Gender Equality in South African Higher Education Institutions: Assessing determinants of policy failure. A Case Study on the University of KwaZulu-Natal (Howard College)

By

Wilbert N. Mhlanga

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Social Sciences (Public Policy)

Supervisor: Prof H. S. Simelane

School of Social Sciences

University of KwaZulu-Natal

Howard College

Durban

NOVEMBER 2013

DECLARATION

I declare that the work presented here is my own unaided work and has been conducted under the supervision of Prof H. Simelane. All citations and borrowed ideas have been duly noted and acknowledged. None of the present work has been submitted previously for any degree or examination in any other University.

_____

Wilbert Mhlanga (Student)

_____

Prof H. S. Simelane (Supervisor)

DEDICATION

My late mother Makharadi as she was affectionately known as grew up at a time when girls could not go to school just because they were girls. Despite that life changing set back she understood the importance and value of education and made sure that we got it in bucket loads. Of all the gifts she gave us, the gift of education will forever be one of the greatest. With this gift she opened a world of endless opportunities for us; it was a gift within a gift. I am who I am today because a hard working woman rose above her challenging circumstances to give me something she could only dream of. From the depth of my heart and sincere gratitude I dedicate this work to her. I also dedicate it in part to you my beloved sister Elizabeth and brother Lindani for the tremendous support, love and faith. To all the many women that brought me up you all remain unforgotten especially my late grandmother Emma.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to give praise and thanks God without whom this dissertation would not have been possible. I would also like to extend my sincere gratitude to the following people who have in their own special way made this a remarkable journey: My supervisor Prof H.S. Simelane for his patience, kindness, understanding and guidance throughout this project, Belinda Johnson who persuaded me to do the course and acted as my mentor throughout my first year, Sisanda Vapi, Thandeka Mbele, Owen Naicker, Dr Mngomezulu and Nqobizizwe Memela for always being helpful and supportive, the entire academic staff who played a pivotal role by granting me the time and opportunity to interview them, Nomvuyo Msomi for keeping me motivated and on track, and lastly you my beloved friends for giving me the motivation to keep pushing.

ABSTRACT

Gender equality barriers today are less obvious and more subtle than ever before and in some instance go undetected. Despite evidence of women's success and proven abilities, a high proportion of suitably qualified and experienced female academics still experience gender inequality and most remain underrepresented in institutions of higher education particularly so in senior positions. Contemporary observations proffer multiple rationales for this such as patriarchal organisational cultures, traditional devaluation of women's abilities, unconscious biases towards women's inappropriateness for certain jobs, roles or positions and the reluctance by organisations to implement gender equality policies. Through an interrogation of the existing gender equality policies and initiatives and analysis of the organisational culture inherent at UKZN (Howard College), the study sought to identify institutional dynamics that act as impediments to achieving gender equality at the institution and adversely affect the formulation, implementation and progression of gender equality policies and initiatives. A consideration of the liberal feminist prescripts, perspectives of both male and female academics and a deeper understanding of organisational culture as an influential factor provide practical and feasible solutions to the problem at hand.

ACRYNOMS

ANC-African National Congress

BBBEE-Broad Based Black Economic Empowerment

CEDAW-Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women

CHE-Council for Higher Education

CGE-Commission on Gender Equality

CEO-Chief Executive Officer

DoE-Department of Education

DoL-Department of Labour

DST-Department of Science and Technology

EEA-Employment Equity Act

EC-European Commission

EU-European Union

GPF-Gender Policy Framework

ILO-International Organisation of Labour

JSE –Johannesburg Stock Exchange

KZN-KwaZulu Natal

NACI -National Advisory Council on Innovation

NGP-New Growth Path

NPHE-National Plan for Higher Education

NRDS-National Research and Development Strategy

SET-Science, Engineering and Technology

SET4W-Science, Engineering and Technology for women

UKZN- University of KwaZulu Natal

UN-United Nations

WEF-World Economic Forum

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORECTICAL REVIEW

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

CHAPTER FOUR: ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

<div align="center">**CHAPTER ONE**</div>

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a general review and context of the study, state the research problem, the objectives of the research and key questions to be answered by the research. Thereafter, the significance of the research will be discussed and a review of literature pertinent to this study will be carried out. The theoretical framework guiding the study makes up the conclusion of the chapter.

1.1 Background of the study

Throughout the 20th century up to present day gender equality has been a socioeconomic issue that the global community is grappling with. This problematic issue entails any action that accords or denies opportunities, privileges, or rewards to a person based on their sex. According to Cohen (2003), gender inequality is a constructed social process which is built and becomes embedded in social structures in which the devalued genders in this case (women) have limited access to resources, rewarded differently and have less authority/power as compared to the valued genders (men).

The continuing marginalisation of women has been proven not just to be socially unjust but also limits women's participation and overall potential contribution to the world's economy and its developmental goals. Thus, respective governments across the globe have been continually seeking to re-create common national cultures free of sexual prejudice.

The inclusion of gender equality and empowerment of women as part of the United Nations Millennium Development Goals to be achieved by 2015 by 189 member states highlights some of the strides that have been taken by the global community to eradicate gender inequality, promote development and foster peace for women.

In South Africa, the fight for social equality has always been the crux of the struggle for a democratic South Africa. The post-apartheid constitution of 1996, which is hailed as the most progressive in the world, calls for and compels all to recognize the injustices of the past and be united in diversity. Its preamble promises all South Africans a society based on democratic values, social justice, a better life and redress of imbalances of the past. With reference to gender imbalances, gender equality is one of the core ideals enshrined in the Bill of Rights of the aforementioned constitution. The principle of equality not only upholds and protects women's rights, but it also unequivocally prohibits discrimination on the premise of gender (South African Constitution, 1996).

With women having played a pivotal role in the liberation of South Africa, it was, however, a bitter irony that in the post-apartheid South Africa, Africa, the fight against social injustices and enthusiasm in achieving social justice and transformation has been predominantly focused and inevitably relegated to a racial male dominated political and economic empowerment contest. A contest in which women have been vastly excluded as men jostled for the country's natural resources such as land, black equity ownership of white-owned businesses and representation of black people in what was termed pale management positions.

Deprecating how most of the effort has been directed at balancing up black male numbers in previously white male-dominated workspaces and business ownership, voices calling for the equal participation of women in the economy through the very channels used for the economic empowerment of men have continued to grow louder.

Having noted the vast exclusion and continued marginalisation of women, ANC led governments enacted various pieces of legislation as a means of reducing social inequities and overhauling working spaces. These laws included the Employment Equity Act 55 of 1998, which prohibits sexual discrimination, the Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment (BBBEE) Act of 2003, which encompass the economic empowerment of women, the disabled and the youth and last but not least the establishment of a regulatory institution, the Gender Commission, which is tasked with dealing with gender-related issues. To show further commitment to prioritizing gender equity issues the government resolved that in the coming years, the New Growth Path (NGP) to guide the economic growth of the country over the next decade will have clear gender goals that will be monitored. Furthermore, the Department for Women, Children and People with Disabilities was tasked with developing a gender equity bill, which will grant the government legislative authority to enforce the 50/50 gender parity, compelling all organisations both private and public to adhere to the principle of gender equality (Langa, 2011).

While gender equality struggles may be portrayed as a battle close to be won as a result of all this immense regulatory and legislative effort, the figures, on the other hand, tell a different story. The MasterCard Worldwide Index of Women's Advancement 2009-2010 report, saw South Africa's score rise by roughly six points from 87.96 to 93.5 as measured according to four key indicators.

The indicators, which assess the socio-economic level of women in relation to men, are broken down as follows; two of the indicators were based on source data from national statistics bureaus and depicted the ratio of female to male participation in the labour force and tertiary education. The other two indicators were based on survey data, and measured the ratio of female to male respondent perceptions of whether they held managerial positions at work and earned above average income.

A score under 100 indicates gender inequality in favour of males whereas a score above 100 indicates inequality in favour of women. A score of 100 indicates equality between the sexes. However, much of the advancement made as pointed out by Anthony West (senior vice president and general manager Africa: Master Card Worldwide) is propped up by the progress made in the public sector (Sapa, 2010). According to a report compiled by Government Communication and Information centre South Africa presently has 44% of women representation in parliament and 43% in Cabinet (SA News, 2012). To dampen the spirit further, this national progress towards the 50% target has largely resulted from the voluntary adoption of the 50/50 principle in all elected structures within the ANC party, and the large majority they hold in the national government as no other political party has such a commitment or policy in place.

On the private sector front, the results were even far more depressing. In 2005, the Commission on Gender Equality (CGE) after having reviewed 20 employment equity reports submitted to the Department of Labour from companies such as Coca Cola, MTN, De Beers, Nike, Shoprite Checkers and Spur found that 80% of those companies employed women at the semi-skilled level regardless of the women being fully qualified while 20% had women stuck at junior management. In 2008, of the 1023 executive directors, only 16 were female.

In 2010, the CGE report noted that the number of better performing companies with 25% or more women directors and executive managers continued to dwindle from 58 in 2008 to 37 in 2010. The report further observed that 4.5% of the CEOs and 19.3% of the executive managers of about 315 Johannesburg Stock Exchange-listed companies were women, 73 did not have women on their boards of directors. The report also noted that 16.6% of company directors are women and only 6% of company chairs are women.

To highlight the gravity of the situation with an actual company, the report pointed out that Shoprite Checkers which has a vast majority of its workers being women and a national award for women leaders only had 15 women in contrast to 276 men in top management at that time (CGE, 2010). Furthermore, a joint study conducted by UCT Unilever institute and TNS Research surveys in 2008 revealed that 89% of decisions made with regards to day-to-day purchases are made by women and women are also responsible for 69% of major household purchases, like kitchen utensils and appliances (McGibbon, 2008). A look at Shoprite Checkers executive shows a sea of male faces: 17 out of 17 and not a single woman in an organisation whose revenue is partially influenced by those purchasing decisions made by women which with a great possibility include store selection.

Speaking at a women's economic empowerment conference, Mike Mabuyakhulu, the KZN MEC for economic development and tourism said ―Women's economic empowerment just like other empowerment initiatives, has been so entrenched in our lexicon that we hardly think about its meaning anymore and the stark reality is that we have not fully implemented it".

He further noted that despite South Africa doing well in terms of the number of women appointed to senior positions with 27% of senior managers in the country being women, the country as no reason to celebrate until these pretty figures are inclusive of all racial groupings were the majority of women are black in relation to the demographics (Langa, 2011).

Looking at the differences in incomes earned by men and women, Terry notes that many countries have passed some version of an Equal Pay act but income disparities between men, and women still exist (Terry, 2007:86). Women typically are not paid equally as their male counterparts for the same equal work done. This is well illustrated by the following quote in which a woman points out that there are many bosses who say, ―You cannot earn more because you are a woman, what do you want the money for? It is the man who has to earn more‖ (Oxfam International, 2004:78). This statement could hold true considering the findings of the World‗s Economic Forum 2010 Global Gender Gap Report, which pointed out that women in South Africa contribute two-thirds of the work being done in the economy and bear the main responsibility for food production and the upkeep of their families yet women‗s income remains low relative to man‗s income. The Report showed that there are still discrepancies that needed to be addressed in as far as income earned between genders was concerned as the average income earned by women was pegged at R50 700 compared to the average of R84 912 earned by men. The report further noted that those averages were based on same job comparisons (WEF, 2011). The standard economic theory prognosticates that earnings have an effect on job satisfaction i.e. if a worker becomes aware that their wages are lower than that of a co-worker, it will undoubtedly reveal itself in an objection that affects both his/her job satisfaction and performance. This hampers his/her chance of promotion as job performance is negatively affected (Hinks, 2009)

In many organisations, gender equality has grown to be part of a bureaucratic practice operating with a model that suggests similarity first and substantial equality second. Gender equality thus, has been lessened to a box ticking exercise where the supposition is that a majority of male managers are unreceptive to gender equality and consequently, have to be coerced to abide to existing laws and policies. One of the instantaneous consequences of this approach is that the purpose and goals of gender equality are neglected and the process of achieving gender equality is placed into the hands of bureaucrats who habitually have diminutive empathy for its goals. In addition indicators at times do not capture the intricateness of gender relations and thus, can say nothing about the co-dependencies that exist between men and women. The very nature of the indicators feeds into dual notions of gender.

Universities in the apartheid era were riddled with obscene governance and oppression in which skin colour played a major role on who was enrolled and subsequently got employed after graduation this created the mostly white male-dominated scene in various workplaces. At the end of the apartheid era the country had 36 racially segregated public higher-education institutions. Post-apartheid South Africa, saw conscious efforts made by the ANC led government to transform and realign the Higher-Education Sector in line with the new democratic ideals that sought to promote and foster social equity and solidarity in which race played no part in enrolment and subsequent education and employment of the population at large. In response to the new social order and the need to produce human capital needed for the social and economic development of the new South Africa, the government through the enactment of the 1997 White Paper on higher education and the 1997 White paper on Science and Technology, sought to transform and overhaul all institutions of higher education in order to achieve equality and diversity.

A couple of years into the post-apartheid era the government in its presentation of the 1997 White Paper on higher education noted that the institutional culture in the historically white institutions continued to be Eurocentric with minute or no effort to position these institutions in the context of Africa. This as the government noted acted as an obstacle to both black students and staff from developing their potential to the fullest. It also observed that there were disparities in the participation rates of students from different population groups and inexcusable incongruity in the ratios of black and female staff in comparison to whites and males (DoE, July 1997). However, in the following years' changes in the demographic profile of the student body of the higher-education system were generally not being backed up by a comparable transformation in the staff profile as black people and women still remained under-represented in academic and professional positions, particularly at senior levels (CHE, 2000). Thus, the Department of Higher Education in an effort to transform the sector set several goals for the sector to be achieved in the years to follow in its 2001 National Plan for Higher Education (NPHE) and the 2002 National Research and Development Strategy (NRDS). The NPHE gave effect to the vision for the transformation of the higher-education system as outlined in the 1997 Education White Paper 3 - A Program for the Transformation of Higher Education. It provided an implementation framework and identified strategic interventions and levers essential for the transformation of the higher-education system.

The NPHE outlined five pivotal policy goals and strategic objectives, which in the governments' observation were vital in attaining the overall objective of the transformation of the higher-education system. However, the most significant of those five goals to this research was goal number two of the NPHE. This goal as defined in the Education White Paper 3 was set to push for equity of access and equal opportunities for success to all who are seeking to realise their potential through higher education, while stamping out all forms of

undue discrimination and advancing redress for past inequalities (White Paper: 1.14). The main objective of this goal was to make certain that the student and staff profiles mirror the demographic realities of South African society. The anticipated outcome of the goal was an in improvement staff equity by increasing the representation of blacks and women in academic and administrative positions, particularly at senior ranks. To realize this goal, the NPHE stated that institutions had to outline, develop and implement employment equity plans in their three-year rolling plans and also build an environment or institutional culture favourable for women to strive in (DoE, 2001:48).

Following these policy developments, the transformation of the student body has been fairly efficacious but there has been less triumph in changing the gender (and racial) composition of the staff, in spite of the existence of a favorable institutional policy environment (Shackleton et al. 2006). According to the Council on Higher Education (CHE), a staff head count carried out at public higher-education institutions in 2007 by gender and level of employment, men held a lion's share of management, academic, technical, trade and service posts, while women were in the majority in specific support professional and non-professional administration posts. Women comprise 40% of senior lecturers and 24% of professor and associate professor. These numbers have changed little since 2004 when 25% of professors and associate professors and 38% of senior lecturers were women. Only 4 of the 23 public institutions have women as vice-chancellors (CHE, 2008). Consequently, this situation warrants a cause for concern as the figures mentioned above fall below the established benchmarks set forth in the 2001 NPHE that universities need to meet, which call for each gender group to have a 50% share of all academic and professional staff posts particularly so at senior levels.

The 2008 CHE report notes that discrimination, in particular, with regard to racism and sexism is still persistent in most institutions and that whilst all universities at a formal level have discrimination and transformation policies in place there still is a disconnection between policy formulation and implementation, differences in institutional culture and transformation policies and a lack of institutional will in implementing them (CHE, 2008). A study sanctioned by the Science, Engineering and Technology for women (SET4W), a sub-committee of the National Advisory Council on Innovation (NACI) in the Ministry of Science and Technology observed that organisation plans placed significantly more attention on racial equity than on gender equity. This was noticeable from the fact that while attempts were being made to develop strategies and interventions to tackle issues of racial equity, there are scanty, if any, interventions or strategies at hand to deal with gender related issues (NACI, 2005).

The Commission for Gender Equality (CGE) 2008 study on gender promotion, on the other hand, noted that, there are invisible elements related to an institutional culture within a demonstrated male-dominated environment that continues to marginalise working women. The study pointed out that internal policies and practice, access to skills training, harassment, and a perception that men are held in high regard, and women have to ―earn their stripes‖ – creates an environment that is even arduous for black women to strive and flourish (Hicks, 2008). Studies commissioned by the South African National Advisory Council on Innovation showed gender discrimination is a problem in various academic fields. Its Director, Thiambi Netshiluvhi in a commentary noted that males tended to doubt the abilities and judgments of women in science, engineering and technology as a result of persisting with gender stereotyping and misperceptions regarding the potential of women in the sector (Fin24, 2009).

Women academics thus feel they got to be tough and join the boys' club and partake in the pack mentality that is a part of the political game men play in business. Tudge (2004) notes that while legislation has been a crucial determinant and a key building block in the significant progress working women have made in terms of achieving equality of opportunity and outcomes with men, there is still more commitment need so that legislation efforts can be transformed into practical realities of the previously disadvantaged, especially women.

The University of KwaZulu Natal (UKZN) like most institutions upholds the prescripts of the constitution, the recommendations of the NPHE and White paper on Education and subscribes the principles of the employment equity act. UKZN also has a transformation charter that advocates for unbiased employment equity and commitment to the need to transform and diversify. However, according to its indicators of success entailed in the university's strategic plan for the years 2007-2016 the University says it will regard itself as being successful in drawing and holding onto staff and meeting its equity objectives if the total staff complement is comprised of 35% Africans, Africans as defined in the Employment Equity Act (UKZN Strategic plan 2007). The observation made here is that there is no mention of how the university will consider itself successful in meeting its gender equity objectives as required and defined by the Employment Equity Act. The 35% African success indicator is also vague on the percentage African women will make up. As a progressive institution that supports and contributes to the socio-economic developmental and social transformation needs of the country and Africa as a whole with a significant number of female academics in its employ the absence of gender equity in the indicators of success is a cause for concern.

One of the University's strategies is to build an atmosphere of collegiality, accountability and organisational citizenship (UKZN Strategic plan 2007). The downside of such a strategy as Thaver (2006) contends is that, collegiality is presented by institutions as a guiding model, but an emphasis on collegiality obscures or conceals the conflict between academics coming from diverse backgrounds. Collegiality in this respect presents a major challenge for all academics—black and white, male and female—who must work closely and in the same space.

1.2 Problem Statement

Organisations are significantly influenced by the persistence of societal beliefs some positive and some negative. Men have long dominated academic institutions establishing and entrenching the rules and belief systems which make up the culture we have in them today. It is therefore my observation and contention that the present struggle for gender equity in institutions of higher learning is the result of a culture impregnated with patriarchy that has survived, evolved and persisted into the present.

Furthermore, most institutional efforts, plans and interventions developed to improve the number of women in the middle and upper echelons of university hierarchies to levels of parity with their male counterparts, have placed far greater emphasis on quantitative gender equality to merely meet set quotas or target, as a way of adhering to affirmative action and equity laws. This has inevitably reduced the transformation into a numbers game creating an illusion that gender equality has been achieved. These quantitative measurements although important on their own do not explain the continued existence of gender inequity.

This study therefore interrogates the prioritization of gender equality at the institution through the analysis of existing gender equality policies and initiatives, their effectiveness and the extent to which gender perspectives and awareness to the objectives of gender equality have been made cardinal to all of the institutions' endeavours such as policy development and resource allocation.

Furthermore, numbers do not give an understanding as to the role organisational culture as an influential factor and determinant plays in the transformation of our institutions of higher learning. This lack of a deep interrogation and understanding of the environment which breeds and feeds systemic sexism has resulted in the failure of institutions to implement real transformation and address the nature in which gender inequity continues unabated in institutions of higher education. In light of this the study also investigates whether and how the current organisational culture at the University of KwaZulu Natal acts as an impediment to achieving gender equality in the institution.

1.3 Objectives of study

1) To examine the type of organisational culture and institutional practices present at the UKZNs Howard College and position the women academics as either colluding with the status quo or resisting it.

2) To gain an understanding as to why institutions of higher education resist or partially implement the changes stipulated and recommended by the various legislative statutes.

3) To provide a platform for wider evidence based debates on designing gender equality interventions, policies and programs that will positively influence the advancement of women within workspaces effectively and efficiently.

4) To determine if the University of KwaZulu Natal (Howard College) has been successful in transforming its organisational culture by creating a conducive working environment which is women sensitive, which not only employs but also recognizes women as professional equals, encourages their career advancement and empowers them by fully utilizing them in senior and top management positions.

1.4 Key questions to be asked

1) How has gender equality been understood and pursued by the University of KwaZulu Natal?

2) What views are held with regard to the University's current employment equity policies and their enforcement, career development initiatives and their effectiveness, promotional opportunities and their fairness?

3) What are the feelings and perceptions of the various stakeholders found within the university with regard to gender equality?

4) Within the University what specific factors are impeding the full achievement of gender equality?

5) To what extent are the various stakeholders committed to achieving gender equity?

1.5 Broader issues to be investigated

1) The nature and form of gender equity policies/programs that have been implemented by UKZN.

2) The substance and comprehensiveness of gender equity policies/program

3) The extent to which UKZN (Howard College) has succeeded in addressing gender equity issues.

4) The existence and effectiveness of policy monitoring and evaluation mechanisms.

