought to intervene in the management of the provincial finances and, from then on, to devise a system orientating educational spending in the middle term (3 years).

TABLE 2 – SHARE OF EDUCATION IN PROVINCIAL BUDGETS (1998 – 1999)

Provinces	Share of Education in Provincial Budget (in %)
Eastern Cape	24
Free State	40
Gauteng	48
KwaZulu-Natal	52
Limpopo	49
Mpumalanga	49
North West	55
Northern Cape	39
Western Cape	47
Total (average)	45

Source: Department of Education, 2000, Education for All, *The South African Assessment Report*.

Also, from 1999, the central government decided to intervene further in the co-ordination of actions to be conducted by the various provincial education departments, as a result of the many failures, low performance and inefficiencies found at provincial level: indeed, certain provinces abandoned indispensable programmes to build premises or supply educational material; others, in order to compensate for their difficulty in remunerating teachers, encouraged teachers' redeployment with the intention of transferring personnel in the less favoured provinces and to distribute more equitably educational resources. This interference of the national power in provincial affairs is indicative of the fragility of the provinces and the limitation of their autonomous capacities for managing education.

As to the SGBs, not only do they ensure the democratic link between parents and schools, but must also contribute to the development of the school since the State only assumes the minimum: payment of teachers as per a determined pupils-per-teacher ratio and budgetary allocation as best it can. SGBs are thus responsible to supply schools with additional financial resources via school fees and various fund raisings. The quality and conditions of teaching thus depend largely on the income of the parents who finance, for the greater part, their children's education through schools fees as determined by SGBs. The wealth of the provinces and their

employment creation capacity therefore have a direct impact on the payment of school fees and the teaching conditions in a given province.

The financial participation of parents in the development of schools also creates clear differences between educational institutions. Schools must implement every strategy to raise additional funds and tend to select pupils, when possible, in function of their socio-professional origin in order to position themselves in an increasingly competitive educational market. Thanks to the funds raised, schools can remunerate additional teachers, making it possible to reduce the pupils-per-teacher ratio or obtain educational material, thus giving them a clear advantage in school rivalry. As it is, the gap is increasing between those populations having access to quality teaching they can afford, and those who are reduced to an education to which the State contributes, but which remains mediocre in many cases: high pupils-per-teacher ratio, lack of infrastructure and material, badly trained teachers.

Moreover, structural gaps in the organisation of the system are upsetting its efficiency. The fact that municipalities play no role in education harms its effective development. Thus, there is an obvious lack of harmonisation between the needs identified by municipalities and the decisions taken by provincial ministerial departments making the final decisions as regards building schools, whereby these departments do not necessarily take into account municipal planning specifications.

At school level, the role conferred upon SGBs concerning the recruitment of teachers and school principals, gives rise to excesses that can go against the objectives of the educational policy. On the one hand, SGB members are not all education professionals and their decisions can be motivated by obscure reasons without real educational foundation. Nepotism, the development of acquaintance networks and exclusion strategies are then possible, to the detriment of access, equity and democracy. On the other hand, the illiteracy of the many parents and their inability to play their part within SGBs hinders, to a greater extent, participation as recommended by the educational policy.

The educational policy, formulated around contradictory claims, displays a number of paradoxes significant of the ambivalence of its two fundamental principles: attachment to democratic principles and implantation of the notion of societal rights, on the one hand, and adhering to a liberal economic policy forcing the South African State to reduce social expenditures that are indispensable for equity and the reduction of inequalities, on the other hand.

While certain principles and objectives defined at national level are meant to guarantee equity and quality of education, it appears that local realities are clearly hampering their realisation at school level. Thus, the effective execution of SGB budgetary responsibilities, successful resource mobilisation and the degree to which the teaching programme operates depend as such on the economic and social environment of the school.

The post-apartheid South African educational system is living, as in most African countries, to the rhythm of decentralisation, “governance”, the multiplicity of actors at local level as well as market logics. Advocating, via the decentralisation of the educational system, the participation of individuals in school issues and a certain form of responsibility, the educational policy, in particular, is the fruit of a State freeing itself from its obligations and “leaving the weight of financing education to the parents” (Vally 1998, p.3). By giving parents the ability to choose the educational institution in which their children will learn, and by giving them the ability to put a lot of time and effort into school matters, the reform has enabled the State to reduce noticeably the cost of the educational system. Concerning school fees, the differences between schools are such that education works in two ways: On the one hand are parents who can afford it give their children a quality education in a school developing thanks to school fees. On the other hand are the parents who cannot afford it and therefore place their children in schools where the State is certainly making an effort to rehabilitate and improve teaching and learning conditions, but where the quality of education remains low and where development possibilities are few, due to low school fees. The hierarchy of inequalities is from now on making more space for social characteristics, parallel to the racial remnants of apartheid of which part of the population cannot get rid due to the weight of its mechanisms in the socio-economic dynamics.