1.6 Significance of study

"Students and staff alike enter the university system with societal prejudices, but as they develop their capacities of reason to their highest level, they cannot leave with all those societal biases intact. Such an attitude denies us the opportunity to learn as we will always respond to matters with preformed judgments thus only reinforcing what may have been wrong for time immemorial and negating the opportunity to correct things and come to reasoned judgements" (Soudien, 2011). This research thus becomes significant in that it focuses on the societal attitudes and cultural beliefs held by the working staff in the university regardless of their gender which when collectively bound together influence and form the organisations' culture and belief system and way of doing things thereby indirectly and directly influence the implementing of gender equity policies, which may run contrary to the beliefs of those who are in control.

With legal prescripts of government carrying penalties for noncompliance to ensure conformity and compliance, there is a consensus that most organisations have resorted to box ticking, fronting or window dressing in fulfilling their obligations but haven't done much in changing male-oriented cultures. Thus, the empowerment of women more than ever transcends it more than being about women's legal rights and legal obligations of organisations to redress historical injustices but real tangible outcomes. Furthermore, transformation is a very neutral term which, to a certain extent, is meaningless unless what needs to be transformed is pointed out. Transformation in higher education according to Fourie (1999:227) entails changes in the composition of students and staff, governance structures, course content but most importantly it's about transforming the organisational or institutional culture and the development, reception, acceptance and approval of new mutually shared values. However, he notes that this can only be achieved through a deep-seated overhaul of the attitudes of all the stakeholders. In support of this view, Luhabe (2004:91) notes that whilst democracy has helped to a significant degree, it cannot overcome the prejudice and discrimination which is deeply embedded in people's attitude. By examining and divulging into both men and women's experiences and perceptions of their workplace, this research sought to find informed evidence based solutions to gender inequity, which will result in the overhauling of patriarchal oriented organisational cultures, which place women in academia at a disadvantage.

Far from their traditional roles as institutions that generate knowledge through the creation of knowledge and ideas and provider of human capital, universities themselves are workspaces in their own right in which the value of the university isn't only in terms of its fixed capital assets, but it's also in terms of its human knowledge capital.

In a knowledge-based economy, universities become relevant by keeping abreast with socio-economic changes and participate in the restructuring of social systems and contribute to social development. Therefore, other than equipping society with specific skills and knowledge needed for social and economic development, institutions of education transmit values, norms and behaviour which can aid social justice, social transformation and cooperation. If a replication of society's biases with regard to the culture of inequity is prevalent in our institutions of higher education where change is supposed to stem from how, then do we expect our institutions of education to play a leading role in ushering in change and transforming society? In light of that, this research seeks to challenge UKZN to examine itself and implement changes through policies and program where ever necessary so that it fulfils its social justice and cohesion mandate and be exemplary to all others.

1.7 Motivation of study

Gender inequity amongst other things is an underlying cause for stifled development, particularly so in Africa. Women have an immense role to play and a contribution to make in the area of economic development. However, their contribution remains constrained as their key role as major economic participants, consumers, and producers is, by and large, underestimated and misconstrued as they continue to be regarded as minors and nothing more than family carers. In terms of social cohesion, human discrimination on the basis of gender is a fundamental phenomenon that is inherent and has an effect on nearly all facet of people's daily lives particularly so for women. Patriarchal orientated norms and attitudes have fostered a culture of inequality in our organisation that has killed and taken the confidence of women to effectively do their jobs as well as men right out of their grasp as if women were innocent children and equality with men was something too harmful for them to hold.

Professor Soudien in an article entitled Humanities-The gift of reason writes;

> We all now work and live practically in each other's worlds with all
> our differences of colour, race and class and this shouldn't be
> something we should regret but something we should celebrate as it
> takes us to the challenge of treating each other with unconditional
> respect (Sunday times 18/09/11).

On a solution's perspective right from the onset of human life and human development men have been instrumental in the socialisation of societies in which gender inequity as a product of socialisation stems from. Judging by the state of affairs assertions that men have been in the forefront in maintaining gender disparities is undoubtedly true. However, it is also fair to point out that in this fight against gender inequity, men should not only be viewed as part of the problem but also as part of the solution in challenging existing stereotypes that enhance or encourage male dominance and masculinity.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.0 INTRODUCTION

This section gives an overview of the challenges women in academia face, women's perceptions and their impact on achieving gender equality and the role leadership plays in changing an institutions culture and transforming the institution as a whole. Furthermore, it provides definitions to the terms pertinent to this study such as gender and gender equality. A

2.1 Definitions of Gender and Gender Equality

Gender refers to the social characteristics and opportunities associated with being male and female and the relationships between women and men and girls and boys, as well as the relations between women and those between men. These characteristics, opportunities and relationships are socially constructed and are learned through socialization processes. They are context/ time-specific and variable. Gender establishes what is expected, sanctioned and valued in a woman or a man in a given context. In most societies there are differences and inequalities between women and men in the allocating of responsibilities, activities undertake, access to and control over resources, as well as decision-making opportunities (UN Women, 2011)

Rubin (1975:175-204) uses the phrase ‚sex/gender system' in a bid to elucidate a set of arrangements by which the biological raw material of human sex and procreation is shaped by human, social intervention. He employs this system as a way to accentuate that part of social life as the provenance of women's oppression. He describes gender as the *socially imposed disseverance of the sexes*. Rubin's understanding was that despite biological differences being fixed, gender differences in the manner in which/how women and men should behave are the oppressive results of social interventions. He observed that women are oppressed *as women* and ‒by having to *be* women." However, since gender is social, it is thought to be alterable by political and social reforms that can finally bring an end to women's subjugation. He concludes by noting that feminism ought to create a genderless (though not sexless) society, in which one's sexual anatomy is immaterial to who one is, what one does, and what one is capable of doing.

Marinova (2003) is of the view that the term gender is still absent in a myriad of languages throughout the world, and it is not an simple term to comprehend or even to educate people what the abstruse disparity between gender and sex is and why we are talking about gender as opposed to sex. Gender equality he enunciates has been and still is ostensible in innumerable societies as something anent only women, fashioned for women and administered by women. He notes that even if it is so women still experience gender inequality in all spheres of society. In conclusion, he observes that the stereotypes anent both genders are so deeply embedded in our reasoning that sometimes even the ardent exponents of gender equality are pulling back unwittingly and succumbing to their stereotypical thinking. Perhaps this is the reason why the gender equality cause is seen only as a ‒women's" movement and with men being more or less excluded from the entire process.

Cohen (2004) notes that gender can be understood as the attributes that society presumes a person to have, which is based on their sex. It can be referred to the economic, social, cultural duties and opportunities associated with being female or male. He suggests that gender is constructed and maintained by identifiable social processes and that as a structure gender divides work at home, in the economy and legitimates those in authority. Jones and George (2009) support this notion, noting that people's perceptions about one another are affected by information that is structured into pre-existing schemas. Schemas they believe are conceptual knowledge constructs embedded in memory that enable people to organize and decipher information about an individual, event or situation. These schemas tend to strengthen over time, and results in them being defiant to change. Gender schemas are predetermined tenets or ideas regarding the nature of men and women their traits, conduct and aptitude to do something. It is these gender schemas that negatively impact on women as society believes that certain jobs are best done by men and that men are superior to women. According to Hooks (1982), the cultural norm of human identity is by description and definition male identity/masculinity and under patriarchy the cultural norm of male identity consists of status, power, privilege and prerogative over and against the gender class of women. Cohen (2004) in his closing remarks believes that in a structured inequality in which gender is a major component, the devalued gender in this case women have less power and economic reward than those of the valued gender men. Put into perspective and in the context of this study, female academic staff has less reward, less prestige and power in comparison to male academics.

Gender as described in the Gender Policy Framework document, which is the guiding document for the nation, refers to the social roles designated specifically to men and women, in particular societies and at particular times. Such tasks, and the dissimilarities between them, are shaped by an array of political, economic, ideological and cultural factors and are characterized in most societies by unequal power relations. Gender is differentiated from sex, which is biologically determined (GPF, 2000).

According to Jensen, Laufer and Maruani (2004) gender equality refers to both women and men having equal access to valued resources, in particular, economic, legal, political, social equality. The United Nations defines gender equality as the equal valuation and consideration of the diverse behaviours, aspirations and needs of both men and women and doesn't mean that men and women have to become the alike but that their responsibilities, opportunities and rights should not depend on whether one is born female or male (UN Women, 2011). As used in the GPF gender equality is having equal conditions for both women and men that enable them to realize their full human rights and potential; contribute equally to the country's economic, political, social and cultural development; and benefit equally from the results. Moreover gender equality encompasses the recognition of women's inferior positions within society, a thorough identification of the core causes of women's discrimination and their eradication so as to end male domination and afford women equal opportunities. Therefore, equality at a superficial level is not just plain equality with men but is composed of both substantive and formal equality (GPF, 2000).

While the significance of involving men in gender work is now broadly accepted, gender equality work as Fish (2006) notes is still generally tackled by working with women, working through and with the women's movement.

Strategically, Walsh (2006) is of the view that gender equality endeavours must harvest the organisational power of women and create an environment for them to employ their recent found rights freely. Greig, Kimmel and Lang (2004:4-5) believe gender equality is not only an end in itself, but also a vital and necessary means to achieving sustainable human development and reducing of poverty.

First world countries often pride themselves on having achieved gender equality but the substance of mass media in the first world still present to their audiences exploitative images of women, images of men fraught with violence and unbending ideologies regarding gender equality. Samuel (2001) believes we must discard the definition of equality where women have the right to be treated equally to men only to the degree that they are the same as men. That definition must be replaced with the acknowledgment that sometimes different people must be treated differently so that real equality can be achieved. This entails understanding that women soft, caring by nature and must be treated with care and respect. There is more to gender inequality than a majority of people think and the gains made thus far are not secure for the future.

2.2 Gender Inequality and Patriarchy

Hartmann (1979) defines patriarchy as a set of social relations between men, which have a material foundation, and which, though hierarchical, establish or create an alliance or unity among men that enables them to control women. She further postulates that the material foundation upon which patriarchy rests on predominately lies in men having authority over women's labour, and that it does not lie wholly on childbearing in the family, but on all the social structures, which makes it possible for men to control women. Control she contends is

preserved by restricting women's sexuality and by denying women access to vital economically productive resources.

Walby (1996) defines patriarchy as a social system in which men exploit, oppress subjugate and women. She contends through her premise of systematically structured gender inequality that patriarchy is not eliminated but rather changes form when women move from one socio-economic and political system to another. She brings out how patriarchy has evolved and how it operates in different spheres but still with the main goal of suppressing women. Weedon's (1987) definition of patriarchy ascribes to power relations in which the general welfare of women is lesser to that of men. He further goes on to note that these power relations take on various guises, from sexual division of labour and the social framework of reproduction to the internalized beliefs of femininity by which we live. Patriarchal power rests on societal implications and meanings attributed to biological sexual differences.

Sidney and Shirley (2003:27) bring out the point that in an African patriarchal and Afrikaner Calvinist society, it is an on-going fight for women to get to the top. Barkty (1990) further argues this point that women's oppression under male subjugation seldom consists entirely in denying women of legal and political "rights," but also transcends to the structures of our society and the substance of our culture, and pervades our consciousness. Tong (1989) believes that women's oppression is buried deep within a patriarchal gender-sex system in which patriarchy is seen as the driving force for oppression, domination and exploitation of women. Walby (1996) adds on by noting that it does not include only the patriarchal political and legal structures but comprises every level of society.

The CGE in its 1998 annual report highlighted that it is a sad fact that one of the few profoundly non-racial institutions in South Africa is patriarchy and that patriarchy is so firmly rooted that it is given a cultural halo and identified with customs and personalities of different communities (CGE,1998).

The first South African report to the Convention for the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) states that patriarchy is firmly rooted in the country and fighting it is seen as attempting to destroy South African tradition or ideals (CEDAW, 1998). In an online article by Willemans, Human Sciences Research Council's Professor Jane Rarieya is also of the view that South Africa is still very much enveloped by a patriarchal mindset and points out the need for women to play a bigger role in breaking the barriers (Willemans, 2013). On a human resources practitioners perspective, Executive Recruiter at Mindcor Portia Moyo, infers that the South African society is still a patriarchal society and still not supportive of the rise of women in the workplace. This as she notes is evidenced by the majority of women that still get stuck in the middle when it comes to pay and progression for the same old reasons (eNCA, 2013)

In light of the above assertions it is very much clear that patriarchy still pervades almost every aspect of modern-day South Africa with most of its society and institutions still having patriarchal value systems embedded in them. Thus, an understanding of patriarchy may help to explain why policies, and those tasked with their implementation have failed to achieve their goals by examining the gender composition of the decision-making bodies and how that on its own influences the decisions being made and the policies and strategies being implemented.

2.3 Gender inequality challenges in Higher Education in South Africa and The Rest of the World

The empowerment of women in the field of academics hasn't only been a South African preoccupation. In support of this, Mayor (1999) on a global context perspective notes that on a worldwide scale academia particularly in the hard sciences and technology is still a man's world. In utter disappointment, he argues that such a situation is unacceptable as it impedes half of the global populace from participating in building the world, and it deprives science and research ideas and methods that are needed in the world. Having examined a myriad of gender issues within the Nigerian university system Pereira (2009) drew interest and scrutinized those issues that are viewed as insignificant within and beyond the institution. These included the way things within the university system have a tendency to be talked about in gender-impartial terms, although gender disparities were glaringly obvious. The voices of authority, the architects and recipients of knowledge and the bulk of decision makers she contends are men. To Pereira, the neutrality of the system is an unjustified premise of its iniquity. She infers that the processes and structures of norm setting riddled with masculinity must be acknowledged as the problem, rather than simply recognizing the effects in terms of the absence of women in universities.

Data on the seniority of academic staff shows that the proportion of women is much lower in higher academic positions across Europe: 44 % of junior, 36 % of middle-range and only 19 % of senior academic staff were women in the EU-27 in 2007. The number females among the teaching staff in higher education institutions decreases with each progression on the academic career pecking order.

This although in part can be elucidated by the fact that the substantial number of women who have entered universities chose academia as a profession fairly recently, this 'glass ceiling' for women may also be a consequence of the prevailing masculine culture that generally exists in academia. Nevertheless, it is only a small number of countries that seem to be concerned about this phenomenon (European Commission, 2009b:75).

Drawing an example from women academics in Britain, a sum of 43 women from a British university were interviewed at length and problematic areas were accentuated by the evidence they gave. A majority of them acknowledged to having experienced discrimination within the university. The issue of working in dominantly male environments took center stage as this led the women to experience remoteness and ostracism from their male counterparts, and resistance to their authority from male pupils. The study also highlighted how they had inadequate support systems, insufficient role models or mentors, and limited access and admittance to communication networks. They also gave oral evidence on bad work relationships, and how they often experienced enmity from male co-workers and students. Finally, they highlighted how the accumulation of these factors had negatively affected their perception of themselves as academics. A great number of them became convinced that the notion of women being academics is still contentious. This inevitably pressures them to outperform their male counterparts, and to avoid being associated with other women. They become "honorary men" and as such are in no position to assist other women (Gibson, 2006).

On the same line of thought as Gibson, Oakley also observed that women unwillingly embody masculine behaviors which equate with an aggressive behavior to assert competence especially in male-dominated fields (Gibson, 2006)

This according to Oakley they do in an attempt to shed the patriarchal influenced misconception of them being incompetent by virtue of them being female. This over-aggression according to Starke (2008:15) then reflects poorly on women as they become harsh and uncompromising particularly so to other women as well rendering them as unfit to lead.

Gibson (2006) explains is that there seems to be a consensus among women that men are better capable leaders than themselves. This as Gibson contends is borne out of being raised in patriarchal indoctrinated societies which uphold male superiority. Thus, as Gibson notes when a woman is appointed to a senior position there is a tendency for that woman to be undermined and doubted by other women as well. The outcome of this has been the death of women's confidence in their ability to lead or be led by another woman. Furthermore, Gibson is of the view that by virtue of there being fewer women at the top, most women perceive the top of the organisation to be cold, lonely, demanding and strenuous. Thus, they often hold back and do not seek promotion as they perceive this will alienate them from their peers and the possibility of their new-found position conflicting with their domestic roles.

Moletsane and Reddy (2011) in their research on the issues that aid or hinder women's participation in the SET sector pinpointed the working environment to be a major obstacle. Remuneration and promotion opportunities, race and gender relations, mentorship and career development, as well as the consequences of a career in SET to family life, featured as stifling factors. Other issues included: the masculine image of science, gender stereotypes, gender-blind workplace policies, the lack of confidence, assigning women to just supportive roles, balancing work and family responsibilities; job stress and burnout, the _glass ceiling',

women's Previously Disadvantaged Individual's (PDI) status, sexual harassment, gender discrimination and masculine organisational cultures.

Norris (2000) believes the historical ‗White-Eurocentric' male-dominated culture that still exists in numerous institutions of higher education illustrates the assimilation or ‗melting pot' syndrome where the organisation remains the unchanged and the minorities are expected to adjust. Wylie, Jakobsen and Fosado (2007) research shows that for women in higher education, the academia is still a bureaucratic system that was established on traditional beliefs about male supremacy. It is still a place where prejudice against women and their place in academia remain understated but nevertheless, conspicuous. In my view, this approach sees women being reluctantly included as a means of fulfilling legislation requirements on equality without a real change in the organisations form, power dynamics, and practices. However, for real equity to occur an outright overhaul of the organisations culture will have to be effected to inculcate a new diverse culture with reworked institutional practices, beliefs, value systems and power dynamics. However, Muller (2000) is of a different opinion as she believes that the obliteration of structures that impede the progression of female academics and practices that sanction those obstacles is an arduous goal, given the resolve with which institutions of higher education have historically repudiated change.

Stober (2004:180) points out that the outlook for advancing the objectives of the Employment Equity Act remains bleak as employment equity plans haven't been effectively implemented and policed within the institutions themselves. Furthermore, affirmative action and equity policies have been perceived to be reinforcing a social stereotype of blacks and women of them being inferior because of their need of assistance in order to succeed in their careers (Social Policy Program, 1997).

However, Tudge (2004) disagrees arguing that the salient features of affirmative action and equity are not to aid blacks and women but to give them an opportunity to succeed.

On the same breath, Muller (2000) duly notes that the demands of affirmative action should not solely be an administrative act intertwined with punitive penalties for non adherence. This he argues only leads to tokenism, outright resistance and the creation of opposing distinct groups within an organization that of insiders and outsiders in which women academics in their minority are viewed as the outsiders or enemies.

The CGE 2008 study on the espousal and preservation of gender equality in the private sector revealed that many entities were nescient of national and regional treaties and pledges to gender equality. In addition, their findings showed that employment equity plans were developed, but not implemented, some even lacked projected targets and time frames for completion. Furthermore, sexual harassment policies were developed but with few cases were pursued, and that in general, entities did not have strategies, proactive interventions, empowerment and capacity-building programs focused achieving on gender equality. Thus, the CGE is of the opinion that gender sensitivity and gender equality at the workplace need to become performance requirements for companies and senior management (Commission for Gender Equality, 2010).

With regards to the forming of networks and being accepted in networks which aid in the upward mobility of women these comments extracted from Moletsane and Reddys 2011 study on *Women's participation in industrial science, engineering and technology* give an insight on why women resign from management positions in the following excerpts of employees:

> Women exit because one is reliant on a network (who you know, who you play golf with, drink in pubs with). I refused to compromise. The organisation tries to make me play golf by paying for it, but I don't enjoy it, and I don't do it anymore. Many deals are made on the golf course and in pubs and, as a woman, if you are excluded from these events you do not make the same deals as your male colleagues, and you are told that you are not performing. Eventually, you give up and leave. (Female IT division manager at a state-owned enterprise (SOE))

> You find these organisations that are run predominantly by white males who are not open to give opportunities to engineers out there that have a brilliant mind and can actually meet some of their requirements. It's even more difficult for women both black-and-white women to make inroads or penetrate that block' (Female general manager at an SOE).

Professor Cheryl De la Rey, Vice-chancellor of the University of Pretoria makes a similar point about the gendered bias in the modus operandi of networking by noting that scientific careers, funding grants and publications rely heavily on reputation, which is built by participating in networks and attending conferences. She asserts that some women are unable to travel because of their roles in the family, and that affects and influences how they position themselves in terms of networking. She further noted that selection committees were comprised mostly of men who often than not acted as gatekeepers.

On an Australian context, White (2008:53) notes that the fact that most senior managers are men in Australian universities creates a male networking structure which subtly excludes women. Male domination she contends is at the heart of low representation of women in senior management. In support of White's view, Hearn (2004) contends that male dominance of hard sciences has an unfavourable impact on the academic careers of women in the sense that from the outset, a majority of the top posts at the top of the academic hierarchy are filled by men from these disciplines. This as Gibson (2006) observes creates the _gate keeping effect' in which male academics block women faculty from entering high-level positions.

Gibson (2006) also notes that women academics feel secluded and hampered by the existing structure of academia as there is a shortage of willing mentors to mentor them and assist them in gaining entry into the informal networks and organisational networks that are requisite for success.

Hoods (1994) contends that a glass ceiling exists that slows and in some instances prevents women from moving into higher-level management as the pressure of the job itself impedes women from forming networks, and relationships needed to work toward the top.

Mawila and Mabokela (2004:413) in their study entitled: *The impact of race, gender and culture in South Africa higher education* observed that most of the universities were soaked in a patriarchal culture as a result of apartheid and cultural norms. In the responses they got, they observed the culture of most universities as being male dominated. They describe how one woman quoted a proverb in her language, _if you give an institution to a woman, it will collapse' and how that view and belief is inherent in her place work forcing women to prove themselves and outperform their male counterparts. Msane (2005), in her dissertation notes that in an age where education opportunities and leadership positions have significantly opened up to females. Therefore it becomes crucial to investigate the reasons why society still thinks that male headship is better than female headship and that in a truly knowledge-based society, traditional gender roles need to be challenged.

In line with the social cognitive career theory Lent, Brown and Hackett (1994) suggest that perceptions of barriers can affect career decisions. In the context of women academics, they argue that perceptions of women academics with regards to supportive initiatives such as mentoring or developmental programs play a pivotal role as women seeking career

advancement tend to avoid careers which they perceive the culture or environment to be hostile and unsupportive or one which they perceive they would be treated as an outsider.

 It is therefore, essential that institutions formulate and implement gender equality policies and measures that seek to rectify and equalize opportunities between males and females and redirect resources and efforts to achieving gender equality.

2.4 Leadership and the Organisational Culture

Du Toit, Erasmus and Strydom (2010) describe leadership as a process of influencing employees to work willingly towards the achievements of organisational change. They further go on to explain that it is not the same as management which in their view is a broader scope comprising four management functions of which leading is only one. They expand on this view by noting that a person can work as a manager without being a true leader because they lack the capability to influence others. Influence and power they conclude are the vital tools leaders use to change the culture of organisations. Ragadu (2008) like Du Tiot and company believes that in an unstable environment like the transformation of an organisations culture in higher education institutions leadership is more important than management. True leadership as Pfeffer (1992) explains stems from one's ability to transform and motivate a group of employees intrinsically through shared values, pride, commitment and dedication to a principle.

According to Colquit, LePine and Wesson (2009:560) there is no bigger driver of culture than top management of organisations. Many times, leaders are expected to sustain the culture that has already been created. At other times, leaders have to be the driving force for change as the environment around the organisation shifts.

Page | 40

This expectation is one of the biggest reasons organisations change their top leadership. The call for transforming universities as Ragadu (2008) explains has placed inconsiderable pressure on the leaders of universities. In some instances, most leaders in the universities lack managerial expertise and experience as most are pure academics with little or no experience whatsoever in the day to day running of an institution and thus inevitably fail to implement the required changes and lead their institutions in the new direction.

Colquit et al. (2009:560) assert that amalgamating organisations with dissimilar cultures is a sure-fire way to transform the culture within an organisation. The issue they point out is that there is no way of telling what the culture will be like after the merger. They believe that leaders and employees play a critical role in ensuring that the culture within the organisation is changed as merging two different cultures has major effects on the attitudes and behaviours of the organisations employees. This is no easy task, as Du Toit et al. (2010) add the reason being culture is not something that changes overnight but over a period of time. Commenting on the UKZN merger the Vice –Chancellor, Professor Makgoba -noted that ‚people had an anxiety and insecurity about their power and entitlements in the new body and there was a passive resistance which delayed the creation of the University's new identity'. He further went to say that while it was easy to put things together on the academic and administrative fronts, it was much harder to deal with developing the cohesiveness necessary to create the new UKZN (*UKZN TOUCH*, 2010:4). However, merging does present an opportunity to start afresh and make changes wherever possible, which wouldn't have been possible to make before the merger. This research seeks to find out if UKZN has taken advantage of the merger and new leadership to make the necessary changes in its organisational culture.

Newman (1995) believes cultural change depends on real change to the structure, systems and the use of resources. Only those with access to organisational power in terms of formal authority and or resource control can bring about this change. According to Gist and Mitchel (1992) to achieve the power of equalization like implementing gender equality measures with an organisation it is the leader's duty and responsibility to delegate more responsibilities to the undermined gender, institute participative practices and induce behavioural change, attitudes and foster cooperation and team work between employees this they say is embodied in the leadership style of the leader.

Du Toit et al. (2010:217) put forward two types of leadership namely transactional leadership and transformational leadership. According to them, transactional leaders motivate employees by appealing to their self-interest exchanging pay and status for work effort whilst in transformational leadership, leaders and employees uplift each other to elevated levels of morality and motivation through idealised behaviour, inspirational motivation, and intellectual stimulation and individualised considerations. Bass (1985) noted transformational leadership as being desirable as it improved employee satisfaction, trust and commitment, especially in teaching jobs where rewards or incentives are low and employees are mostly driven by passion. Furthermore, he observed that transformational leaders were effective in organisations where major changes and transformations were taking place within the organisation itself and its external environment.

On a similar but gender specific thought White (2008) in her journal article noted that women favour transformational leadership over transactional leadership. The reason being as she argued is that transformational leaders are concerned about others, are accessible, encourage questioning, value a learning environment and self-development, have integrity and believe

in building a shared vision. In addition to Whites premise, Voskova and Kroupa (2005) contend that in terms of motivational factors men place a higher value than women do on instrumental things like bonuses and basic salary. These things they further contend influence their performance at work and identification with the employer. Women, on the other hand, they believe place more importance than men do on the prospect of coalescing family life and work, respectful treatment by the employer and inter-personal relations at the workplace. In her closing annotations, White is of the view that it is this kind of leadership that is necessary for changing the hostile masculine academic environment inherent in most institutions of higher education (White, 2008).

In the context of the study for a transformation strategy to achieve its objective there has to be an immense commitment by all stakeholders and the ability of those in leadership to lead. Real leadership undoubtedly requires a leader to persuade and lead people where they don't want to go. Leading them out of their comfort zone and facing the realities is what true leadership is all about. Therefore, despite the negative influence patriarchal orientated social and cultural factors have had on institutional norms, management has the ability and potential to transform any organisational culture from one which is patriarchal and oppressive towards women to one which is open, conducive and progressive. The determination of an institution's leadership in the formulation and implementation of progressive gender equality policies positively influences and provides an avenue to change women's status and well-being for the better. In conclusion the pertinent issue is still on how academic careers and organizational cultures are still constructed and evolving in ways that privilege dominant forms of masculinity, and the question pertinent to this study is whether the disadvantages women academics face are being recognized.

2.5 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The onus of this study was to delve into the matter of gender inequality examine, reveal and challenge the continued discrimination of female teaching staff at higher-education institutions, particularly so at the UKZNs Howard College. Due to the complexity of the subject matter that was being explored the use of a single conceptual framework would not have sufficed. The transformation agenda must be guided by feminist thought as feminism can be viewed as a movement and intellectual commit that seeks justice for women by recognizing that all women share a common struggle regardless of class, race and ethnic group than they do with men and aims to bring to an end all forms of sexism and patriarchy. Feminists' theory is informed by practice and is anchored in the experiences of different women _as women.' At the same time, feminist theory seeks to effect and change the oppressive experiences of women.

Thus for the purposes of challenging gender inequality at institutional level through policy making, implementation and the legal framework this thesis makes use of the theory of Liberal feminism. In addition, based on the observation that universities seem to be riddled and reinforce a patriarchal culture which treats and disadvantages female academic staff this study uses the concept of organisational culture as it pays attention to the importance of understanding organisational culture and the role it plays and how it can be changed to one that is more desirable and places women on an equal footing with men.

2.5.1 LIBERAL FEMINISM

Feminism and the objectives of the liberation of women have never been independent from broader struggles for social justice. Feminism is a historical but ongoing movement in which women's struggle for equity arises from and provides a link between women's oppression and male power. According to James (2000), feminism is rooted in the viewpoint that women are disadvantaged and oppressed in contrast to men, and that their oppression is unjustified or illegitimate.

Many feminist theories, however, embody different conceptions as to the manifestation of women's oppression, but all are bound by one common thread male power as the source of women's oppression. The basis of this male power as postulated by feminists is that it stems from the male based control of knowledge, religion, culture and labour in which women are ostracized from positions of authority and power and in the manner in which cultural homogeneity unfairly limits women. Under the umbrella of this general characterization James (2000) notes that there are various expositions of women and their oppression and it is erroneous to perceive feminism as a single philosophical doctrine. Their disjuncture as he points out stems from the different thoughts on the ways and means to ending women's oppression. In this respect, it is possible to single out four major approaches to the feminist movement, which are liberal feminism (the guiding theory for this study), radical feminism, socialist feminism and post modern feminism.

The origins of Liberal feminism are traced back to the era of the civil rights movement of the 1960s in the USA. The civil rights movement and its architects made a notable contribution towards the elimination of racial discrimination and inequity, but their fight was just limited to that.

Page | 45

That limitation acted as a stimulant to the emergence of the feminist movement as women sought to remedy the social injustice they were being subjected to by the virtue of them being women. The emergence of liberal feminism as a feminist approach is greatly embedded and borne out of the ideals and somewhat mirrors the operations of the civil rights movement. Liberal feminism maintains ideals and methods similar to those of the civil rights movement, which is the use of non-violent but democratic means as a choice of weaponry in their battle for equal and fair treatment.

According to Okin (1989:89), Liberal feminists argue that women's unequal status in society is due to inherited traditions and institutions riddled with patriarchy, and calls for efforts to identify and remedy such institutions and traditions. Liberal feminists further argue that women's interests and needs are inadequately reflected in the basic circumstances under which they work and live, and that those conditions lack legitimacy because women are poorly represented in the processes of democracy.

This according to Millet (1971) men do so by occupying positions of decision making in all spheres of life and due to their dominance form networks that exclude the participation of women. Walby (1996) also points out that even though women have broken the chains of being financially dependent on men, collective decisions that affect their lives are still being made by men in this case politicians. In South Africa, the drafting, implementation and enforcement of policies within organisations or in the political front which advocate for the advancement of women is still largely being done by men. Women do not play a crucial role in policy formulation like the BBBEE Act or Employment Equity Act that's going to affect them.

The understanding of patriarchy may help to explain why gender equity policies at UKZN (Howard College), and those tasked with their implementation have failed to achieve their goals by examining the gender composition of the decision-making bodies and how that on its own influences the decisions being made and the policies and strategies being implemented.

Liberal feminists further argue that the state in its governance role must effectively protect women and pass enabling legislation which eradicates gender inequality in all political, social and economic spheres of society. According to Beasely (1999), liberal feminists work for the correction of institutional bias, the drafting and implementation of better laws. It supports the notion that education is a vehicle for change and that the oppression of women is not a structural feature of the capitalist economic system and looks to the state to effect women's emancipation through legislative measures such as affirmative action, employment equity, pay equity, parental leave, subsidized day care for professional and middle-class women. Beasley further notes that liberal feminism understands the subordination of women in terms of their unequal treatment through the existence of artificial barriers go beyond the family and household and now impede them from participating in all spheres of the public world. She further believes that the emancipation of women lies through them attaining education and the changing of the view held by society, which believes women are by nature less capable, irrational than men. The main focus on liberal feminism is to change the status and opportunities in the political and economic institutions by granting women equal access to what men have through reforming present systems by changing and or implementing legislation, and through democratic channels.

Socialist Feminism a second strand of feminism drew on Marxist theory, connecting capitalism to women's oppression. Socialist feminists believe that there is a direct link between class structure and the oppression of women and therefore confront the ideologies of capitalism and patriarchy (Tong, 1989). According to Evans (1995) socialist feminists argue that the foundation of women's oppression is their economic dependence on a husband. Furthermore, as Evans (1995) points out, socialist feminist believe western society rewards working men because they produce tangible, tradable goods. On the other hand, women's work in the domestic sphere is not valued by western society because women do not produce a tangible, tradable good. They are also of the view that a woman's class status is directly linked to her husband's class. This they say gives men power and control over women (Evans, 1995). Social Feminists according to Coontz&Peta (1986) are of the view that the best way to end this oppression is to put an end to class and gender. Socialist feminists according to Barret (1988) critique the impoverished circumstances under which most women work, and capitalist reliance on women's cheap or free labor to make a profit. They argue according to Barret (1988) for a change in the nature of production, shifting the focus to state programs that assist reproductive labor rather than subsidize exploitative, luxury-oriented industries. They believe that the system of capitalist patriarchy must be changed by societal and global redistribution of power and wealth.

Radical feminism a third strand of feminist theory sees patriarchy as dividing rights, privileges and power primarily by gender, and as a result oppressing women and privileging men. It is this sex-gender system they believe has created oppression and their mission is to overthrow this system by any possible means possible (Tong, 1989). According to Beasely (1999), radical feminism attempts to draw lines between biologically-determined behaviour and culturally-determined behaviour in order to free both men and women from these rigid

gender roles that society has imposed upon them. Furthermore, Walby (1996) is of the notion that radical feminists believe that the very rules and norms that govern society, the manner in which societies are organized and the foundation of our thought processes have all been inspired by masculine thinking and thus support patriarchy (Walby,1996). Tong (1989) notes that radical feminists are of the notion that patriarchy and men are inseparable, and view men as being inherently tied to patriarchy socially, philosophically, culturally and politically. Some believe a war must therefore be raged against all men whether or not some of them actually oppress women. Their anger as Tong (1989) concludes is directed at males as males according to them are representatives of patriarchy.

Postmodern feminism is a philosophy of cognitive relativism which asserts that objective truth is illusory, and that cultural contexts and language itself create a multiplicity of equally valid subjective realities, typically called ―narratives‖ (Tong, 1989). Postmodern feminists according to Lober (1994) question and reject traditional essentialist practices of establishing universal grand narratives as a means of understanding and explaining society. They argue, instead, that women have different experiences of oppression (according to their socio-economic, cultural, and political locations) and that any solidarity women may develop should arise from women's consciously choosing to work together on an issue.

They spurn the limited notion that broad categories such as gender, race or class ascribe common traits or characteristics to those who are members of that group; these traits are falsely assumed to be part of that groups "essence" or nature. As such, they don‗t believe there is a single way to be a woman. However, they accept the male/female binary as a main categorizing force in our society (Lober, 1994).

Following in the footsteps of Simone de Beauvoir, postmodern feminists according to Nicholson (1990) see females as having been excluded from the dominants being cast into the role of the ―Other‖. They criticize the structure of society and the dominant order, especially in its patriarchal aspects. Nicholson (1990) asserts that postmodern feminists in their arguments reject the idea that the biological man and the biological woman be identified with the "masculine" and "feminine" respectively. To insist that people are different because of their anatomy they allege forces both men and women into a repressive structure. Moreover, as Tong (1989) notes postmodern feminists are wary of feminisms that posit a natural sisterhood of women, presupposing a universally shared experience of oppression. Postmodern Feminism is seen as the ultimate acceptor of diversity believing in multiple truths, multiple roles and multiple realities.

This being a public policy think piece, I chose to use the theory liberal feminism as the it supports the position of this study to rectify gender inequality issues and advance the interests of women through available democratic channels and through the use of non coercive methods such as gender equity policies and programs. Unlike liberal feminists, radical feminists do not believe the oppressions of women can be achieved through democratically reforming the patriarchal systems such as the passing of appropriate acts of legislation, policies and programs but rather the whole system of patriarchal values must be totally uprooted and that society must also be reconstructed in order to dissolve patriarchy. Socialist feminism comparable worth solution to the gendered workforce is far different from liberal feminism programs of affirmative action which this thesis advocates for.

Postmodern feminism on the other hand with its anti-essentialism stance makes it difficult to take political action based upon gender difference. Its argument that women experience oppression differently does not mean that they have nothing in common as all women suffer from sexism. However, it must be noted at this juncture that my preference to liberal feminism does not invalidate other feminist's theories and their valid uses but an evaluation of gender equality policies in my view does require the of use liberal feminism.

The Theory of Liberal feminism also assisted me in my research as it underpinned the position of gender equality in which all people are created equal meaning women are essentially the same as men. The theory is also based upon the principle of equal opportunity and freedom in which gender equity is not determined by sex. It also recognizes the subtle nature and evolution of patriarchy, and that gender inequality not only stems from unequal participation in the domestic arena but in other spheres of life such as education and paid labour force. Furthermore, the theory aided me in determining whether the policies put in place by the state are bringing about the much-needed transformation in universities such as the UKZN or whether more needs to be done beyond democratic and legislative reforms. At an institutional level, the theory advocates for the use of existing legal frameworks to ensure that gender equality policies become practice in institutions such as the UKZN.

Placed in the context of the UKZN it assisted me in determining the existence of gender equality policies and programs as required by state legislation and also establishing whether current gender equality policies and programs have been successful in changing the status of women academics within the institution. Proposals for change that emerge from liberal feminism suggest that societal attitudes must change to ensure real gender equity is achieved.

Liberal feminists also assert that institutional intrusions must be encouraged to ensure women's integration.

2.5.2 THE CONCEPT OF ORGANISATIONAL CULTURE

The domination of women is now more than elsewhere within the public world of work and politics as evidenced by how workspaces are still riddled with normative gender expectations that privilege men and disadvantage women. Feminists assert that gender inequality in occupational divisions of labour as everything to do with patriarchal oriented.

Organisational culture is generally seen as the way things are done around an organisation. It is the accepted practice, established style, custom and common understanding in the organisation. This shared social knowledge within an organisation concerning the norms, rules and values inevitably shapes the behaviour and attitude of employees and the way they treat each other. According to Rossouw (2008), culture is the set of values and beliefs that define how an entity lives and operates. Values as Rossouw expounds do more than just mould the corporate culture they also reflect what a corporation stands for and how it sees itself. Philips (1996) contends that these set of values mentioned by Rossouw serve as guides to acceptable perceptions, thoughts, feelings and behaviour and eventually manifest themselves into the organisations' values, norms and artefacts. The values as Philip (1996) concludes are tacit among members and passed onto each new member of the group. Muhlbacher, Leihs and Dahringer (2006) are of the view that organisational culture over time becomes deeply embedded in all activities of the business and regulates the human interface. Organisational cultures they conclude are based on the values dominating the national culture and, in most cases, incorporate the norms of the industry.

Put in the context of the study UKZN just like any other organisation is considered and perceived as a microcosm of greater society and in its organisational culture will almost always reflect the ideologies, attitudes or beliefs of the society it emanates from.

The 1995 White Paper on Higher Education asserts that the values and gender role patterns of South African women have much to do with South Africa's patriarchal culture and that as a result women suffer discrimination and ill treatment, male domination and sexual harassment, among other forms of abuse (DoE, 1997). Academia, in particular, has been conceived traditionally as being elitist, male with a patriarchal attuned network of customs, traditions, cultural practices, social attitudes and ideologies subtly interwoven into an organisations culture and structure. Gibson (2006) points out that the culture of academia has been described as inhospitable to women as they try to traverse the various aspects of their positions and environment. In South Africa historically the majority of higher-education institutions have been the domains of white male supremacy. Before the merger present day UKZN Howard College formerly University of Natal was historically predominately a white's only institution with white male academics overwhelmingly in the majority.

Although, patriarchy is mediated by culture, race and class, it is, nonetheless, a system that glorifies the practices, values and attributes related to domination of women by men. Patriarchy, when reflected through all the structures and institutions of the world, is a system that exalts male supremacy and female oppression.

An organisational culture perspective of how patriarchy is embedded in our workspaces was therefore of great importance to this study in that part of the main objectives of this research was to investigate the subtle existence of patriarchal norms and practices within UKZNs Howard College due to its history of being vastly male dominated.

Reality in organisations is fashioned by daily practices as such an understanding of the culture and practices prevalent and entrenched in the University therefore becomes important and relevant to this study as it may help to explain why there is a persistence of gender inequity and how it should be changed in a more equal direction through organisational transformation. Focusing on organisational culture is also of great importance because unless the culture in our institutions of higher education, which hold fraternal-patriarchal structures in place are rectified, academic organisations will only transform spuriously, temporarily and not genuinely. Furthermore, while policy initiatives within organisations guided by state legislation as liberal feminists believe can change the treatment of women and revise the proportions of representation of males and females in the upper echelons of institutions and bureaucracies, a strong organisational culture can become a barrier to change and even undermine formal corporate diversity policies as it has significant influence on the attitudes and behaviours of its staff and how they treat and relate with each other.

Wallace (2000) observes that even when government policy has effectuated prescriptive cognizance of gender equity into its policy making, the systems of privilege that are guarded by fraternal-patriarchal organisational practices continually withstand remediation. Instead, the normative cognizance that continuously persists to inform the attitude of decision-makers as they strive to preserve the status quo has proven to be extremely insusceptible to disruption.

In my view, a change in organisational culture undoubtedly arguments liberal feminism efforts and at the same time also offers an innovative approach to doing things and gives hope to the possibility of new organisational spaces for women.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.0 INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes in depth the methodology employed for data collection and data analysis to be able to address different questions. For the purposes of this research secondary data and primary data was collected, fused and used in a complimentary fashion to get a clear picture of the situation in the researcher's main areas of investigation.

This study used a qualitative methodology approach to obtain the information required to conduct the study. I employed a qualitative research methodology as this study intended to uncover and build explanations that would explicate the correlation of one element to another through qualitative methods. The qualitative methods used did not have standard measures or numbers; rather they were based on perceptions, opinions, attitudes, and beliefs held by the respondents under study. I chose to utilize this particular type of research methodology to highlight how certain variables such as organisational culture have an impact on a particular phenomenon such as gender equality. This research is guided by a Feminist theoretical framework thus as Birch (1998) notes qualitative methods provide a seamless fit within a feminist approach. This is so due to the fact that the feminist approach seeks to listen, observe, and describe social phenomena outside socially constructed ideals and interpretations, with an emphasis on the oppressed. This enables the oppressed to share those experiences and perspectives.

Most of the knowledge produced in our society according to Spender (1981) has been fashioned by men. Men have twisted knowledge by not acknowledging that they are presenting only the explanation and interpretations. Men he asserts have gone on to ―pass off‖ this knowledge as human knowledge. Thus feminist standpoint scholars according to Spender (1981) argue that it is a woman‗s oppressed location within society that provides fuller insights into society as a whole. Women they believe have access to an enhanced and more nuanced understanding of social reality than men do precisely because of their structurally oppressed location in comparison with the dominant group, or men.

Smith (1987) an early proponent of the feminist standpoint perspective also stresses the necessity of starting research from women‗s lives by adding women into research samples, asking questions that take into account their everyday experiences and through paying particular attention to and finding and analyzing the gaps that occur when women try to fit their lives into the dominant culture‗s way of conceptualizing women‗s situation. In conclusion Smith notes that by looking at the difference between the two perspectives, the researcher gains a more complex and theoretically richer set of explanations of the lives of the oppressors and the oppressed that are closely as possible to the original meaning.

Furthermore, a qualitative methodology was chosen as this study sought to investigate and ascertain the gendered perceptions academic staff had of each other. This type of methodology, on the other hand, assisted me in exploring of phenomena by providing descriptions and explanations through the employment of various qualitative methods. Rabie and Cloete (2009:21) describe how the qualitative methodology approach has become increasingly popular because of the way in which it can enrich the results of a study by gaining a deeper understanding of the phenomena of interest.

A qualitative methodology they say aims to answer the _why' and _how' questions and is ideal when non-causal questions make-up the premise for the assessment, when contextual values, knowledge and perspectives are sought after to arrive at a comprehensible conclusion in the exploration of a phenomena.