CONCLUSION

Ten year later, the young democratic South Africa still needs to consider clearly its development as regards the distance covered and the readjustments carried out since the end of apartheid. However, the need for making good apartheid damages inclines one to grasp social inequalities mainly as a consequence of apartheid and therefore to conceal other mechanisms creating them. Correlatively, educational policy evaluation is largely based on the statistical grasping of the results or on the actual analysis of the texts and their objectives, to the detriment of actual field work. Yet, statistics are often misleading; they tend to conceal the participation of private actors in the school offer and to give credit only to the State when results show an improvement in educational offer.

Some South African research and evaluating institutions tend to offer, from now on, more empirical work with projects such as those of the Centre for Education Policy Development (CEPD)³ and its consortium Education 2000+, Governance and Equity, that should enable the government to grasp further the realities of the educational field and the results of its educational policy. However, the impact of this policy on society itself and the direction schools are taking need to be measured more widely and in a more articulated manner. While controlling education quality is crucial to social development, analysing the relation between society and schools, the meaning society gives schools and how it interprets such meaning daily is nonetheless as important and indispensable to enable South African schools to play their role of spur for social development. That is why the principles that have been feeding educational decentralisation policies and, in particular, the involvement of local actors in supplying school offer, or still the idea of “schools at the centre of communities”, deserve to be analysed at local level – the ideal level to analyse the conditions according to which the relation between schools and society has been established progressively in South Africa.

Schools are not separate entities and cannot be perceived only as an objective per se. The AIDS epidemic that has struck pupils and teachers, unemployment and extreme poverty, the balance of power between political and traditional authorities are all linked to this and influence the functioning of schools. Research on education must therefore recognise the social dimension of schools to a greater extent. It must understand the impact of schools on societal development as much as accept society as an actor in the development of schools. Grasping further the social space of schools appears today as a main line which research must take into account if it is to participate in the optimisation of the South African educational system. The field is wide, the need is great, and yet too little has been done in this domain. The multiple skills and disciplinary domains must be pooled in order to understand the complexity of South African schools. Whether in a fundamental or applied manner, the aim is to make school formation mechanisms explicit so as to ensure quality education in the citizen schools of South Africa.

In an environment marked by decentralisation and globalisation, the relation between centre and periphery appears as a central element of educational policy. The link between the various levels and between the various actors and partners of the educational system includes

³ Founded in 1993 so as to propose the new orientations of the educational policy to the future democratic government, the CEPD represents the sixth Education Policy Unit of the major universities. The consortium it creates with these five units and the Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC), is working on projects aiming to explore the conditions of education in the poorest communities of South Africa.

a certain number of stakes questioning the place of schools in society, concerning as much organisational as political objectives. With the development of partnerships, the need for democratic justification and the increasing diversity of actors, the school dimension is, from now on, extending well beyond the educational sphere. In this context, local levels and, more particularly, the link between schools and local spaces, constitute an object and a privileged field for studying South African schools and answering the many unresolved issues.

To what extent are the orientation of the educational policy – very widely aligned on the concept of community – and its implementation at local level, appropriate to answer the objectives as determined, initially, in a South Africa still strongly immersed in the communitarist ideas of social life imposed by apartheid? Which antagonisms are emerging from the confrontation of school actors? Which social processes are governing the conditions for enforcing the right to education and to what extent is this right perceived as a collective commitment and not as an individual natural right only? Which formal and informal processes are taking part in the construction and regulation of school segregation, i.e. the concentration or separation of school publics on social, ethnic or academic bases? What is the role of the school and residential strategies of the families in the construction of school segregation? What is the link between the representations and strategies of the families and local context characteristics, from the viewpoint of educational and residential offer and that of segregation regulation mechanisms? These are the many questions that cannot be evaded if we want to appreciate the extent of the current political and social transformations in South Africa today.

TABLE 1 - SCHOOLS STATISTICAL DATA PER PROVINCE (2001)

Provinces	Type of School	Number of Schools	Number of Pupils Ratio	Teachers	Pupils-Teacher	Net % of Schooling in the Primary (1997)	Net % of Schooling in the Secondary (1997)
Eastern Cape	Public	6 056	2 027 791	60 882	33	97	45
	Private	31	6 041	419	14		
	Total	6 087	2 033 832	61 301	33		
Free State	Public	2 396	703 912	22 403	31	91	59
	Private	63	12 109	553	22		
	Total	2 459	716 021	22 956	31		
Gauteng	Public	1 900	1 444 861	43 761	33	86	59
	Private	313	116 498	7 115	16		
	Total	2 213	1 561 359	50 876	31		
KwaZulu-Natal	Public	5 608	2 661 508	71 628	37	105	63
	Private	143	36 945	2 612	14		
	Total	5 751	2 698 453	74 240	36		
Limpopo	Public	459	194 377	6 183	31	74	45
	Private	19	2 724	176	15		
	Total	478	197 101	6 359	31		
Mpumalanga	Public	4 446	1 793 788	56 491	32	95	57
	Private	185	22 401	1 020	22		
	Total	4 631	1 816 189	57 511	32		
North West	Public	1 864	894 284	24 245	37	78	47
	Private	62	9 713	268	36		
	Total	1 926	903 997	24 513	37		
Northern Cape	Public	2 271	883 567	28 743	31	87	65
	Private	40	9 577	491	20		
	Total	2 311	893 144	29 234	31		
Western Cape	Public	1 474	888 888	25 008	36	88	58
	Private	128	29 142	2 203	13		
	Total	1 602	918 030	27 211	34		
TOTAL	Public	26 474	11 492 976	339 344	34	92	57
	Private	984	245 150	14 857	17		
	Total	27 458	11 738 126	354 201	33		