The focal point of qualitative research is on the exposition of a phenomenon and it emphasises on the process and interpretation of the outcome. Qualitative research methods can be considered to be key instruments of the research process itself. They double up as _a means to an end and also an end in themselves' as they seek to bring out the depth, richness, and texture in understanding the complexities of various human phenomena. Qualitative research processes are often inductive and exploratory in approach and may produce new theories and hypotheses in the analysis, interpretation and explication of data. Barbour (2001) describes how qualitative research has a distinctive ability to harness perceptions and experiences of individuals, allowing a research question to be examined from various angles.

3.1 Research Methods Employed

Due to the nature and objectives of the study a combination of qualitative methods was required. The study combined three qualitative methods which were semi structured interviews, descriptive and case study.

Semi-structured interviews were chosen as to attain primary data for the study. According to Purdon (2001:14), semi-structured interviews as a qualitative method allow respondents to describe a situation as it currently stands, their personal experiences by providing a forum to share first hand experiences thereby giving the researcher a deeper understanding of the situation at hand.

They are suited to eliciting personal or sensitive information by providing a forum to share such experiences. In support of this, Steward (1997) makes the point that unlike structured interviews, semi-structured interviews allow for new questions to be asked during the interview as a result of what the interviewee says in order to test his or her perceptions of how things are or how they ought to be. The interviewer does not stick rigidly to the questions but is able to improvise and formulate follow-up questions and further delve into meanings and areas of significance or interest that crop up during the interview. Semi-structured interviews also enable the interviewer to gather information on the context and to explore meanings in a way that other methods of study do not enable.

The 30 male and female academics who took part in the interviews were purposively selected as the population to be placed under study as they were considered to have in-depth knowledge of the issues at hand. According to Given (2008), purposive sampling is a form of non-probability sampling in which decisions taken by the researcher concerning the participants to be included in the sample are based upon a variety of criteria. This may include individuals who meet a certain criterion and possess specialist knowledge of the research issue, capacity and willingness to participate in the study and individual participants who would be most likely to contribute appropriate data, both in terms of relevance and depth.

To ground my research within context, I used the case study method. Purdon et al (2001: 16) describe case studies as a method of generally looking at individuals and or organisations from the multiple perspectives of key actors in which a detailed understanding of these multiple perspectives on an intervention is sought within a particular location or setting.

These perspectives help to construct a comprehensive understanding of the outcomes and experiences within a specific context. Babbie (2007) points out that qualitative research methods like the case study approach seek to study social phenomena in its natural environ by presenting an understanding of social actions in terms of specific contexts. This is because in human life different individuals or groups have diverse perspectives and different circumstances even though they exist in the same place or environment.

More data was obtained through the descriptive research method. The rationale of utilizing this method was to delineate the nature of the situation, as it exists at the time of the study and to investigate the cause/s of specific phenomena. Archival data collection method was employed as secondary data was gathered from the university's records, Council for Higher-Education reports, newspaper articles, internet sources, government reports, previous research both published and unpublished. This provided a historical overview of the issue at hand, progress that has been in solving the issues and areas of concern still needing to be investigated.

Through the analysis of the secondary data, the researcher had made an observation that there was slow progress being made by female academics, low recognition and a continued low number of female academics in senior lectureship, professorship and leadership positions within the institutions of higher education. Thus, the study took on the attempt to try and ascertain what barriers if any exist that impede female academics from thriving in the world of academia. The study also aimed at identifying these barriers in order to make informed prescriptions of possible practical solutions and changes that can be made to rectify the problem at hand.

From another angle, this was also done to create a baseline of data to ascertain general perceptions already at play regarding the factors that impede women in the academia from thriving. Furthermore, this was done to enable the data obtained from the interviews to be used comparatively against the baseline data, to collectively evaluate it on related themes of the study and formulate rationally solid inferences and recommendations for the study

It was necessary for a number of reasons to use a combination of qualitative methods. Firstly, some qualitative methods are complementary as they enhance, support and validate the applicability of the information gained from this exploratory study. Secondly, the nature of the research required the use of qualitative data from both secondary and primary sources. Thirdly, since both male and female academics were the subject of the study, it was imperative to study them in their location and take their perceptions, feelings and experiences into account within that setting as the case study method dictates.

3.2 Research Process and Ethical considerations

To begin the study a research proposal was submitted to the University Of KwaZulu Natal School Of Social Sciences for authorization to conduct research within the Howard College. An application to the Ethics Committee of the University of KwaZulu Natal was also submitted to make certain that no ethical issues were being flouted. Any questions for further clarification were asked to be directed to the researcher or the supervisor of the study. Telephone numbers and email addresses were provided for this purpose.

Relevant primary data pertinent to the study was obtained through semi-structured interviews. The semi-structured interviews were administered to a purposively selected group of both male and female academics and were 30 in total.

The semi-structured interview questions (See Appendix 2) were broadly constructed by the researcher of the study and affirmed by the supervisor of the researcher. The questions were created after consideration of acknowledging that there are different factors that contribute to gender inequality within institutions of higher education. The questions, furthermore, aimed to provide the opportunity to explore pertinent areas of concern and those that had been previously red flagged in other similar research and warranted for further investigation.

The qualitative interviews were conducted on both willing and available female and male academic staff regardless of race. The information regarding the study and the intended use of the data was also outlined in the informed consent form (See Appendix 1). The information was provided in a written format so that it was clear and transparent. This was done for them to make a valid decision on whether they want to voluntarily participate in the interview or not. The aim of the research was also briefly orally explained and no incentive was provided to elicit participation.

Each potential respondent was given the consent form prior to the scheduled interview which had all the details of the study and a copy of the questions to be asked in the interview. On the day of the interview before the interview commenced participants were asked to sign the informed consent form. The participants were also informed that their participation would not bear any positive or negative consequences. The intention was to ensure that all participants did not feel coerced to participate in the study. These efforts were made in order to respect the autonomy of all the participants. With the consent of the participant, the interviews were recorded using an audio recorder. The recording of the interviews allowed me to concentrate on the interviews as they progressed. It also made it possible for me to easily access them at a later stage.

The interviews were conducted for one hour each on a one-on-one basis. The interviews began by first ascertaining the identity of the respondent, their job title, their qualifications, level of experience, the time period they have been working at the institution. Thereafter, the interview approached the meaning of gender equality to each respondent; perceptions of the institutional culture and present working environment; their awareness and knowledge of gender equity policies and programs, perceptions of male and female headship, awareness and perception of career development programs, the staff promotion criteria, perceptions of the consultation process in formulating policies.

Lastly, the respondents were asked to provide information on what they believe would best make their work and working environment better. The interviews aimed to elicit responses of the general perceptions, opinions and feelings. The data obtained through the semi-structured interviews allowed for an in-depth exploration into the experience of research participants as academics and employees of the University. The data was the subjective opinion of the research participants.

The interviews were held in a conversational manner to make it as natural as possible, to put the respondents at ease as they talked about their own perceptions, experiences and expressed their views. The friendly yet somewhat professional helped to make the interview a relaxed open space for sharing. The interviews covered several basic questions. In most interviews, in going through the first few questions other questions were answered before I asked them allowing me to come up with more probing questions to keep the conversation going. Engagement with the older academic staff was more enlightening as they had more to offer in terms of chronological comparisons of the issue at hand. Confidentiality was guaranteed to the participants with no adverse or positive effects to result from the interviews.

The identities of the research participants were protected and therefore there had neither the motivation nor incentives to provide false data. The researcher also aimed to establish a good rapport with participants enabling them to express barriers and obstacles that the researcher had perhaps failed to identify.

A challenge I faced in carrying out of this research was the problem of time. Time was a notable drawback in terms of scheduling interviews. I had to make repeated appointments to obtain an interview due to the busy nature of their work. The opportunity to use the snowball technique as a means of accessing my sample population and collecting the much-needed data was utilised. Snow balling, as a referral method in which a respondent links the researcher to others he or she knows would be interested and or helpful proved very useful. Through this method, some of the research participants connected me with their colleagues who shared a similar interest in my research area and this I must acknowledge made it easier for me to access informants who were ready to help.

3.3 Analysis and Interpretation of data

I used a qualitative approach in interpreting the data from interviews. The data was analysed inductively and manually, using the important activities of qualitative data analysis which is reviewing and scrutinizing the data for common themes and propositions and lastly gaining an understanding of the data in the context it was collected. The thematic analysis was focused on identifying prevailing barriers to achieving gender equality within the University. The themes emerging from both the male and female academics experiences and insights in that regard were also interpreted in line with the liberal feminist theoretical framework and the concept of organisational culture.

The data collected and analysed focused around ascertaining the perceptions and attitudes the academic staff in their various faculties held and had towards each other in their abilities to lead and or despatch their duties as male or female within the academic profession including respect for one another. Another focus was on the perceptions the academic staff thought of the working environment interrogating the institutional culture prevalent at the institution factors influencing the decision-making process with regards to policies, staff promotion and lastly, their perceptions of the leadership within their faculties and Schools and the University as a whole.

CHAPTER FOUR

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS

4.0 INTRODUCTION

To have a better understanding of the data collected from the interviews, the responses of the interviewees were analysed and interpreted by contrasting them in a thematic way against the prescripts of the liberal feminism theory and the concept of organisational culture which underpin the theoretical framework of the study. The questions asked in the interviews were directly linked to the key questions, broader issues to be investigated and the objectives of the study. The interview questions examined the academic staffs understanding of the concept of gender equality, their knowledge of gender equity policies and programs and their objectivity. Furthermore, the interview questions interrogated the academic staff's participation in the formulation process of gender equity policies and programs. The questions also sought to establish the academics' staff's perceptions on the university's culture and working environment, career development programs, incentives and promotion criteria currently in place and their views about the decision making with regards to employment and promotions. In overall, the interviews had positive outcomes, although it must be noted that on certain questions, some respondents did show a lack of awareness and through their responses indicated that they were not sure whilst in other instances some chose to be rather vague about certain issues under investigation. However, the passiveness was of great importance to me and I noted such instances as I felt this revealed something about the issue in question.

4.1 Definitions of Gender Equality

The term gender equality has a broad definition and meaning encompassing a wide range of concepts. Feminists argue for the condition that recognises both the uniqueness and separateness of women and recognition of their worth as being equal to that of men. Liberal feminism suggests that societal attitudes and perceptions must change to ensure real gender equity is achieved. In that regard, the first question **"According to you what is gender equality/equity?** was therefore of great importance to identify and understand the general feelings, attitudes and perceptions held by each individual academic through their own definition of gender equality.

All the interviewees had an understanding of the term and its meaning and some gave insightful definitions and meanings which showed their conviction. A male academic in the Languages Department explained his understanding the term as follows:

> Gender equality is accepting everybody as the same, in other words, not judging a woman by being a woman but judging her according to her qualifications, experience or personal contact. I don't really see gender equality as a problem as I accept everybody for who they are as they approach me. I believe that if you are a true democrat, every single person around you is of equal value and I don't think a lot of people do that. I do believe women have a harder time I must say in society for all sorts of reasons because of the domestic socialisation that they are supposed to have plus their academic qualifications and experience sometimes I think people don't see the value in them because they are a women. (Interview with P. Millar,)

On a legal perspective gender equality was described and defined by Buthelezi as the acceptance that both males and females are equal and that they must all enjoy equal protection under the law. Furthermore, an assertion was made that all the rights that are listed in the Bill of rights must be enjoyed equally without discriminating anyone in terms of their gender. This according to the Lawman was to be accomplished by understanding that the

biological distinction between males and females means nothing when it comes to the enjoyment of the rights. (Interview with M. Buthelezi, Senior Lecturer at the School of law)

On the other hand, a male academic in the school of theology brought in an interesting viewpoint in the following response he gave:

> To start with, one needs to separate the two terms. According to my own reading, gender is something that is constructed. In other words, it is either socially or culturally constructed beyond the so-called biological descriptions of gender it is in our attitudes. For example, gender roles within society I don't think those attitudes are something that we might say we are ontological born with those particular roles. I have a problem with the term equity, firstly, its very mechanistic and am not quite sure what people mean when they talk about gender equity so I tend to prefer to talk about gender balance rather than equity (Interview with T. Sitoto).

He concludes his response by posing a question. ―What is gender equity? I wash the dishes today, and she will do the dishes tomorrow that kind mathematics I don't think is an adequate way to express it all" (Interview with T. Sitoto).

This last assertion made by Mr. Sitoto highlights a common misunderstanding and his assertion sheds more light on how gender equity is a distinct term from gender equality/balance with a different meaning. Furthermore, in all the responses gender equality as is most often was understood, perceived and only seen as mainly comprising of equal treatment and equal opportunities for both genders, with equality of outcomes being left out as a precise goal of gender equality. The exclusion of equal outcomes in all responses is worrisome in the sense that sometimes equal treatment does not often lead to equal results and that to achieve equality in outcomes we need to accept that men and women are different thus we may need to treat them differently.

4.2 Prioritization of Gender at UKZN (Howard College)

Since its merger in 2004, UKZN has undertaken a series of steps and undergone a makeover in terms of balancing up its staff and student profiles to levels which correlate with the population demographics of the country. However, racial equity has been at the forefront of most transformation agendas not just at the University but in many other institutions as well. This has been necessitated by the fact that much of the transgression of the apartheid era was based on race rather than gender. However, gender equity as of late has emerged from the mist as an issue which needs just as much attention paid to it as racial equity.

Going into the study, there was evidence from general observation and from the published University Staff profile that there has been a rise in the sum total of women academic staff. However, this research sought to investigate not the notable increasing number of female academic staff but the prioritization of women's issues. Thus, the question **In your own understanding is gender equality a priority at the University? Can you briefly explain your point of view with examples**? was important in drawing out the feelings and perceptions held by academic staff with regards to the prioritization of women's issues. There was an overall consensus from the respondents that indeed gender equity is a priority at the university. However, some did point out areas of concern which they felt needed more attention. This can be seen in the following responses they gave.

> I suppose it is a priority but however, in as much as we are making attempts at addressing gender equality I feel not enough investment and effort is going into grooming the young female academics we have into senior lectureship position. I feel we need to encourage them to even venture into male-dominated fields like engineering as that is still a male dominated field they are still very few female academics in such faculties (Interview with Z. Ndlovu).

His colleague agrees by noting that whilst gender equity is a priority, there's no prioritisation of it in policy terms to attract enough female postgraduate students (Interview with B. Johnson). Another female academic agrees to the prioritisation of gender but with reservations.

> I think so from HR perspective the way they advertise posts sometimes means that they are only accepting females for that position to balance up things I suppose but once you are employed that's different (Interview with K. Jones).

Two of the interviewees did express their misgivings about gender being regarded as priority at the university. A male academic had this to say: ―I think it is not enough of a priority to UKZN as a whole I would suggest more needs to be done" (Interview with M. Regan). A young upcoming female academic was of the view that there was general interest in gender equity issues but it is not as blatant as it ought to be. She felt that they didn't enforce it and that a bit more could be done. She suggested that as an institution that is full of researchers who are always looking for areas of interest that have not been covered before, the institution could insist and request for more feminist and emancipatory research from relevant departments to be done. Thus as a result build up stronger gender awareness within the university and make gender equity more pronounced as it isn't right now (Interview with Q. Dawood).

In contrasting sentiments a senior female academic who requested anonymity expressed her disgruntlement through the following quote:

> No! Gender equity is not a priority. The priority is how much money we make through research, how can we have race equity, how can we make sure that we have more black people in higher positions. There isn't even an issue on black women that we need to bring in more black women to do PhDs. The priority of the university is to money it has got the nothing to do with gender equity (Interview with a senior female academic).

Her sentiments regarding a high prioritization on making money against other pertinent issues were echoed by other academic staff during the course of the interviews but in response to different questions from this one.

A senior male academic who used to be part of many committees as well as the Senate not so long ago echoes this as he was of the view that policies in relation to gender equity as well as the overall policies of the university in general were always intensely debated. However, those debates as he notes, were less to do with gender equity issues but more to do with economic, political and also territory issues. He contends that people were worried about their own particular spaces needing their own territories so in the end alliances were often made and broken depending on what one was actually pushing for. So at that point as he concludes gender issues were really not a priority (Interview with Prof Kumar).

4.3 Organisational Culture and the working environment

An organisations culture is so strong that it puts pressure on employees to conform to it and more often is a major barrier to change. Few organisations are prepared to unlock male power bases in which old ways of doing things are deeply entrenched thus as a result gender inequality beneath the surface still remains unchallenged.

The Education White Paper 3 - A Program for the Transformation of the Higher Education System noted that the institutional culture and ethos in the historically white institutions continues to be eurocentric with a slight or no effort to position these institutions in the context of Africa. This as the paper notes acts as an impediment to staff as it hinders them from developing their potential to the fullest. Furthermore, it noted that there were gross discrepancies and unjustifiable disparities in the proportions of black and female staff in comparison to whites and males and institutions must create an appropriate organisational environment for the disadvantaged to prosper (DoE 1997). However, so much has changed since then as many institutions of higher education have transformed considerably to proportions that mirror the demographics of the country.

Even so the Act still plays a requisite role in evaluating the effort and gauging the success which an institution like the UKZN has made with regards to overhauling its working environment amongst other things so as to meet its gender equality obligations by merely comparing the prescripts of the Act against the actual state of affairs at the university.

Previous studies have, however, shown that institutions of higher education still breed systematic but subtle patriarchal cultures in them which carry on to impede the full achievement of gender equality. It was the premise of this study to therefore investigate if such a culture is in existence at the university and expose the extent to which it is affecting it female academic. In contrast to a patriarchal culture and working environment, a gender-sensitive culture would be one that creates a friendlier and stable working environment which succors women to become more self-confident, develops a greater sense of collegiality between women and men, creates a level field for all and eradicates sexism against women. The question **In reference to gender equity how would you describe the culture and working environment currently present at the institution?,** was important as the responses would be informative as to what kind of organisational culture and working environment is currently in existence at the institution.

There were mixed feelings from the respondents as to what kind of culture and working environment was prevalent at the institutions. Some quarters felt it had changed for the better, whilst others chose to comment just about the culture and working environment within their departments as they weren't aware of the overall state of the university , with two respondents feeling it was in a state of decline. However, the majority were of the view that it's in a positive state.

The responses that best captured the state of the university culture and working environment are listed as follows:

> At the moment, it's in a state of flux when I started here at the university it was difficult as a female junior member of staff. One used to be relegated to administrative duties generally with a male as your line manager. So we would have more administrative duties delegated to female members but that has been gradually changing (Interview with Junior Female Academic).

> Having been with the UKZN for so long I think it's definitely improved its there's definitely a whole lot more gender aware and sensitivity in terms of employment equity. I think the situation is now better than when I started out not that there was over gender discrimination in terms of employment but I think there is a lot more awareness and it's being implemented at the policy level (Interview with Dr .Jagganation).

> I think the university is meant to be on paper a fairly gender equitable institution. In other words, it recognises women's rights and that they have been disadvantaged in the past and that they need to be given particular status, as well as accorded some extra measures with regards to access to education. I think there's some sensitivity towards that socially in terms of the policies. In terms of practice that's not always the case because you might find that there's discrimination still taking place whether it's being done unconsciously, or sometimes it's being done because of institutionalised patriarchy where things like culture and insensitivity by a very patriarchal system continuously excludes women on that level (Interview with Dr L. Nadvi).

> We are in a bubble the law school is different from other schools we are dominated by women we have a female dean who promotes women's empowerment so the working culture and environment in this school is perfectly in tune with the university policy. In terms of the gender equity factor we have gender equality as there is very little difference if there is any between male and female lecturers. When I started here I think I earned less than a male colleague who started with me, but I don't think it was because they were male but maybe he had slightly more experience than I did, in fact, there was a male dean who didn't try harder to ensure gender equality (Interview with L. Stone).

> I can't speak broadly on behalf of the whole institution, but I can only make reference on what I see, observe and experience at the law school. So I think that maybe also the experiences are shaped by the fact people in the law school are mindful of the need that they need to respect the rights of others so there seems to be no problem with that. We interact with one another regardless of gender even the dean or head school is a woman she has been in that respectable position for some time. There are also other colleagues who are holding responsible positions which my male colleagues have no problem

with they accept even currently the academic leader is a female. There are other positions of other committees which are held by females so personally I don't have a problem with that and I have also observed that other colleagues interacting with them don't have any problem with that (Interview with M. Buthelezi).

Within the law faculty itself there are more females than males, but I think at the end of the day it's actually quite fair if you are dealing with gender and equity. The good thing is I actually studied at the institution and studied at this faculty, so I have colleagues now that were my lecturers before so am not having this feeling of it being a patriarchal environment as such I think that here you have your peers that support you and there's no issues as such with gender equality. So it's a very happy environment, we are willing to work with each other and support each other, and frankly, I haven't had any thoughts on that (Interview with Prof Khan).

At this institution, I think it's something they have been trying to work on as the differences were huge pre merger. It's hard for me to identify if there has been some material changes because in my area it hasn't changed an awful lot. Another thing is that there's a tendency, for some reason, for the majority of teachers of language and literacy to be female than male. However, I have seen instances of gender oppression. One of the biggest mistakes they have made was to do a second transformation exercise whilst the previous transformation wasn't yet done. As a result what it has merely done is making the lives of administrators and academic staff extremely difficult (Interview with Dr M. Pillar).

It is hard for me to comment because I don't really know outside my own discipline I know some limited number female colleagues and friends other than that the relationship within the school. It is very collegial, and we assist each other where possible other than that we don't have any issues, but I think the limitation we have in our discipline is not the 50/50 but it's better than what we had before. Female headship is fine generally I think my colleagues have accepted female leadership. I don't personally believe whether being you are a male or female head has much to do with what you are supposed to do the nature of the work and workload is supreme you bring your best to do the job I think the expectation should not be any less because one is female and only more because it is male. I don't think we should measure people on the basis of gender I think they should be measured on the basis of their ability to carry out the job at hand (Interview with Prof Kumar).

I think there is a culture of equality and ever since I have been here if you look at the staff there's quite a large number of females. Our dean is female, and we got a female as chief of research so there's a sense culture of gender equality. When I first got here it was full of males, pale men and but there still aren't many black men (Interview with Prof Luiz).

In terms of gender equity, I think it's good that we find ourselves working with female academics as they are passionate, hardworking and committed. When I started lecturing I served under a female head and it was a good working relationship we had and the working environment was excellent (Interview with Z. Ndlovu).

I think they have done a very great job in ensuring that there is a balance not just in gender but in race too. I don't think I have ever been discriminated upon based on my gender and I have a good working relationship with my male colleagues (Interview with Z. Taljaard).

I think the working environment has deteriorated when I first started working here I used to love coming to work I enjoyed coming to work but now I don't so much has changed and there's a total lack of respect for the staff (Interview B. Simpson).

The above responses suggest that the existence and the increase in the number of women academics in the University has helped in transforming the organisational culture and working environment of UKZN into one which is harmonious. Moreover, the responses illustrate that an enabling atmosphere/environment is prevalent throughout the institution for management to formulate and implement women friendly policies, practices and programs. In such an environment, gender equality is highly attainable possibly to levels of parity. The institution, however, still has a daunting task of consolidating that environment with policies, practices and programs which will aid in changing the nature of academic work which seems to have a negative impact and outcome on the women academics. This I say because judging from the responses, male and female academics are mutually respectful of each other as individuals, as professionals and recognize and acknowledge each other's talents and the work which each produces. However, it is in the manner in which the leadership of the University seeks work output from academics which is a source of strife and not their immediate working environments and male to female interactions. This is greatly affecting collegiality amongst academic staff. The following responses illustrate this well:

It is just surviving from day to day. In actual fact, the university encourages you to be selfish. It doesn't encourage you to work with others because it is much better for you to do an article on your own than to do it with somebody else because you will only get half the productivity points. It is also extra work when you are working with somebody so in a way the way you are rewarded for all of this encourages one to be selfish. I am going to share my idea with somebody else because I want that idea for my research, and if I talk too much about somebody else might use and hand in their article before me so it discourages working together (Interview with B. Simpson).

It has changed me and its making me unhappy. I even look at my own line manager with contempt because am doing all I can to the best of my ability and I get a 2 out of 4 for research when I simply don't have enough hours during the day to do research as he is the face because he gave me the 2 but his just implementing a university policy. I had published prolifically in university texts books and other student books but the university said it means nothing isn't the dissemination of knowledge not good enough for the university. The reason why most accept the low salaries was because of the freedom but they have taken it away and we being exploited (Interview with L. Stone).

On paper, the University of KwaZulu Natal in recent years seems to have made progress in raising its gender equity profile. However, this progress has been slow and the reality of the matter is that sometimes numbers will always be just that numbers as they do not show just how much an organisation has achieved real substantial equality. The question **In your experience has the University in your view become a more equitable place in terms of gender equity? Can you provide concrete examples or elaborate?** Was therefore set to assess the progress the institution has made in terms of real substantial equality. A significant number of respondents alluded to the fact that there the institution has become more equitable. However, it is perhaps the following responses that best capture the mixed perceptions of it all. The respondents give us various glimpses as to just how much substantial equity has taken place.

When I got here I was the only female and now we are four so there has been an improvement. My ideal area to pursue my PhD would have been minerals but when I got here it was a pale male-dominated field. I met with a couple of people but it's still very much an old boys club as far as am concerned so I decided that I will not break my hip trying to get in there because it will be very difficult to compete with experienced people (Interview with A. Singh).

At the moment, my problem with the UKZN is the large exodus of top female academics and no one coming to replace those who have left creating amongst other things a gender imbalance and teaching deficiency (Interview with B. Johnson).

Like some colleagues will say there is this superiority thing going on amongst male colleagues especially the more senior ones because they have this attitude that they know it all, big egos and all but I haven't encountered it (Interview with Dr Jagganath).

I think that in terms of the workplace environment women if they are perhaps at a lower rank or if they are in vulnerable positions are still subjected to some kinds of comments and remarks. However, the university in its sort of what you call working labour practices is attempting to ensure that it does have grievance procedures in place so that women can lodge any kind of complaints that they have. I think, however, that the issue of sexual harassment needs to be dealt with also in terms of career advancement for women and that there needs to be perhaps a more executive drive to ensure that women of colour are given preference. I do think the job adverts do take note of that but are subtle to the disadvantaged women. There has been improvement over the years but the university still faces the same challenges like all other places of work face like continuation of gender discrimination (Interview with Dr L. Nadvi).

Since I have been here I haven't noticed a change but I may be ignorant of some of the larger policies and things like that as a fixed term employee you don't get too exposed to the same access to policies and changes in regulation as a full time employees so you are not as aware of the things that the Senate has decided, policies that have been handed down. I know they are other issues where gender is concerned but I don't think that has managed to change since I have been here. I think the department since I have been here since 2005 its been roughly the same we have hired new female and male academics but the ratio has stayed roughly about the same (Interview with M. Regean).

I still I think that the scales are still very much tilted in terms of male academics they seem to be in the majority within the university system. In terms of leadership roles though I think that one is beginning to see a number of women academics taking up quite a number of prominent roles within the various hierarchies of leadership within the industry structure whether at the level of deans such research office for an example.

One of our top researchers in the school who is actually our head school is female and there's is no resistance from male colleagues and I don't see anything militating against her (Interview with T. Sitoto).

I think the institution is actually geared and moving towards equity when I started working here, they were actually only three females employed here at the law faculty itself of different races (Interview with Prof Khan).

I wouldn't be able to answer that precisely because maybe when I first started off I never paid much attention so I wouldn't have a recollection of where we are coming from other than to observe maybe broadly of where we are even though we don't have figures we are making progress we may be ahead of the country in general I don't know (Interview with M. Buthelezi).

I do think so I certainly think attention has been paid to it. I think one of the problems with the university is its fully chaotic in its processes sometimes to figure out if there are changes which are positive ones too are not easy to be perceived treatment of people at UKZN is not great (Interview with M. Pillar).

There has been progress and significant strides considering from where we were in the mid 90s for example to 2000 then to 2010. I think the number of women that we now have on our teaching proportions is more in some disciplines than before so it has changed. I don't think in the world we will ever have an exact 50/50 ratio, although we would love it to be so because at the end of the day we also need to look at the issue of who is adequately qualified, who is adequately suitable for a particular position (Interview with Prof Kumar).

I have sat on various committees' interview selection panels and all that. They interview people and before they make the appointments they have to look at the equity profile and whether not in gender only, so there is a consciousness in that (Interview with Prof Luiz).

Yes, it has to some degree, but I do feel that the Industrial Organisation and Labour Department has to be stronger about it especially it being a labour relations department. I feel we have an onus to work for the university and try and promote this gender equity (Interview with Q. Dawood).

An effort has been made to make it possible for women to become active members of this community as lectures and managers. When one looks around there are still lots of males more than females but in the last five or so years there has been an increase in the number of females but they are still not enough. Hopefully, in the next 10 years we will see some gender equality taking place and it would be nice to see a woman become vice chancellor, more women become professors and managers someday (Interview with Z. Ndlovu).

> I think it's quite great the manner gender has balanced out in our school specifically. It used to be very male dominated even the head of school used male but now we have a female head (Interview with Z. Taljaard).

Judging from the responses there has been an increased awareness on gender equity issues within the institution but however, with such mixed responses one can safely assume that the question may have different meanings to different people. The drivers for the increase in the number of female academics at the institution still remain ambiguous this view is perhaps best captured by the following remark from a female academic.

> I think it is a priority for the university as a whole, but then again, I will have to use the school of law school. Here it is quite problematic in this case as there are more females than male I don't know whether that's because those female candidates are just so much better or whether they are just finding more females applying because many men have gone to the private sector they don't see lecturing as real job (Interview with L. Stone).

Most of the responses still view gender equality in terms of numbers whereas the direction of feminist thought in terms of gender equality calls for real and lasting change that goes beyond the numbers game. Gender equality beyond figures helps remove doubt about just how much the institution has become equitable. Having large numbers of female academics isn't enough focus should be directed at the cultivation of real transformation in which there's an improvement in the work environment and work life of female academics.

4.4 Gender Equality Policies and Programs

The correction of institutional bias by reforming present systems through the formulating and implementing of pro gender equity policies is an important principle of the liberal feminism theory guiding this research. Constitutional and legislative provisions are important prescriptions formulated and enacted by governments that must be complied with by those it's targeted at.

The Employment Equity Act, 1998 (EEA) which is the foundation and guiding policy upon which all equity employment policies, procedures and plans are drawn up against, compels every organisation to design and implement gender equity policies and programs.

However, the institutional will of implementing gender equity policies differs widely, ranging from no policy action to a broader definition of problems. Moreover, while institutions have implemented diverse policy instruments, more general strategies to argument them are often lacking. In light of this, the question **Are you aware and well informed about the gender equity policies and programs currently being pursued by the University and what their implications are?** , was therefore, pivotal in eliciting from the respondents their awareness and knowledge of any gender equity policies and programs in the institution that ought to be in place as required by law. Furthermore, this question sought to establish if the respondents understood the gravity of those gender equity policies and programs.

In response to this question, a seasoned senior female academic at the school of social work who has been with the institution for well over ten years had this to say:

> Am not sure that am well informed. I know the transformation charter mentions it, I know that we have a sexual harassment policy which I think is quite old and I don't think it has been relooked at for quite some time. I think when we do assess the role of that kind of thing, the efforts are always on whether we have transformed racially rather than whether we have transformed in gender terms. I think the university is aware of that kind of thing, but I don't know if there is a gender equity policy as such or gender equity program. However, I do know there are programs like women in research offering support and encouragement (Interview with B. Simpson).

In agreement with the above view, another female academic in the School of Social Sciences explained it as follows:

> The University hasn't necessarily developed a specific document that stands alone with regards to gender equity. Am not aware of one, if there are discussions happening in the various places which may be happening but I have not come across such a policy in my work here. I know that there are efforts made to perhaps include women in various spaces but I think that in all comprehensive documents we should form policy that spells out anything relating gender and gender equity issues. So such policies in this university need to be and should be actually developed (Interview with L. Nadvi).

A female academic in the School of law who has taken part in employee interviews concurs to the non existence of a specific gender equity policy view held by the others, and she had this to say about it all:

> I have sat on various interviews in which HR has mentioned that we should appoint someone specifically. S once I was on the board of interviewing people I knew that the board had said that we should focus on the females so that's we focused on. However, am not aware of any specific gender policies and I haven't seen any (Interview with a female academic from the School of Law).

On the contrary, and on a slightly different angle a female academic who due to the nature of her response chose to remain anonymous, expressed her deepest disappointment with the following response:

> I know what their implications are and about two years ago there was a dramatic demonstration of their performance. We had interviews for jobs and candidates that had gone through the entire process right up to them being shortlisted without the active recruitment of in house female candidates who in my view qualified and had the level of experience required for those jobs. Are we not supposed to look internally first and possibly mentor those who meet the grade into those positions? (Interview with female academic).

More disappointment was also observed and noted as a young female academic had this to say: ―I have never even heard about them all I hear about is the language policy and the BEE restructuring that gets thrown at our faces" (Interview with a young female academic).

More responses such as the following further amplified the non existence and lack of a specific gender equity policy.

> No, I am not aware of the gender equity policy of the university or the ambitions of the department, but I have heard about trying to enforce employment equity, the ratio side of it as a tutor hearing it in the corridors. However, I haven't been informed and when I was employed, I didn't ask as well about gender equity policies in this department as it is mainly female dominated. I didn't really think about what plans they had in place for gender equity, but I do know there are employment equity guidelines. However, being a labour relations department we don't even have a basic conditions employment act hanging anywhere here and to speak more about gender equity. We also haven't played a role in fostering gender equity or making it known to all employees, and I feel we are at fault in that way (Interview with Q. Dawood).

A male academic in his response to the question at hand helped to shed light as to why so many were not well conversant with the gender equity policies and programs he had this say: ―Not at all! In fact, fact, I am not sure of other policies as well. They are not communicated to us and one only looks for a policy when there is a problem that has come to light, and it is affecting them" (Interview with Z.Ndlovu).

A greater majority of the respondents expressed ignorance in relation to the question due to a lack of interest. Some respondents assumed and were of the opinion that the institution had to and ought to have such policies in place even though they hadn't necessarily seen them. A couple of the respondents did express their awareness of the Sexual harassment policy which in my view, although commendable, necessary and important only addresses one aspect which is the protection of women from verbal and physical abuse which is sexual in nature. The evidence as seen from some the responses also suggests that policies in general are not adequately communicated to the staff via effective communication channels as those currently used by the Institution seem to have failed to do so.

Lack of communication has been cited as the biggest reason for the failure of many policies and programs to meet their expectations, however, used effectively it can reduce duplication of work, non productive effort, help eliminate mistakes, aid in the identification of problems, helps in the generation of ideas which leads to better solutions, encourages teamwork and involvement of all key players.

It thus becomes imperative that the institution through its Human resources department effectively communicates its policies and programs to the staff, generates interest and also understand how any given policy or program could affect the behaviours of the staff. The evidence also suggests that the Human Resources department may not view this as part of their core responsibility, but in reality, it is undeniably their responsibility as they are the all-important link in the employer-employee relationship and the institutions custodian of policies governing staff welfare, empowerment and conduct. In summation, all the responses from the 30 interviews highlighted an absence of a specific gender equity policy that advocates for substantive gender equality and demonstrates a serious lack of institutional will in addressing gender equity issues.

4.5 Policy Formulation and Implementation

Much of the failure of gender equity policies has been ascribed to the domination of men in the policy formulation and implementation processes. Although the goal of providing equal opportunities for women and men exists almost everywhere, few institutions have successfully implemented the gender mainstreaming strategy into their policy processes. This strategy involves ensuring that a gender equality perspective is integrated at all levels and stages of the policy cycle. This is to be achieved by involving the disadvantaged gender seeking remedy in this case women in the gender equity policymaking process.

This strategy falls in line with the reasoning of liberal feminists who believe a change the status and opportunities of women can be achieved through democratic channels in which in all stakeholder participation is key.

The question **In your view is there comprehensive consultation and equal participation by all in the formulation of policies like the gender equity one?** Sought to interrogate and determine the level of stakeholder involvement throughout the policy formulation process. However, evidence from previous questions pointed out the absence of a specific gender equity policy. Thus, I sought to interrogate the formulation of policies and recent developments which I felt have had, to some extent, impacted on the achievement of gender equality in the institution. Due to the nature of the question, most respondents requested anonymity. The emotions and perceptions of the respondents their responses are presented as they are. A male academic in the School of law had this to say:

> I don't think there is. It is more of a top-down approach like, for instance, the sexual harassment policy it was introduced but there wasn't a broad consultation. Maybe sometimes it becomes a nature of one like when the government or state wants something done like this, I must just conform (Interview with male academic).

The top-down model according to Matland (1995) regards implementation of policy as a process that flows from the officials or decision-makers to the target group. The policy goals are set by the authorities or decision-makers and do not consider the broader public objectives. The methodology used in this approach gives greater importance to policy makers and less regard for other actors. This approach can be seen in practices as evidently portrayed by the responses from the interviewees.

A senior female academic had this to say about the lack of consultation and used the recent re-organisation of schools taking place at the institution as an example:

> No, and I think over the years we have been seeing less and less consultation and involvement of people. Power has been almost centralised. Policies have been made far away from the ordinary people. The reconfiguration of the university hasn't been in consultation with the academic side of people who basically have to run the university. It would be interesting to see who has been mostly affected by the reconfiguration! Part-time staff? Who is part-time staff? - Women, who are contract staff? I think it's mostly women; the ones that I know are women. Secretaries, administrative staff most of them are women and they are the ones who have been moved around to other schools some had to reapply for their jobs and some are the contract staff who haven't been paid (Interview with senior female academic).

Going further with the issue of re-organisation and how it has affected some of the women academics a senior female academic captures it well with this response:

> This passage is now all women and the toilets on this floor two of them are men's toilets and one is a women's toilet, and the woman's one is out of order. We said to them can't we take one men's toilet and have it be converted into women's one because it's not proper for ladies to go into a men's toilet. They said we should not worry as there are no men on the floor so we should use one of the men's toilets, but it's actually unpleasant to go into a men's toilet. It is just the small things that can make a woman's life more comfortable. Nevertheless, they said they can't do that there's just no money for that kind of thing (Interview with senior female academic).

Still on the subject of the re-organisation of the institution a senior male academic had this to say about it:

> I think much can be said on both sides, but I think generally the perception and what I hear from colleagues and the people that I have met and spoken to and so on is that, often the directives come from the top, and they are justified as though they come from the bottom. So it kind of lends itself to difficulties, and the actual achievement of those goals like for an example, the restructuring exercise nobody knows where it came from. (Interview with senior male academic)

Another male academic in an emotionally intertwined response had this to add on:

> I don't know if our management gives a damn am sick and tired of this kind of dictatorial rule that they have over this university. They make rules without considering them. Makgoba actually admitted at the meeting we had about the 2nd transformation of increased research productivity so why change if we are moving in the right direction. If we are doing great in race and gender equity why change it so radically now and it is definitely impacted negatively on everyone's morale. The university has this very unconcerned attitude towards us. I will carry on teaching at this place but am angry at the way the transformation has taken place. I don't believe we were given proper consultation. It was like do not complain just get on with it. The communication system is very poor (Interview with male academic).

In conclusion, to on the re-organisation issue a female academic sums it all up by saying this:

> Unfortunately, since 2005 the university has a very top-down approach they make decisions come at the top whether they see considerate its questionable so they just decide on something for an example the reconfiguration and they don't consider the day to day running of things with the decisions they make, which is why we are suffering now (Interview with female academic).

The re-organisation of the institution that currently took place on a broader scope negatively affected all academic staff and administrative staff work life alike. The re-organisation resulted in administrative duties being given to academic staff that is already overburdened with high teaching loads and other job pressures such as more publications and the attainment of PhDs. This has tremendously added more weight to already struggling and overburdened female academics leaving a majority of them on the back foot and precarious position as they were already struggling to balance their work demands and that of family. It must be noted that women academics are still emerging from a disadvantaged position of systematic oppression and still embroiled in a battle for recognition and equality. Notwithstanding that significant progress has been made in the uplifting of the status of women much needs to be done and it is with eventualities like this recent development which negatively impact on that progress.

With regards to the PhD policy which compels all academic staff to have PhDs within a specified time frame has disgruntled staff even more. Once more, whilst the idea and the gains to be realised behind the policy are of a positive nature, it is the policies formulation and implementation that has greatly jeopardised its success. The following responses serve best to capture the disgruntlement. Whilst this policy has affected both male and female academics staff it has further hampered the progress of women.

This young female academics response shows how this new policy is greatly affecting her as a female academic in the following response she gave:

> One of the reasons am most unhappy about is that we are being forced to do our PhDs at a very young age. We are still young members of staff and my focus as a female is on family that is trying to start my own family which I can't do now. We are also still not really qualified to write a 500 page dissertation. It was never discussed with us. It was just a law or rule that was enforced upon on everyone in the university that we have to have our PhDs registered by February 2012 or one should consider leaving the university. I think that is terribly unfair. I think it's one of the policies that were actually enacted to say that get your PhD or leave. It's now created an environment where female academics are perfectly now being jeopardised to the degree that as a young academic I can't start with a family as I first have to complete my PhD (Interview with young female academic).

Another young female academic had this to say:

> We are working longer hours than most universities and there is pressure from above to do PhDs. How am I supposed to do a PhD when am always in a lecture room trying to teach, trying to publish. Staff that already have PhDs are head hunted by UCT or Stellenbosch and off they go. This university doesn't do actually do enough to make our situation better (Interview with young female academic).

A senior female academic in lending her sympathy to the younger academics had this to say about the PhD policy:

> It's very difficult and unfair pressure on young academics". On the contrary, she was however unsympathetic when it came to the older academics ―they are older academics who have been doing nothing all along as far as PhDs and research is concerned the pressure has always been there the writing has been on the wall (Interview with Prof Luiz).

Another policy which had tongues wagging is the publication policy which compels academic staff to publish in journals only accredited and recognised by the University. A great majority did feel it hampered academic growth and has made their work life more difficult. A male academic had this to say about it:

> It is another form of labour brokering because you teach but the university doesn't recognise your teaching, only recognise your publications because it brings money. Say publish about five journals the university gets about a R1million from there so what you earn in a year would be at most R500k so if you have made R1million the university has taken half of that and given you half. For me, the primary function isn't research there's also teaching and the way they also do it is an infringement on our academic freedom. I should be free to publish in any other journal other than to be forced to publish in certain journals. There are international journals that are not recognised by the Department of Education, so I cannot publish on those, even if there is an opportunity to do so and get to grow as an academic instead of bringing in money (Interview with male academic).

On the same wave length, a senior female academic echoed the same sentiments in this response:

> The university has changed it now expects you to teach and to publish and publication is difficult especially for younger staff. Every time you turn around they have raised the limits of what you must publish, and then they don't often recognise things that might not have come out from an accredited journal but you would have made a great contribution to some extent and that is simply motivated by money (Interview with senior female academic).

These institutional changes are having an adverse impact on the work lives, personal lives and academic collegiality. In light of this, one can point out that the academic staff was being made to accept and endorse policies and programs which had already been drawn up and finalised without them having made a contribution and to some extent, which they were in total disagreement with. According to Reynolds (1969), Induced participation covers those situations in which low level stakeholders are encouraged to accept a plan already drawn up and settled for by high level stakeholders. The relative probability that the low-level stakeholder can deliberately influence event in accordance with their interest is low. Induced participation has three main phases, a phase of understanding, in which the stakeholders are expected to grasp the aims of the program of change, a phase in which those concerned are led to accept that these aims being compatible with their own advantage and a phase in which people should take action to fulfil their own part in the plan.

The following comment best captures this induced participation:

> The vice chancellor spent a lot of time explaining the re-organisation to us that it was from the discussions in the Senate and with various auditors. You only kind of hear things from the top, and we get driven into those running waters and drown. People still complain about their voices having not been heard properly and when disruptions take place because of the adjustments of the structures and so on, people don't know who to report to, who to complain to and where matters can be resolved. There is so much of a gap in communication as well as implementation (Interview with senior male academic).