Sources: Department of Education 2003, *Education Statistics in South Africa at a Glance in 2001*

* As indicated by the HSRC (2004, p.310), the net percentage above 100 in the Province of KwaZulu-Natal comes from an error in the source data. It is possible that this incorrect number is due to an irregularity in the census data or school statistics. The potential falsification of birth certificates by many parents to register their children at school, who are too young or too old, would contribute to the statistical inaccuracy.

REFERENCES

- BAMBERG I., 2001, « Education et démocratisation en Afrique du Sud : le nouveau système éducatif unique et décentralisé face à la reproduction des inégalités ». *Autrepart*, vol. 17, N°Des écoles pour le Sud, p. 91-110.
- BAMBERG I., 2002, « L'éducation au niveau local en Afrique du Sud : enjeux de la gouvernance scolaire » in ANTHEAUME B., GIRAUT F., MAHARAJ B., *Recomposition territoriale : confronter et innover*. Actes des rencontres scientifiques franco-sud africaines de l'innovation territoriale, Avignon, Le Pradel, Grenoble, 22-28 janvier, ><http://iga.ujf-grenoble.fr/teo/Innovation/introduction.htm>, accédé le 19 mars 2004.
- BAMBERG I., 2003, « "L'école comme centre de la vie communautaire" : diversification des représentations et des pratiques dans une communauté semi-rurale d'Afrique du Sud », *Cahiers d'Etudes Africaines*, XLIII (1-2), 169-170, , p.121-142.
- BAMBERG I., 2004, « Droits à l'éducation en Afrique du Sud : une démocratisation de l'éducation entre banalisation de l'accès et libre choix », Colloque international *Le droit à l'éducation : quelles effectivités au Sud et au Nord*, 8-12 mars, Ougadougou, Burkina Faso
- CARPENTIER C., 1999, « L'école en Afrique du Sud : entre apartheid et mondialisation ». *Revue Tiers Monde*, Vol. XL, N°159, p. 597-623.
- DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, 1998, *National Norms and Standards for School Funding*. Notice 2362 of 1998, Pretoria.
- DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, 2000, *Education for All. The South African Assessment Report*, Pretoria.
- DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, 2000, *South African Curriculum for the 21st Century*. Report of the Review Committee on Curriculum 2005, Pretoria.
- DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, 2001, *Education in South Africa: Achievements since 1994*, Pretoria.
- DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, 2003, *Education Statistics in South Africa at a glance in 2001*, Pretoria.
- DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE, 1996, *Growth, Employment and Redistribution. A Macroeconomic Strategy*, Pretoria.
- NZIMANDE B., THUSI S., 1998, « Children of War. The Impact of Political Violence on Schooling in Natal », 1st Ed. 1991, in EDUCATION POLICY UNIT (NATAL), *Democratic Governance of Public Schooling in South Africa, a record of research and advocacy from the Education Policy Unit (Natal)*, Durban, EPU Natal, p. 3-20.

- SITHOLE S., 1998, « Parent-Teacher-Student Associations (PTSAs): Present State and Future Prospects », 1st ed. 1994, in EDUCATION POLICY UNIT (NATAL), *Democratic Governance of Public Schooling in South Africa, a record of research and advocacy from the Education Policy Unit (Natal)*, Durban, EPU Natal, p. 39-49.
- REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA, 1995, *South African Qualification Authority Act*, Notice 58 of 1995, Le Cap.
- REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA, 1996, *South African Schools Act*, Notice 84 of 1996, Le Cap.
- REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA, 1998, *The Further Education and Training Act*, Notice 98 of 1998, Cape Town.
- REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA, 1998, *Employment of Educators Act*, Notice 76 of 1998, Le Cap
- REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA, 1997, *Higher Education Act*, Notice 101 of 1997, Le Cap.
- REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA, 1996, *National Education Policy Act*, Notice 27 of 1996, Le Cap.
- REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA, 2000, *Adult Basic Education and Training Act.*, Notice 52 of 2000, Le Cap.
- UNTERHALTER E., 1991, « Aspects of reformism in bantu education, 1953-1989 », in UNTERHALTER E. & al., *Apartheid education and popular struggles*, Johannesburg, Ravan Press, p. 1-18.
- VALLY S., 1998, « Inequality in Education ? Revisiting the Provisioning, Funding and Governance of Schooling », *Quarterly Review of Education and Training*, Wits EPU, Vol. 5, N°4, August.