Another male academic had this to say: ―There's no consultation at all we attend meetings in which preconceived and concluded judgments will be passed to us so the meetings are there to serve as some form of procedure" (Interview with male academic). A female academic on a reflective note had this to say: ―Sometimes you wonder if they have already decided, and your input is just going through the motions" (Interview with female academic).

On a balanced but insightful level, another female academic had this say;

> I think that (policy formulation) is for the people who are in positions of power. It might be useful to look at the constitution of the top-level management of the university to see how many women are at the very top level, because those are the people who are supposed to have an input into the formulation of policies. So if there's an equal balance of man and women then you will find that equality. Obviously, those of us at the lower level of universities, for example, junior lecturer staff, contract lecturers and so on we don't actually have a say. Although, there is an institutional song which is meant to have people make input on issues that affect the institution but I think that its people at the highest level (Interview with female academic).

A female academic in her response to the question raised an issue of concern about the lack

of consultation not just of low level stakeholders but that of experts who are in the employ of

the university and this is what she had to say:

> We have a language policy at the university that was enacted recently and we being the language scientists employed by the university were never consulted on the production of the language policy. Some of us specialise in the development of the language policy for South Africa as a nation, for companies, for institutions and so on yet in our institution the linguistics department was not consulted. There are a lot policies that are created at this university at a very higher level with no consultation with staff and with specialists that work at the university that specialise in that particular field. We feel so excluded from these sort of procedures so the cooperation level from staff is very low (Interview with female academic).

A female academic from the school of law had this to say about the whole lack of

consultation:

> They never ever do on any aspect later on gender equality so what the law school ends up having to do is to lodge an objection, but we don't really get far so. There is no consultation because there are certain decisions, which are made that don't seem logical or reasonable, for example, the decision to access our email its unlawful. They have this vast resource available to them free of charge even if they communicate about the perjury. We appointed a senior counsel and thousands and thousands of university money was spent on external legal services, legal services which could be accessed in house because we have suitably qualified people to do that.

> On gender, specifically there enough qualified people who teach gender in the law and human rights that could make informed contributions into many of these issues (Interview with female academic).

The two schools, by and large, have female academics in the majority than males could it then be by coincidence that the university deliberately chooses not to consult those departments on such important issues because of not wanting to be seen seeking female expertise? Or could it be a case that the university has a strong belief in outsourcing such expertise? Well, I believe that's open to different interpretations depending on the angle one chooses to look at it.

In closing remarks, the status of women has changed drastically but society has adjusted with difficulty to the changing role of women. The work-family divide preserved by society hinder women from being full-time participants in the organisations as they carry on to shoulder the responsibility of looking after the family. This according to feminist thought sees them more concerned about fulfilling other roles first such as putting family first ahead of work. The formulation of policies and implementation of policies in an impeditive way as depicted above which show a lack of women input can only prove detrimental for female academics as their needs are pushed back to the margins.

Weaver (2009) mentions target compliance as an implementation strategy which has proven futile as policy beneficiaries often resist and refuse to comply as policy makers often assume that they know how the policy beneficiaries will react and that compliance will be automatic. Policy experts he further contends tend to think they know best, that they possess all the relevant information, and the policy is the best option. Failure to listen often leads to bad policy formulation, which automatically has an adverse impact on its implementation and success.

Keyan Tomaselli, Director of The Centre for Communication, Media and Society notes that only 20% of the academics are producing over 100% of the university's research target. This can be viewed in two ways, firstly, as some form of resistance to compliance and secondly as a sign to management that academics are simply not coping well (*UKZN Indaba* July 2012).

4.6 Policy Effectiveness and Objectivity

The response to the next question was always going to be a difficult task as it had been revealed from a previous question that there was no specific gender equity policy in place. Furthermore, the majority of the respondents had expressed their unawareness and lack of knowledge to other gender equity related policies and programs in place at the institution. Any emphasis on examining the degree to which policy and program are objective and effective must contend with the reality that policy makers often do not state their objectives clearly enough to permit a thorough analysis of whether they are effective, objective and achievable. To assess a policy or program effectiveness and objectivity requires input from low level stakeholders. This involves obtaining the views and perceptions of the low-level stakeholders through qualitative means for an in-depth analysis on the usefulness and effectiveness of a specific policy or program. Thus, the next question **In your own perspective are the gender equity policies and programs in place objective and effective? If not how best can they be improved?** was important in holistically assessing the existing gender equity policies and programs to the knowledge of the respondents and seek solutions based on their responses.

A male academic in the School Of Law in his analysis of the sexual harassment policy had this to say:

> For instance, the way the sexual harassment policy is designed it is not mainly only dealing with staff members but also mainly designed to protect, student from staff but it is not mainly applied horizontally as well but mainly vertically. Like maybe there should be a separate policy for people in the same level like when employees as deal with each other and a different policy for students or the same one should be modified to specifically deal with students at the same level and also to deal with staff at the same level because sometimes it feels like its vague (Interview with M. Buthelezi).

A female academic from the School of Social Sciences who was involved in Gender studies, and research was more or less of the same view with her School of law counterpart said

> The sexual harassment issue on campus needs to be administered much more carefully. I think that the policy isn't very clear with regard to the kind of subtle ways in which women are targeted and become victims of sexual harassment, but even if it's overt, for example, comments made in fun. I have personally in my time here in the faculty of humanities proposed, and they have accepted to have a gender advisory body that forms part of the formal structure of the faculty of humanities. I would hope that we would be able to still have not only an advisory board but a decision-making structure within the college that can be tasked with dealing with all kinds of gender issues and development of policies around these things not only for the college but also for entire the university (Interview with L. Nadvi).

A Female academic in the School of engineering also felt that the policies the university comes up can be very punitive she gave an example of the need for teaching portfolios (Interview with A. Singh).

The dearth of a specific gender equality policy was further compounded by the lack of gender equity indicators of success in the institutions strategic plan to measure the effectiveness of the gender equity policies. It thus becomes obvious that gender equality at the university still remains a non priority with a number of other policies being blindly passed which seem to be clashing and impeding the achievement of gender equality within the institution.

4.7 Policy Monitoring and Evaluation

Monitoring and evaluation is an essential exercise carried out to gauge progress being made by a certain policy, program or intervention. The Employment Equity Act compels every designated employer to prepare and implement internal monitoring and evaluation procedures and numerical goals for achieving gender equality. Institutions of Higher Education like Ukzn as the act requires should have mechanisms in place to assess outcomes of policies or programs of action they have implemented. This enables them to determine the effectiveness and efficiency of their policies and program. In the absence of constant and effective monitoring and evaluation, it would be difficult to know whether the intended results are being achieved as planned or what corrective action is needed to ensure the delivery of the intended results. Waterman and Wood (1993) believe that the objective of policy monitoring is to provide policy makers with direct systematically derived, unbiased information on the level and nature of a particular policy output on a continual basis. They further go on to say that the primary goal of policy monitoring and evaluation is to provide decision makers with the ability to better control policy outputs and make necessary adjustments.

The question **<u>Can you briefly describe the monitoring and evaluation mechanisms that are in place to measure gender equity progress?</u>** sought to interrogate the existence of such mechanisms and possibly their effectiveness.

A greater majority of the respondents professed their lack of knowledge to the existence of such mechanisms. Most answered with a flat no. Whilst the following responses depict and give us a general

‒There are not any which I know of but I have seen something about gender in the year to year rolling plans of the university" (Interview with Mr Z. Ndlovu). ‒Am not aware of any at all so I wouldn't be in a position to adequately answer that" (Interview with Prof Kumar). ‒There is a board that did monitoring of the development studies unit we had to interview them to see how the department was functioning. You do have that committee that goes to each department each year and looks at the output rate and how equity measures are working" (Interview with Mrs Q Dawood).

Thus in an attempt to get at least a response the respondents were quizzed on whether there was some form of monitoring and evaluation that take places in relation to how well academic staff members are coping in their day to day work lives. Again most responded in the negative without giving much detail. However some did have a thing or two to about it all and their responses are as follows:

‒If we are not performing on par the dean does call us but that's just at the end of the year but for the greater part of the year we are just left to our own devices" (Interview with Ms L Stone).

> My progress isn't tracked because am a contract staff and they are not interested in my progress and well being at all. I have been working here for four years my work load increases every year and I have no job security whatsoever. Should my contract come to end there's is no guarantee. They actually said I will not be employed permanently because I have no PhD but am in my 2nd year but if they carry on to increase my work load I will not be able to complete it. I have also been told to my face by HR that I will not be made permanent because of the colour of my skin (Interview with Ms K Jones).

There seemed to be a general consensus amongst all academic staff members that at institutional level no one in management nor the human resources department seems to care in relation to how they are coping with their jobs.

They feel the evaluation done at year end happens a bit too late as its only an outcome or output of what one has been going through and how one has been struggling year round. However, they feel they owe much their success to the constant monitoring and evaluation which happens at school level and the constant encouragement and support structures that have been implemented at school level have helped them to cope. In some department, this lack of constant monitoring and evaluation is nonexistent, and the effects are tremendously felt.

The evidence presented here depicts a general weakness in managerial responsibility to implement. The lack of monitoring and evaluation mechanisms means that the institution cannot adequately assess the progress, strengths and weaknesses of its own gender equality initiatives aimed at advancing and empowering women. This, therefore, means that any gains or progress that has been made cannot be apportioned to the workings of institutional level initiatives. Instead what the data shows is that school-level initiatives are responsible for much of the progress that has been made on the gender equality front. This on its own is a cause for concern bearing in mind that state led monitoring, and evaluations on gender equality programs and initiatives undertaken by the Department of Labour are done at institutional level, and not at school level.

Monitoring and evaluation requires the involvement of all stakeholders/actors as this aids in contributing to good governance in that the results help to keep management honest as management cannot manipulate results and are forced to report truthfully their findings and curb the biasness in appointing women to certain positions in an effort to satisfy government quota targets.

Prennushi, Rubio and Subbarao (2004:125) concur to this by pointing out that non all actors/stakeholder have an important role to play in monitoring and evaluation as they help to keep the biasness of management and their self-fulfilling interests at bay. Furthermore, on the issue of accountability Schneider (1986:360) points out that whilst even if one cannot attribute a cause and effect relationship between the program/policy and its level of success, the reporting of the information itself is an indication of accountability and often provides constituents/stakeholders with the information needed to determine whether a policy is performing at a satisfactory level.

Policy monitoring and evaluation when successfully integrated into an administrative culture provides a fair analysis of the gender equality programs or policies set forth by the University and aids in accountability to the State and other stakeholders.

4.8 Career Development and Incentives

As part of the human-resource development plans the National plan for higher education requires that all institutions of Higher learning should develop and implement plans which should to include staff development, academic development (that is improved qualifications), career-pathing, skills management, technological re-skilling sabbaticals, conference attendance and academic contact visits. In addition, the plans should support remuneration and conditions of service that take into account the increasing competition from the public and private sectors for well-qualified black people and women (DoE 1997). One of the barriers to gender equity as postulated by previous research was the lack of career development programs, academic support structures and adequate incentives in institutions. Some research did point out that such initiatives were present in some institutions but were open to all staff without any specifically designed for women's advancement.

As such the question **What career development programs and incentives are in place and how effective do you think they are? Justify your answer with examples?** was set in order to identify the existence and assess the University's career development programs and incentives meant for female academics and their effectiveness. The responses are quite enlightening and are presented below:

> Am a bit ambivalent when it comes to this one as I feel we just talk a lot about these programs but not much is being done or rather there's no dedication from those who ought to implement them. I remember when I started off here I would have loved to have a mentor to show me through publishing provide support for my PhD. It would be nice to go out as colleagues to network and mentor each other (Interview with Z. Ndlovu).

> I don't know what they specifically are, but I have seen them advertise things like women in research, and I think the university should concentrate on helping women how to publish because I know a lot of women do struggle in writing there a huge focus on young women academics. We do have a good mentorship relationship and there are financial incentives but that a law school initiative plus editing (Interview with Prof Luiz)

> I am not really aware of any career development opportunities that are available. If they are they need to be well publicised and introduced to staff members (Interview with Godfrey).

> I think incentives are very bad I think sometimes as academics everybody is going to have a qualm when it comes to salary, and I think that there isn't much incentive. We are always having debates about salaries as in how our salaries are not on par with what other academics are receiving in other institutions and the fact that we put in so much work and effort and we are just being underpaid. Career development well I guess the fact that they have incorporated performance management and production units in this faculty we have mentors and mentees so in that sense they are assisting in producing work and that is helping us strive (Interview with Prof Khan).

> I am not aware of any. On our own accord, we have formed a support group to try and help each other to get through the process of getting our PhDs. Most of us in that group feel there is little or no support for PhD students as we are lecturing too. We also hold junior lecturing posts thus a result we pick up the slack of our department our workload is big, with lots of admin and lots of marking. For an example I teach two modules one module I have 300 students and the other one I have a 100 that's a lot and because am contract am not allowed a sabbatical, or research assistance so it really makes it really difficult to pursue a PhD in this institution.

From a formal perspective, we don't hear about any programs most of the opportunities I hear about are by word of mouth and you need to belong to an informal network of people (Interview with K. Jones).

I don't know what they specifically are, but I have seen them advertise things like women in research, and I think the university should concentrate on helping women how to publish because I know a lot of women do struggle in writing there a huge focus on young women academics. We do have a good mentorship relationship and there are financial incentives, but that is a school of law initiative plus editing (Interview with Prof Kumar).

Well, am not sure what programs and incentives are in place but one certain thing is that mentorship is ill defined in the institution. There's a difference between a patronizing culture from a culture of mentorship, which is supposed to be more nurturing and caring. There are few support structures available, for example, whenever one wants to finish their PhD if you need to take time off you have to take time from your sabbatical. Sabbatical is not a luxury its academic right so that you can concentrate on your research, and so I must not count on sabbatical as a support mechanism. Then there's the whole issue of academics to have PhDs on a practical level it's difficult with the teaching loads currently present (Interview with T. Sitoto).

In terms of incentives, there's actually nothing. I thought maybe with this whole performance management which apparently they spent a lot of money on getting consultants and doing training was going to help. However, whether I come out at the top or bottom, I get nothing for it like some recognition or some money. It has been an ongoing story now I think for 3years now but they keep saying they don't have the money for it so I don't see the point of doing it. In terms of development I need to and I want to develop as a researcher, but it becomes an issue of time because our academic teaching loads are high and that cuts down on the amount of time available to do research. It becomes very difficult to get sabbatical nowadays because you can't get somebody to replace you for that period, and it becomes your problem. So sabbatical appears to be a privilege and not something you are entitled to but that is not fair because people choose academia for different reasons. We choose to take the job knowing that you will earn less, but if they cut down sabbatical and other commissions of service, it's going to be difficult to attract people especially females into academia. As it is already a problem for us to get staff (Interview with A. Singh).

Nothing university wide, this school of law has developed its own program called MERIT (mentoring and research incentive) were a junior member of staff will be aligned with a senior member of staff and they will try and publish together because the junior member of staff doesn't have experience and you get paid for that. The money comes out from internal school funds which we make by teaching part time students, it doesn't come from university funds so we make our own money to give our people to try and facilitate research and develop our careers.

That has fallen away because the person who had the initiative retired and there is no one who has been able to take it further. All we hear is the need to register for a PhD but no one says ―ok you can have a lighter teaching load". Am lucky that I don't have an interest in starting a family or having kids otherwise I wouldn't cope. Because I don't think that there's been enough to help young female academics especially those with children (Interview with L. Stone).

In terms of gender, I don't see what programs are in place to empower or that will make a difference to the lives of female academics. In terms of terms of general empowerment, you have the staff training courses which are open and available to everyone. However, that is your choice to do all that or not and its dependent on whether you have the expertise or not, and if you want to be promoted. I don't see any specific gender programs in place that are going to put women on a more empowered level than they are at present (Interview with Dr Jagganath).

There are actually grants specifically targeted for female academics but am not quite sure what else is actually there at the present moment, but we could do with mentorship in helping us grow in our careers (Interview with B. Johnson).

I haven't seen the latest version of it but to my understanding the university is quite keen in ensuring that staff is developed whether they are men or women in terms of skill acquisition, further study, higher study and high-quality tuition. There is this drive by the university, and I think it is also linked to that the more people they have who have PhDs the more perhaps subsidies the university gets and I also think most of that drive is to try to ensure that it has as much personnel as it possibly can especially in the academic sector (Interview with Dr L. Nadvi).

I think in that regard the university is doing very well. Specifically speaking from the point of the School of law we have a mentorship program which I think is fantastic, our faculty has a great mentorship program where the older professors or academics would give mentorship to the younger academics. I think that is doing very well, and we appreciate that and I think it's something that they have done really well but it's from the school not the university side. I think that development programs from the university said they do ok they send out teaching and learning initiatives and workshops etc. I really don't think about attending because I don't think they actually benefit me in anything I have gone to some which have been a total waste of time but I guess they are making an effort (Interview with Z. Taljaard).

Well, as a PhD student, there are a lot of grants and research training opportunities, but you find you have to go through someone else in the department and I'm lucky enough to have a very efficient supervisor and she is the one who often shows me and guides me.

There are opportunities like publishing so we publish together as master students and as a female it increases your chances of getting on conferences. I just came back from one in the UK and managed to get funding even though people will tell you: ―you may never be able to get it because you are not the right colour‖. But in this instance because of the marks and the topics that I covered which was dealing with of Muslim madams and their men, I felt they looked at it as a very female emancipating research that's why they allowed me to go on the conference. So there are certain opportunities as a female Indian but you have to go out and actively seek them they are not going to come to you and not be deterred by what other people are saying. There are opportunities for growth as a female lecturer if you are looking at purely academic (Interview with Dawood).

I have been to the mentoring conferences which are very interesting because it's something so integral to mentor students male and female that's how it should be even to the younger academics who are new in the department and wanting an academic career they need that support and it should be given willingly. I think the problem with mentorship is when I went to that workshop; it was quite detailed on how they would like academics to mentor students and colleagues. However, there are no mechanisms in place for that kind or level of mentorship. Mentorship is something that should come naturally in your daily activities and it should be included in your day to day activities but at the same time the level the institution expects us to do mentoring means more work. It's a very specific task, but there has to be a way in which it is recognised and remunerated (Interview with Dr Jagganation).

I haven't noticed any per say but when I did my PhD for an example they waived tuition for the first two years. I don't know if you call that career development, but it definitely was an incentive that sort allowed me to get my doctorate very easily and I know that management also negotiates with staff members who are also working on their PhDs trying to help them get their PhDs I don't know about anything sort of outside of that but I think that's an important contribution that management has made (Interview with Dr Reagan).

Talking from my own perspective and from an academic perspective, there are programs but mainly focusing on research because I think that pressure is exerted by management. Most programs focus on developing academics to become researchers as research is now the main focus. I know like even now they are not encouraging but sort of forcing everyone to attain a PhD. The life of an academic has become sort of research based those are the barriers but they do advertise some workshops. However, there are no support structures though to push for PhDs especially after this whole re organisation. For instance, we have eight suites, and the support staff has been reduced. Some suites where there is no administrative assistance we carry that work which should be carried by administrative assistants.

When they came up with this re-organisation they said academics are now going to be free to do what they are employed to do which is research, but it is not that way. On top of that we have a large number of students at undergrad level to administer in addition to tutorial groups. However, in the school of law, we have a healthy mentorship program in place (Interview with M. Buthelezi).

My issue is the way things are going with this business college model if the university is being run like a business then they have to pay their staff accordingly to whatever they do. You can't expect an academic now to start doing the work of an administrator. It makes financial sense for the institution but they are forgetting the human side of it because as lecturer I am now doing things we never do we have taken more but what are they doing to remunerate me for my effort. I am all for this institution being world class but we can't work in third world standards we have got to be paid for what they want us to do there has to be balance and am not seeing it (Interview with female academic).

We have tried various things at informal levels, but it's just so much work the administrative work becomes more and more so we can't have those lunch meetings to discuss a journal article. I think we have to find a way to reward people in the university in different ways. We should maybe have research funding for women that we can be able to use for things like child care. If one has a child at home who's going to looking after the child? However, if you are a man your wife can look after the child but if you are the mom you are stuck. Men get to go to conferences and develop their interests and better themselves whilst women are left behind. There are single mothers raising children on their own it's very difficult they can't go to conferences, meetings after hours (Interview with B. Simpson).

The general feeling with the exception of a few is that at an institutional level there are inadequate support structures such as mentoring in areas such as publications and attaining their PhDs and incentives for those who wish to mentor. This is despite the institution having placed a high prioritisation seeking more publications from academic staff and requiring them to attain PhDs. Much of the mentoring and staff support being undertaken by various individual schools was a self initiated, of which not all schools have such programs in place. Factoring in the high teaching loads and administrative duties this places a heavy burden on all staff and acts as an impediment to them advance but more so for the female academic who has family to contend with also.

There is also seemed to be aware of only one program targeted specifically at women which is the Women in research initiative which specifically offers them only support and encouragement. The rest of the programs and incentives in place in terms of things like research grants are intended for all staff. The respondents also noted insufficient reward being given despite having higher workloads and more duties. The lack of knowledge as to what programs and incentives were in place displayed by some respondents once more highlights a major communication problem.

The treatment of sabbatical as a privilege rather than an academic right by the institution runs in contradiction with the provision of the NPHE. An assertion is made by some respondents that the institution has set up barriers that impede academic staff from going on sabbatical as when requested and desired by academic staff. This they say they have done by requiring that academic staff on their own, need to find someone who will remain taking over their duties before being granted and undertaking sabbatical leave. Furthermore, the institution has failed to provide adequate relief staff to not just to alleviate the workload left by academics that have gone on sabbatical or maternity leave on the remaining academic staff but also to help deal with the high teaching loads and administrative duties. This staffing responsibility falls squarely on the institutions shoulders and not those of the staff especially on sabbatical issues. The uplifting of the workload could also help in giving particularly female academics with families an opportunity to attend conferences, workshops, meet their publications quota and complete their PhDs.

4.9 Promotion Criteria

In an effort to achieve reasonable progress towards gender equity in intuitions of higher learning and to ensure equitable representation of employees from designated groups in all occupational categories and levels in the workforce. The National Research and Development Strategy in line with the National Plan for Higher Education compel institutions of higher learning by means of affirmative action measures to develop a promotion policy for development of women in academia that is not punitive in respect of their career advancement (DST, 2002:21). The question **what do you think about the staff promotion criteria being currently employed?** Was of significance in assessing the fairness and gender sensitivity of the criteria? In answering this question some respondents requested anonymity. Their responses are presented as follows;

> Promotions seem to be extremely hard we had somebody who actually applied for promotion a good couple of times and eventually he said to the university that if they don't promote him he will resign and he got promoted. (Interview with A. Singh)

> I have a big problem with the criteria. I think we should be able to move up the rank and improve on the basis of one's teaching I mean we are a teaching university and that's where a huge amount of our money comes from and if we didn't have students we wouldn't teach. How then would we able to get those students to move on to postgraduate studies? How then would we get people to get PhDs without good undergraduate teaching? I think that teaching should really be rewarded they talk about the other part of the university mission being that of community engagement that is just not rewarded at all so you can forget about that. In social work community engagement is integral to what we do. You cannot teach people to be social workers without doing community engagement and there's no credit for that. At the end of the day what counts for promotion is research and it's just not fair because some people don't have much opportunities to do journal research because of other things they choose to do. I should be able to become professor based on my teaching obviously I need to do the minimum research but shouldn't be expected to do extra research so that I can get promoted. So I think the promotion criterion is problematic (Interview with a senior female academic).

My only drama between then and now is that. It is so difficult to get promoted. After PhD, I tried for promotion because I had so much experience but I would get turned down. I applied again got turned down and like now am not even bothered to apply for promotion again and yet I have everything that it takes to be promoted, probably more but the criteria for being promoted has become so strict it is like giving birth to an elephant to get promoted that's my only drama because we could all do with the extra money, academics don't earn well."(Interview with female academic) ―The university's promotion criterion is actually unattainable. It means you have to publish a hundred publications and have a PhD most people don't have that (Interview with L. Stone).

I think it's very difficult to get promoted there's a lot of stuff which needs to be proved and done and experienced it seems the whole process of the university is shifting towards research and not necessarily towards teaching and basing our promotions on our research and not our teaching (Interview with Z. Taljaard).

I think it is not good it makes it even more difficult to be promoted. It is easier to get promoted through applying for a new position that has been advertised and I know a number of people most them women who have gained promotion not through the promotion process but applying for a position within the school as external candidates and going for an interview and getting the promotion that way. The promotion policies make it difficult to be promoted (Interview with male academic).

It's a major work just to get the stuff together to apply for a promotion they look at your teaching and want to see things like good student evaluation because a student doesn't give you a good evaluation doesn't mean you are a bad teacher because students have one agenda, and you have another agenda. I have a concern with that I think the evaluating of teaching is very difficult. And they look at your publications it's in black white as in how many points do you have. What they should be looking at is how many masters' students you are supervising (Interview with Prof Luiz).

We don't know what the staff promotion criterion is at the moment. Here in the department the number of people has gone down over the years and the quality of lecturers that we used to have, have been taken up by other universities. I don't know how people get promoted to say head of school, academic coordinator. There have recently been questions especially here in sociology about how people graduate up the ladder but I don't know how that situation works like maybe if I was to become a permanent I would be more in tune with these meetings (Interview with Q. Dawood).

I think the criterion itself is fair, but at the same time I don't think it's applied consistently as they are some questionable promotions and so forth (Interview with Z. Ndlovu).

> I think it's fair as the guidelines are quite clear as to how one can be promoted (Interview with Prof Kumar).

> Well, every year there is a process for promotion anyone can apply. It is an open process, but if you have accomplished something and you are looking for recognition usually it doesn't happen like that there's a process the university has put in place you need to apply for an award or someone will nominate it doesn't happen automatically (Interview with L. Nadvi).

> In this faculty I think it is fair if you have experience and published a couple of articles you could actually move up to senior lecturer. But then, on the other hand, you do have some academics on campus that don't even have a master's degree sitting at professorship level and it's confusing but I guess that was part of the old regime (Interview with Prof Khan).

A greater majority of the respondents felt the promotion criterion is strict in terms of what it is required for one to climb up the ladder to the top even for the most basic thing like converting from contract to permanent staff as one respondent pointed out. A couple of respondents in their view did feel the criterion was fair to a certain extent. The criterion was applied right across the board with no exceptions for either of the two sexes.

The publications criterion at a glance might not appear unjust. However, concern for research favours men as women research output is negatively affected by added societal responsibilities such as childbearing and rearing thus in that view the criterion begins to negatively weigh against female academics. Furthermore, a worrisome note was highlighted in the manner in which the promotions were being done it seems to me external candidates are favoured more than internal candidates. This interpretation is based on a couple of responses which pointed out how it was possible to get a promotion by applying as an external than from within. Thus, it can be concluded that the promotion points based criterion weighs heavily towards publications output and student evaluations coupled with a requirement of a PhD qualification but neglects the teaching component, postgraduate supervision and community engagement.

It becomes clear from the response that gender equity isn't a priority in terms of having a promotion criterion which factors in the difficulties and present situation and circumstances of female academics as they try to strike a balance in their heavy work load and family lives particularly so without an adequate support system in place.

4.10 Decision making and promotions

Many important organisational decisions such as the selection of a candidate for employment or promotion are made by groups, boards or committees. The purpose of group decision making is to curb against biases and errors prone and offer diversified opinions and alternatives lacking in individual decision making. However, according to Jones et al new evidence shows that group decision making can also be undermined by biases too just like individual decision making. A key source of group bias they purport is groupthink. Group think they say is a biased and flawed system of decision making that happens in groups whose elements endeavour for a consensus amongst themselves at the cost of accurately assessing information pertinent to a decision. Typically, the group rallies around one central theme and group members become blindly committed to it without sticking to a set criterion (Jones & George, 2009). An organisations culture is unspoken, difficult to change and it can be a hindrance to an organisations ability to adjust to a changing environment. When the outside environment, usually the social or political environment undergoes rapid change employees look to the organisations culture for survival. Newman (1995) believes that this forces them to stick to and protect what they know best even though it's to a detrimental effect as human beings have been shown to possess an innate fear to change and uncertainty.

Furthermore, another notable barrier to achieving gender equality in institutions of higher learning has been the lack of prioritization of gender in most of the decisions made as far as employment and promotions are concerned. Thus, the question **what are your views with regard to decision making in as far as employment and promotions are concerned? Justify your answer with examples or comment?** Was important in assessing and gauging the extent to which gender equity was now a priority in the decisions made. The responses as always were enlightening and are presented as follows. It must, however, be noted that some of the respondents requested anonymity.

> Am not party to those decisions or in any of those committees, but it seems to me that race equity is more important than gender equity we need to promote equity in people, we need to have African people in top positions so sometimes you think well my qualifications are better than that one and she got promoted but I didn't but I don't have evidence maybe there is something in that person's curriculum vitae that I don't have. It's a perception rather than I know for sure (Interview with senior female Academic).

> I know that in Anthropology, you don't find so many South African anthropologists who are officially available to come in and take permanent posts qualified people in South Africa the next choice would be someone African which makes sense. The sentiment t is that too many Africans are occupying positions in Social sciences than is necessary. There are Ad-hoc comments that I have heard and the general feeling is that few South Africans are being promoted its kind of like being swept under the carpet, and preference is being given elsewhere (Interview with female Academic).

> It doesn't matter how talented somebody is the committee that sits to look at things, sometimes they have their own way of doing things. In the past people of colour weren't getting promoted as much as they should have been but I think that's changing slowly because if you have met all the criteria in the tick boxes they no choice but to promote you (Interview with L. Nadvi).

> I worry about the broader retaining of the academics. Since the changes, we have lost quite a good number of academics. I can't speak about particulars, but I do feel UKZN is losing good academics especially in our humanities department. I would love to see top academics coming in than top academics leaving (Interview with M Reagan).

Within the humanities and social sciences when the recruitment is done am aware of instances where for an example when a female candidate is available that candidate is given preference over male candidates that is if she meets the criteria of the post advertised (Interview with T. Sitoto).

In reference to our school manager, we found that people who have been put in new appointments were not adequately trained didn't have experience. They were merely put in those positions more because of race equity reasons. It doesn't seem to be leaning towards being either male or female but on race that seems to be more of a key issue on this campus. You are employed according to race, gender is secondary to race. There's a lot of politics happening in our faculty (Interview with female academic).

What I gather from others like, for instance, when I was promoted is that one of the members in the selection panel was against me being promoted but that member was out voted so these decisions are not a serious process that has some credibility its quite an informal process for employment and promotions (Interview with female academic).

I wouldn't say it is gender biased it seems to be applying in general but am also thinking that there is no consistency its open to manipulation because it appears that the policy is inflexible but then you find that someone who wants to appoint somebody can always motivate that's my experience. On the look of it, it's not racially based (Interview with M. Buthelezi).

This is where we have a problem, there is an emphasis on the humanities faculty particularly that staff are in many way actively forced out. I think they are trying to reduce staff all the time so that affects the nature of development. A colleague of mine and I have been trying for many years to get her what she deserves, which is a permanent post, but I get frustrated by that because she is a perfect example person should be encouraged and developed but not sometimes I don't know how it balances out. I also don't know what management wants in terms of equity because the people who seem to deserve the most advancement are the ones who are left out she's been doing the same job as me for a long time has the same qualification but she's still a part-time contract staff. I think she is becoming increasingly frustrated. The work itself doesn't faze her she's generally hard working but I can see a definite demoralisation with her because of doing a lot of work and not being given credit or advancement for it. It makes you think should I really bother with a doctorate is it actually going to benefit me in the long run or not. People should be used for what they are best at many of us are prejudiced without even releasing it (Interview with M. Pillar).

‖think it takes a very long time to decide sometimes they take 3-4months and by the time sometimes one is well no longer interested" (Interview with Prof Luiz). Well, when I finished my masters, there was a delay in getting my results, so I was supposed to start teaching a module in Feb, and I only start in March. So when I tried finding out from others about getting a job I was told not to even try getting a job at the university because I am the wrong colour. However, the department was desperate and I needed to get in and also my marks reflected consistency. I was mainly desperate for a job as an academic so I just took what I could get and I didn't look into the gender equity part of it and I think I should have (Interview with female academic).

I think that is a very big problem, they are forcing us to do PhDs when the proper support isn't necessarily given lectures won't be cut we still have to do our lectures but and the dean school our dean is very helpful in helping us get out PhDs (Interview with Z. Taljaard).

My view is that we should look at gender in relation to the job that has to be done, the qualifications of the candidates, the most suitable candidate for the position. In that regard, we have to look at the special qualifications that they bring to the table. At the operational level, the issue is very complex. One issue is that sometimes qualifications and the relationship to the expectations of the job like when one gets into the specialisation of the field. For an example in a particular post if there are a given number of applicants and you push only the gender issue then of course only females will get it but then you also have to look at balancing the best candidate that qualifies for the post that's when I think it becomes a little bit tricky as to how far HR would want to push the gender issue. Sometimes things are more complicated than what they seem to be, sometimes they are issues that come in the way and may interfere with the handling of issues so people take certain things at face value like when a certain candidate is promoted and happens to be male but they will be other issues kind of involved in that decision being made (Interview with Prof Kumar).

According to O'Sullivan (1999), decision making is regarded as a formal or informal statement of intent made by authorized actors signifying in the decisions they have made as to whether they are willing to challenge and alter the status quo. In this case that would be showing commitment in the employment and promotion of all women are carrying on with the marginalisation of women by intentionally sidelining them and focusing on other issues such as race and personal power relations which have long been dominating the scene of employment equity and promotions at the institution.

Some respondents did point out that there has been a much improvement with regards to the number of women who have been appointed to higher positions but this remains a commitment which is yet to prove the test of time.

Whilst there is a set promotion criterion and employment equity policy in place at the institution, the respondents felt that the decision-making process is riddled with inconsistency and subject to manipulation. It is also clear from some responses that the decision making is by due influence of those who make up the selection committees. Much of their focus as the responses depict is focused on race equity and power relations. In some instances when a woman got promoted or employed their race took precedence over their gender. This lack of gender sensitivity greatly impedes the attainment of real gender equality within the institution and sets in place a glass ceiling for those women who are qualified and have the experience but are regarded as being of the wrong colour.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 CONCLUSION

There were a number of observations and theoretical assertions made from the analysis of past and present literature upon which this study was based on. The confirmation or otherwise of those assertions was based upon the analysis and interpretation of the findings from the study. Based on an exploratory and empirical study of the University of KwaZulu Natal (Howard College) the study's objectives sought to establish the existence and effectiveness of gender equality policies, programs and strategies currently in place and being pursued by the institution and assess the determinants causing policy failure. Furthermore, the study set out to examine and assess the organisational culture prevalent at the institution, the impact it has on the eradication of gender inequality and position female academic staff as either challenging or colluding with the status quo.

Liberal feminists hold the state accountable and responsible for churning out legislation and guidelines for eliminating gender inequality in broader society. However, the achievement of the objectives and goals of those public polices greatly rest on non-state actors such as institutions like the UKZN who have a major role to play as implementing agents. The most direct way to measure or assess an organisations performance or achievements is to measure the impact of its policies.

This study finds that the UKZN has failed to play a supporting role to government efforts in advancing gender equality as barriers to gender equality remain prevalent within the institution. This as the evidence suggests is qualified by the non-existence of a specific gender equality policy, disaggregated and explicit gender-specific strategic goals, targets and organisational trajectory and the lack of monitoring and evaluation mechanism for gender equality programs in place. The absence of effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms made it difficult to know whether the intended results are being achieved as planned or what corrective action is needed to ensure the delivery of the intended results.

The study acknowledges the existence of gender equality programs meant to empower and advance female academics. However, their effectiveness could not be ascertained as a result of inconclusive responses from the respondents. A greater majority of the respondents were oblivious to the existence of the aforementioned programs, whilst those that did acknowledge their existence had not taken part in them due to lack of time. Furthermore, the lack of incentives for mentors renders the mentorship programs ineffective.

The phenomenon of gender inequality in the workplace is often examined in terms of the relationship it has with the workings of patriarchy. One of the observations and assertions upon which this study derived its rationale and motivation from was that gender inequality is still prevalent in most institutions of higher education as a result of unchanging patriarchal oriented organisational cultures. The research findings in contrary indicate that overt sexism at UKZN is seldom experienced by female academics and this may be due to a number of factors such as the increase in the number of female academics at the institution and to a large extent the respect they get from their male counterparts.

Thus, based on the views of the respondents the study concludes that a harmonious culture is prevalent at the institution. However, the story doesn't end there because the findings also reveal that whilst a gender-sensitive culture is present at UKZN, gender issues are less prioritized as a result of institutional dynamics at play.

The fixation by the university's leadership on race serves as a barrier to achieving gender equality at the institution as gender issues continue to be sidelined. The 2008 Report of the Ministerial Committee on Transformation and Social Cohesion and the Elimination of Discrimination in Public Higher Education Institutions noted that there was both pervasive racism and sexism within South African Higher Education Institutions. As a result of the findings and recommendations of the report the University in 2010 developed and approved only the policy on race and racism.

The study observes that there is quite a significant number of women who serve on various committees such as the Institutional Forum that are tasked with advising the University Council on issues affecting the University, including but not limited to gender policies. However, two years later and there is still not a specific stand-alone document in the form of a gender policy in place. Whilst one might argue that gender is included in the Transformation Charter its mere mention in the document does not carry the same weight as a specific policy document. This could be loosely interpreted and misconstrued as an inability by those women at the top in using their influence to make sure that gender issues receive the same attention as race. Thus, the study concludes that having women at the helm is not enough the real focus should be on the cultivation of women in the middle and lower hierarchies of the organisation to enable organisations to change systematically.

The adoption of policies such as the one which calls for all academic staff to have PhDs by 2014 and the implementation of the new performance management system at the University have been perceived by academic staff as punitive rather than developmental. The PhD policy the study observes puts pressure on both male and female academic who don't possess that qualification due to its completion deadline. On the other hand, the new performance management system leans heavily and seems to reward academics who produce more research output and but giving less weighting to the teaching duties despite the high teaching loads. The compounded effects of those two policies are more profoundly felt by female academics that also have to contend with the inequitable division of labour at home.

Whilst one might argue that the private life of its workers is beyond the university's jurisdiction, the university, nonetheless, should not be oblivious to the extent to which external factors such as the manner in traditional gender roles and stereotypes found in broader society and practiced at household level adversely affect its female staff. Policies and programs ought to match and respond to influential factors such as those emanating from the external and internal environment of any institution. This lack of a gender mainstreaming has resulted in known issues that affect women not being incorporated into policies thus resulting in policies that lack a gendered perspective and greatly disadvantaged female academics to a certain degree

At the heart of the career advancement problem as feminists have argued is that in general, women are less interested and persistent in pursuing career advancement opportunities as a result of their female socialization. This as the liberal feminist's note results in women passing up career advancement opportunities such as going to conferences and work outings.

However, the evidence presented throughout this study points to the contrary in that at UKZN in particular the biasness of the promotion criteria towards race, research productivity points, conference and weekend retreats attendance impacts negatively on a female academics aspirations. This therefore becomes a career advancement barrier for female academics which again in contrary to the above assertion all seem to have a desire to advance their careers and gain promotions but due to their overburdening workload and time constraints female academic find themselves not being able to meet the requirements needed for promotion. However, some schools have found ingenious ways to work around the promotion minefield. Although a quite number of female academics have been employed, decision making in as far as employment equity is concerned is still greatly biased toward racial equity.

This study from the responses given concludes that substantive and meaningful gender equality is being super ceded by skin colour. Part of the data in that with regards to female academics of colour they are not being employed because they are first and foremost female but because they are of colour them being female thus becomes an added bonus this is further substantiated by claims from some respondents, in particular, Indian and white female academics who have been told point blank that they are of the wrong colour.

Furthermore, there is a lack of urgency and will on the institutions' part in converting contract academic staff majority of whom are female to permanent status. The university's human-resource division defines contract staff as staff on contracts of one month to two years, however, some contract academic staff work for periods of more than five years without being turned into permanent staff. This lack of institutional will to give them permanent positions renders the contract academic staff insecure, less committed and due to their contract status silences them from challenging workplace injustices they encounter daily.

Corporate Culture is the sum of values shared by the members of the organisation and the common rules of behaviour in the organisations environment. A corporate culture will only be gender sensitive when UKZNs leadership through communication as well as actions sends clear consistent signals regarding the priority of treating each other fairly and with respect and positively reinforcing behavioural norms, values and attitudes that encourage equality between male and female academics. Fox and Colatrella (2006) state that a woman's progression, performance and participation and within an organisation is not a straightforward function of her individual characteristics. Rather her participation and achievements also reflect and are affected by features of organizational contexts which she's subjected to such as evaluative practices, organisational culture, working climate, work structures, and reward patterns. These organisational settings are of vital importance to the attainments of women and men across all occupations.

5.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

An organisations policies and strategic plan provide a clear and concise statement on a organisations response to the challenges presented before it. They ideally assign roles, responsibilities, set targets and provide clear guidance on how an organisation should be responding to the challenges. The UKZN needs to put in place a gender policy and gender equality needs to be explicitly stated in all undertakings of the institution as much as to the degree in which racial equity has been explicitly stated and pursued. The formulation and implementation of a gender policy will be an indication of UKZNs commitment to transformation. A gender policy will also promote a gendered understanding of the principles within the entire organisation, and courses of action.

Furthermore, gender equality performance indicators need to be set and policy evaluation mechanisms implemented as they play an integral role as an information providing system which feeds into the cyclical policy-making process thereby providing objective feedback to various stakeholders. Furthermore, monitoring and evaluation broadens participation and opens up the policy process and emphasizes on the need for accountability. Indicators on the other hand help to measure the performance of programs and policies and.

Considering that knowledge walks on two legs it should be noted at this juncture that it's costly to lose female academics after having trained them and invested in them. Little attention has been paid to how decision making made by the University's leadership on policies and programs affects gender equality. The University's decision-making body has repeatedly chosen the authoritarian route when it comes to managing participation and implementing policies/program seemingly ignoring the demands of low status actors. The institutions leadership will have to change to a participatory management style that will involve all the stakeholders in the institutions decision-making process. Organisational practices that lack a gendered perspective can split a workplace into little camps thereby adversely affecting productivity and working relationships. Thus, policies that recognise and unify the differing needs of a diverse staff contribute to a workplace culture that encourages productivity and cohesion.

Furthermore, employees gain a great deal of satisfaction from an organisational culture that upholds fairness as this often leads to better work relations amongst employees which in turn fosters commitment, and it is commitment that leads to employees going above and beyond the normal call of duty.

Lectureship and professorship are professions, which are driven by commitment, self-sacrifice and going the extra mile to educate the masses often for little monetary reward and recognition. The top-down decision making approach is no longer feasible and acceptable and will have to give way to consultative decision making as stakeholder participation is a principle and one of the cornerstones of our democracy that ought to be upheld and accepted by all spheres. It has equal benefits for management in terms of gender-sensitive ideas.

Stakeholder interest articulation as a decision making strategy is a necessity in policy formulation and implementation if the policies and programs are to meet their objectives and be a success (Gunther, 1996). Through stakeholder interest articulation female academics gain the opportunity to contribute a gendered dimension to policy formulation debates on issues that affect their interwoven individual, work and home lives. The institution needs this kind of dialogue amongst its actors to help conscientise itself on how decisions made and policies implemented upon deep interrogation have serious ramifications and adversely affect the work-life balancing scale of female academic staff as policies have dissimilar impacts and effects on male and female faculty. Thus, policies and program design will be based on the real needs of the academic staff .In that regard, the University's leadership should consult and involve all academic staff whether permanent or contract in the discussions about policies, projects and programs that directly affect them such those to do with gender equality.

Academic staff, on the other hand, should also take the initiative and have the right to hold the university leadership accountable and seek reasons behind the decisions that directly affect them that have been undertaken by the university. Staff participation should be seen as something which fosters a good and open relationship between the staff and management.

It encourages positive dialogue, an engaging and positive organisation culture and working environment through the notion that the initiative for engagement is often led ‗from below' low level stakeholders rather ‗from above' by the high level actors.

It is important to develop an understanding of specific policy contexts when formulating and implementing policies or programs. Policies and programs ought to be relevant and sensitive to the environment that they will be implemented in. Failure to do so will inevitably result in the policy failing to achieve its objective. According to Grindle (1980), the specific context in which the policy is to be implemented under must be given serious attention by its promoters as they risk formulating poorly defined policies which will result in a failure to achieve any useful development advance. Instead, resources will be wasted in a futile attempt to prove that action is being taken and results are being achieved.

Communication channels and strategies need to be reviewed regularly. Every now and then, policies and programs change, circumstances change, objectives change and the audience changes too. These changes need to be communicated to all staff as ill communicated policies breed negative attitudes, animosity and resistance towards them and in the end they fail to achieve their objectives but in hindsight the more informed the staff are the better they will understand what is required of them. Whatever innovative solutions are laid on the table, whatever plans to create opportunities are devised they will not achieve their objective unless they are effectively communicated to all and feedback sought. Furthermore, staff representatives in the form of departmental heads, staff committee members and union representatives should be accountable to the staff they represent and share the same experience and interests with the staff.

This is to ensure that critical policies and programs like those to do with gender equity address and meet the needs and subsequently improves the working conditions and environment of the represented.

Academic staff made a few recommendations of their own which they believed would greatly improve their work life more so female academics felt these recommendations would aid in gender equality becoming a reality. A great number of female academia recommends that the university's management needs to look at how they can give females opportunities to succeed in terms of understanding that they are fundamentally different from their male counterparts and that they do not seek different standards upon which to be evaluated upon but just as a matter of understanding the difference. They also contend that a woman's multiple roles with respect to production and reproduction impacts on her capacity to participate effectively in the workplace.

It is important that management implements a performance management system that yields fair and accurate assessments of performance and work being done. The university in that regard needs to come up with a new performance evaluation formula which takes into consideration and recognises the teaching component of their jobs bearing in mind the high teaching loads they are currently undertaking. To ensure gender equality in career development and advancement UKZNs leadership needs to consistently monitor the workloads of their academic staff and devise mechanisms that will aide academic staff when workloads become excessive.

The university's leadership needs to look into the remuneration of academic staff as they feel that the remuneration offered is not competitive in relation to other universities. Furthermore, the university has given them more duties to do in reference to the administrative duties they now have to do but with no corresponding remuneration. Most academics agree to gender equality initiatives such mentoring but those that do the mentoring need to be rewarded for their efforts. Female academics also felt that the promotion criteria is too stringent and lacks reality this study recommends that a new promotions criteria which recognises not only the research output calculated by number of publications one has done but takes into account other aspects as well.

A common point of agreement amongst female academics is a call for greater security measures to be implemented as they are of the view that there is inadequate security and lighting especially during the late hours of the day. This constitutes an impediment on their right to a safe environment and their desire to carry out work on campus after hours forcing them to either to carry their work home or leave it for the next day which at times is not ideal. Furthermore, finding auxiliary staff to cover up for and temporarily undertake the duties of academic staff that desire to go on sabbatical, maternity leave should be the responsibility of the university and not academic staff. M. Buthelezi on a state level noted that current legislation is geared to put pressure on women in the sense that if a woman exhausts her leave days she has to go back to work but in some instance the father of the child would have been contributing to the UIF for more than 20 years whilst noting that men are only given two days of paternity leave. He recommends that legislation should be changed to allow the mother of the child if need be to make use of her spouse's contributions and that men should be given more days for paternity leave (Interview with M. Buthelezi).

However, it will take immense dedication by institutions to start implementing the steps crucial to achieving a climate in which gender equality can thrive in. A university is as good as nothing without its academic staff that which is its valuable human asset. Giving equal attention to the different aspects which affect its academic staff and other staff in general and recognising staff diversity not only results in a motivated and happy staff but this also positively creates a conducive organisational working environment, culture in which academic staff both male and female of whatever race or colour can thrive and advance in their careers thereby increasing the knowledge base and worth of the institution through the innovative research they do and the knowledge they disseminate.

Whilst this research focused on the struggles of female academics it emerged during the study that administrative and cleaning staff comprised mostly of women face far greater challenges and have been greatly left out in the gender equality battle taking place within institutions of higher education there is a lack initiative that are specifically directed at them and afford them the opportunity to advance themselves. It is important to understand that apart from the academic part of the university there are sections of the university where women are employed and contribute to the smooth running of the institution.

REFERENCES

Babbie, E. 2007. *The practice of social research.* USA: Thomson Wadsworth.

Barbour, R. S. 2001. *Introducing qualitative research: A student guide to the craft.* London: Sage.

Barrett, M. 1988. *Women's Oppression Today: The Marxist/Feminist Encounter.* London: Verso.

Barkty, S.L. 1990. *Femininity and Domination: Studies in the Phenomenology of oppression.* London: Sage.

Bass, B.M. 1985. *Leadership and performance beyond expectations.* New York: Prentice.

Beasely, C. 1999. *What is feminism? An introduction to Feminist Theory.* Australia: Allen and Unwin.

Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment (BBBEE) Act 2003.Captown and Pretoria: Government Printers.

CEDAW. 1998. *First South African Report.* [online] Available from: <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N98/065/49/IMG/N9806549.pdf?OpenElement>[Accessed 7 March 2014]

Cohen, P.N. & Huffman, M. L. 2003. Individuals, jobs, and labor markets: The devaluation of women's work. *American Sociological Review*, 68, 443-463.

Colquitt, J., J. LePine and M. Wesson. 2009. Organisational Behavior: Essentials for Improving Performance and Commitment. USA: McGraw-Hill.

Commission on Gender Equality. 1998. *Annual report of the Commission on Gender Equality.* Pretoria: Government Printer

Commission on Gender Equality. 2010. *Best practice guidelines for creating a culture of gender equality in the private sector* [online] Available from: <http://www.cge.org.za/> [Accessed 5 February 2012].

Coontz, S. & Peta, H. 1986. *Women's Work, Men's Property: The Origins of Gender and Class.*London: Verso.

Council for Higher Education . 2000. *Towards a new higher education landscape: Meeting the equity,quality and social development imperative of South Africa in the 21st century.*[online] Available from: <http://www.che.ac.za/documents/d000138/> [Accessed 5 February 2012].

Page | 123

Council for Higher Education. 2008. *Annual Report 2008-2009.*[online] Available from: < http://www.che.ac.za/documents/d000200/> [Accessed 5 February 2012].

Department of Education .1997. White Paper 3: A Program for the Transformation of Higher Education. *Government Gazette No. 18207.*

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

Department of Labour. 1998. *Employment Equity Act No. 55*. Pretoria: Government Printer.

Department of Science and Technology. 2002. *The National Research and Development Strategy.* Pretoria: Government Printer.

Dr Norris. 2000 .*Managing cultural diversity within higher education: A South African perspective*.[online] Available from: < http://www.immi.se/intercultural/> [Accessed 11 May 2011].

Du Toit, G. S., B. J. Erasmus and J. W. Strydom. 2010. *Introduction to Business Management*. South Africa: Oxford University Press.

European Commission. 2009b. *She Figures 2009: Statistics and Indicators on Gender Equality in Science*.[online] Available from: < http://ec.europa.eu/research/sciencesociety/document_library/pdf_06/she_figures_2009_en.pdf > [Accessed 5 February 2012].

Evans, Judith. 1995. *Feminist Theory Today: An Introduction to Second-Wave Feminism.* Newbury Park: Sage.

Fin24. 2009. *Women forge ahead despite bias*.[online] Available from: <http://www.fin24.com/articles/default/display article.aspx?Articled=2551314> [Accessed 5 February 2012]

Fish, J.N. 2006. Engendering democracy: Domestic labour and coalition-building in South Africa. *Journal of Southern African Studies*.32 (1).

Fourie, M.1999. Institutional transformation at South African universities:Implications for academic staff. *Higher Education* 38 (3),pp227.

Fox, M. and C. Colatrella. 2006. *Participation, performance and advancement of women in academic science and engineering: What is at Issue and Why?* Georgia Institute of Technology. Atlanta: Springfield.

Gender Policy Framework 2000. [online] Available from: < http://www.info.gov.za/otherdocs/2000/gender.pdf > [Accessed 11 May 2011].

Greig, A., M. Kimmel. and J. Lang.2000. Men, masculinities and development: Broadening our work towards gender equality. *Monograph No. 10*.New York: UNDP/GIDP.

Gresham, M. 2009. New wine in old Bottles: cutting a new path in the academy. *The forum on public policy.*

Gibson, S. 2006. Mentoring of women faculty: The role of organizational politics and culture. *Innovative Higher Education*. 31(1).

Gist, E. and T. Mitchell. 1992. Self-Efficacy: A theoretical Analysis of its Determinants and Malleability. *Academy of Management*. 18(2).

Given, L .M. 2008. *The Sage Encyclopaedia of Qualitative Research Methods*. CA: Sage.

Grindle, M. 1980. *Politics and policy implementation in the third world*. New Jersey: Princeton.

Gunther, R. 1996. *The Impact of regime change on public policy: The case of Spain.* Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Hartmann, H. 1979. The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: Towards a progressive union. *Capital and Class*. 8.

Hearn, J. 2004. Gendering men and masculinities in research and scientific evaluations. *Gender and Excellence in the Making*, 57.

Hick, J. 2008. *Gender equity in South Africa:Progress and Challenges.*[online]Available from:
<http://www.cge.org.za/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=172&Itemid.> [Accessed 20 April 2012].

Hinks, T. 2009. *Job Satisfaction and Employment Equity in South Africa Date of creation*. Working Paper No 23/09 [online] Department of Economics, University of Bath.Available from: <http://www.bath.ac.uk/economics/research/workingpapers.html> [Accessed 20 April 2012].

Hooks, B. 1982. *Aint I a Woman*. London: Pluto Press.

Hood, J. 1994. Investigating the glass ceiling phenomenon: An empirical study of actual promotion to management. Washington .*Academy of Management Journal. 3*

James, S. 2000. Feminism in Philosophy of Mind: The Question of Personal Identity. In M. Fricker and J. Hornsby. (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Feminism in Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jenson, J., J. Laufer and M. Maruani. 2000. *The gendering of inequalities: Women, men, and work.* England: Aldershot.

Jones, G.R. And George, J.M. 2009. *Contemporary Management 6th ed.* Boston: McGraw-Hill

Langa, L. 2011. Bill to ensure more top posts for women in business. *Mercury*.August 12.

Lent, R. W., S.D Brown and G.Hackett . 1994. Towards a unifying social cognitive theory of career and academic interest, choice, and performance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*.

Lorber, J. 1994. *Varieties of Feminism.* New Haven:Yale University Press

Luhabe, W. 2004. *South Africa At 10: Perspectives by Political, Business and Civil leaders*. Pretoria: Human and Rousseau.

MacGregor, K. 2010. Universities and gender and the MDGs. Issue No: 122. [online] Available from:< http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20100502074043241 [Accessed 20 April 2012]

Makgoba, M. 2010. A world class research-led university. *Ukzn Touch*, October,p 4

Marinova,J. 2003. Gender stereotypes and the socialization process.[online] Available from:< www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/egm/...boys2003/EP3-Marinova.pdf > [Accessed 20 April 2012]

Matland, R. 1995. Synthesing the Implementation Literature: The ambiguity conflict model of policy implementation. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*.

Mawila, F.N.K. and R.O. Mabokela .2004. The Impact of Race, Gender and Culture in South African Higher Education. *Comparative Education Review* 48 (4), pp. 396-416

Mayor, F. 1999. *Taking action for human rights in the twenty-first century*. France: Unesco.

McGibbon, C.2008.*Black diamond's spending power increases despite recession* [Online] Available from : <http//www .commerce. uct.ac.za/ Commerce/ News/2008/20081013 _BlackDiamonds.asp [Accessed 7 March 2014]

Millett, K. 1971. *Sexual Politics*. London: Granada Publishing Ltd.

Moletsane, R. and V.Reddy. 2011. *Women's participation in industrial science*. Pretoria: HSRC Press. [online] Available from:<http://www.hsrc.ac.za/Document-4062> [Accessed 23 August 2012]

Moyo, P. 2013. Patriarchal systemholds women back. [online] Available from:< http://www.enca.com/south-africa/patriarchal-system-hold-women-back> [Accessed 7 March 2014]

Muller, U. 2000. Gender equality programmes in German institutions of higher education: The North Rhine-Westphalia case. *Higher Education in Europe*. 25(2).

Muhlbacher, H., Leihs. H. and L. Dahringer. 2006. *International marketing: A Global Perspective.* London: Thomson.

Msane, T.P. 2005. Masters thesis. *Life histories of three African women school principals in the eThekwini region*. University of Kwazulu Natal

National Advisory Council on Innovation and the Department of Science and Technology. 2004. *Facing the facts: Women's participation in Science, Engineering and Technology*. Pretoria: NACI and DST

Newman, J. 1995. *Gender, Culture& Organisational Change: Putting theory into Practice. London:* Routledge.

Nicholson, L. J. 1990. *Feminism/Postmodernism*.New York and London: Routledge.

Oakley, J. G. 2000. Gender-based barriers to senior management positions: Understanding he scarcity of female CEO's. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 27:321-334.

Okin, S. 1989. *Justice, gender and the family*. New York: Basic Books.

O'Sullivan, T.1999.*Decision Making in Social Work*. UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Oxfam International.2004.*Trading Away Our Rights: Women working in global supply chains*. United Kingdom: Oxfam.

Pereira, C. 2009. *Gender in the making of a Nigerian University system.* [online] Available from:< http://www.foundation-partnership.org/pubs/> [Accessed 10 May 2012]

Pfeffer, J. 1992. *Politics and influence in organisations*. USA: Harvard Business School.

Philips, M.E. 1996. *Industry mindsets*. London: Sage Publication

Prennushi, G., Rubio, G. and Subbarao, K. 2004. Monitoring and Evaluation.. *Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper Sourcebook*. Vol 1. Washington DC: World Bank.

Purdon, S. 2001. Research methods for policy evaluation. *Research Working Paper* No 2. UK.

Rabie, B. and Cloete, F. 2009. *A new topology of monitoring and evaluation approaches*. Administratio Publica.

Ragadu, S.C. 2008. *Transformations in higher education: Perceptions of female academics at a distance education institute of higher education*. Masters Dissertation. University of Stellenbosch

Reynolds, J.P.1969. Public participation in planning. *Town Planning Review*, 40(2).

Robbins, S. and S. Robbins. 2003. *Africa a continent in agony we accuse*. Milnerton: Caspal.

Rossouw, D. 2008. *Business Management*. Capetown: Juta.

Rubin, G. 1975. The Traffic in Women: Notes on the Political Economy of Sex. In R. Reiter (ed.) *Toward an Anthropology of Women*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Samuel, S.2001. Achieving Equality: How Far Have Women Come. *Agenda*, No. 47, pp. 21-33.

Schneider, A. L. 1986. *The Evolution of Policy Orientation For Evaluation Research: A Guide To Practice*. Oklahoma: OS University.

Shackleton, L., S. Riordan and D. Simonis. 2006. *Women's Studies. International Forum.*29(6).

Smith, D. 1987. *The Everyday World as Problematic: A Feminist Sociology.* England: Open University Press.

Social Policy and Program 1997. Pretoria: Government printer.

Soudien, C.2011.Humanities offer the gift of reason. *The Sunday Times*, 18 September.

South African Government News Agency.2012.*Vulnerable groups still marginalised-Xingwana*.[online] Available from: http://oldsanews.gcis.gov.za/rss/12/12022910551003 [Accessed 10 March 2012]

South African Press Association. 2010. *Improvement in equality.*[online] Available from: <http://www.iol.co.za/news/south-africa/improvement-in-equality-1.671775> [Accessed 23 August 2012]

Spender, D. 1981. *Men's studies modified: The impact of feminism on the academic disciplines.* Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Starke, L. 2008. *State of the world: Ideas and Opportunities for Sustainable Economies*. United Kingdom: Earth Scan.

Steward, G. 1997. *Surveying the research process in politics*. Washington: Pinter.

Stober, P. 2004. *A-Z of South African politics*. Johannesburg: The Mail&Guardian.

Terry, J. 2007. *Women's Rights*. India: Pluto Press.

Thaver ,B. 2006. *Transforming the Culture of Higher Education in South Africa: Opening up the conversation about institutional culture and race in South African universities.* London: Ashgate.

The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa Act 108 1996. Capetown and Pretoria: Government Printer.

Tomaselli, K.G. 2012. The Ukzn Griot. *Ukzndaba*, July.

Tong, R. 1989. *Feminist Thought.* New York: Westview Press.

Tudge, R. 2004. *Gender Equality in the Higher Education Arena: A public policy perspective*.Doctrate. University of Kwazulu Natal.

University of KwaZulu Natal.2007.*Strategic Plan.*[online] Available from: <http://www.ukzn.ac.za/aboutus/strategicplan.pdf.> [Accessed on 17 January 2011]

United Nations Women.2011. *Concepts and definitions*.[online] Available from: <http://www.un.org/womenwatch/osagi/conceptsandefinitions.htm> [Accessed on 25 February 2011]

Vaskova, R. and Kroupa, A. 2005. *Quality of working life in the Czech Republic.* Dublin: Eurofound.

Venter, R. 2004. *Labour relations in South Africa.* Capetown: Oxford University Press.

Wallace, J. 2000. *Encountering resistance to gender equity policies in educational organizations*. Ontario: University of Western Ontario.

Walby, S. 1996. *The Declining significance or the changing forms of patriarchy*: *Women at the end of the twentieth century*. Oxford: University Press.

Walsh, D. 2006. The Liberal moment: women and just debate in South Africa, 1994-1996. *Journal of Southern African Studies*. 32(1). 85-105.

Waterman, R. W. and Wood, B. D. 1993. Policy monitoring and policy analysis. Journal of Policy Analysis and Management. 12

Weaver, K. R. 2009. *Target compliance: The final frontier of policy Implementation.* Brookings.

Weedon,C. 1987. *Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory*. Oxford:Blackwell

White, K. 2008. *International Journal of organizational behavior*. Australia: Victoria University.

Willemans, C. 2013. Patriarchy reigns supreme in SA. [online] Available from: <http://ewn.co.za/2013/08/08/Patriarchy-reigns-supreme-in-SA> [Accessed 7 March 2014]

World Economic Forum. 2010. *The Corporate Gender Gap - Report 2010*. Geneva: World Economic Forum.

Wylie, A., J. R. Jakobsen, and G. Fosado. 2007. Women, work, and the academy. *The Barnard Center for Research on Women* 2: 1-17

UNIVERSITY OF
KWAZULU-NATAL

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES, DEVELOPMENT AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Study Subject's Name:

A1. INTRODUCTION

My name is Wilbert Mhlanga student number 210555235. I am currently studying at the University of KwaZulu-Natal doing a Master of Social Science degree in Public Policy. I am doing a research project on Gender Equality in Higher Education: A Case Study on the University of KwaZulu Natal (Howard Campus) and I would fully appreciate your participation in my study. This participation entails the answering of a few questions so that I may understand the topic that I have chosen in depth.

This form tells you why this research study is being done, what will happen in the research study. If there is anything you do not understand, please ask questions. Then you can decide if you want to join this study or not.

A2.WHY IS THIS RESEARCH STUDY BEING DONE?

The purpose of this study is to provide a platform for wider evidence based debates on designing interventions, policies and programs that will positively influence the advancement of women within workspaces effectively and efficiently. This study considers the relationship between female academics and male academics and the organizational culture they work under.

A3. WHY ARE WE ASKING YOU ABOUT THIS STUDY?

You are invited to participate in this research study because due to your profession and experiences you have in depth knowledge of the issue at hand.The Supervisor of the study is Head of School in the Department of Politics Prof H. Simelane.

A2. DO I HAVE TO BE IN THIS STUDY?

You can decide whether to take part in this study or not. If you do agree to participate, your participation is voluntary and you may withdraw from participation at any stage of the study for any reason whatsoever. If you choose to withdraw at any stage, there will be no adverse consequences to you. Likewise there will be no objective benefits to you if you choose to participate, only the knowledge that you have assisted my study and a better understanding of this topic.

B1. WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF I TAKE PART IN THE STUDY?

This research is purely for academic purposes only. The Information you shall provide will be recorded in such a way so as to protect your identity and any written or audio will be kept in a secure environment (locked in cabinet) and destroyed after a period of 5 years in line with the University Policy.

B2. HOW LONG WILL I BE IN THE STUDY?

A minimum of 30 minutes of your time is required.

B3. WHO CAN ANSWER MY QUESTIONS ABOUT THE STUDY?

If you have more questions about this study at any time, you can email me or the Study Supervisor Prof H. Simelane.

Supervisor Email Add: Simelaneh@ukzn.ac.za

Student Email Add: wilbert.mhlanga@gmail.com

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN THE STUDY

By signing my name below, I confirm that i have read and understood this entire document. All of my questions have been answered to my satisfaction.

Date:

Subject's Name   **Subject's Signature**

APPENDIX 2

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE OF QUESTIONS

1) According to you what is gender equity?

2) In reference to gender equity how would you describe the culture and working environment currently present at the institution?

3) In your own understanding is gender equity a priority at the University? Can you briefly explain your point of view with examples?

4) In your experience has the University in your view become a more equitable place in terms of gender equity? Can you provide concrete examples or elaborate?

5) Are you aware and well informed about the gender equity policies and programs currently being pursued by the University and what their implications are?

6) In your view is there comprehensive consultation and equal participation by all in the formulation of policies like the gender equity one?

7) In your own perspective are the gender equity policies and programs in place objective and effective? If not how best can they be improved?

8) What career development programs and incentives are in place and how effective do you think they are? Justify your answer with examples.

9) Can you briefly describe the monitoring and evaluation mechanisms that are in place to measure gender equity progress?

10) What do you think of the staff promotion criteria being currently employed?

11) What are your views with regard to decision making in as far as employment and promotions are concerned? Justify your answer with examples or comment?