CHAPTER THREE: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This research is about the effectiveness of academic staff transformation as gauged through the lenses of race, class, and gender. It is concerned with demographic, procedural, attitudinal, and experiential change as a result of increasing equity, equality, and the development of a progressive institutional culture. It therefore explores the structural nature of the institution and its systematic processes, in addition to, how the individual experiences the institution, its institutional culture, and other members of the institution.

Traditionally, sociology has been approached from one of two perspectives, either a structural or interpretive perspective. Structural accounts prioritise economic and social dynamics, whilst interpretive accounts focus on cultural and symbolic dimensions. Literature on the transformation of race, class, and gender within organisations has tended to mirror this disciplinary dichotomy. However, more recent literature illustrates the incorporation of both structural and interpretive aspects. This research follows in that tradition, aiming to holistically examine the nature and extent of transformation within UCT and Wits by utilising a combined approach.

The literature review aims to do the following: i) briefly scope the South African higher education field, ii) highlight contemporary trends in higher education transformation scholarship, iii) review selected scholarship on workplace change and transformation at UCT and Wits, and v) discuss the conceptual framework employed in this research.

The South African higher education field

Globally, higher education has developed as an independent and distinctive field. Tight (2004) discusses how the global trend of massification in higher education has spurred the development of this field of inquiry (Tight, 2004: 12). Interestingly, Tight also notes that in international (although non-American) scholarship, contemporary writing does not
typically focus on academics as the subject of writing (Tight, 2004: 6). However, a few key scholars on academics within higher education studies include: Becher and Trowler (2001), Trowler and Knight (2000), and Altbach (1996).

In South Africa, massification is embedded within a much larger and more complex post-apartheid reform and reconstruction of higher education. It is likely that this broader context has contributed to the growing scholarly interest, which is signified by the emergence of a South African higher education studies (SAHES). However, interest in this field has also extended beyond the parameters of education, with increased interest expressed within many other disciplines, such as sociology. The bedrock of the higher education field has been laid by key scholars such as Ian and Lisa Bunting, Nico Cloete, David Cooper, Michael Cross, Trish Gibbon, Jonathan Jansen, and George Subotzky, amongst many other important scholars.

Some of the strengths of the SAHES have been: policy development and critique, where the Council for Higher Education Transformation (CHET) played a particularly active role; employment equity profiling and identifying of challenges, where Cooper and Subotsky (2001), and Subotsky (2001) were pivotal; transformation of historically disadvantaged (‘black’) universities, where Gibbon, Habib, Jansen, and Parekh have both individually and collectively contributed; transformation, Africanisation and African identities, where both Seepe and Makgoba are distinctive; academic staff transformation, where Gibbon and Kabaki (2002), and Putgieter (2002) are key; diversity in higher education, where Cross (2004) has written extensively; and managerialism and transformation in higher education, where Johnson’s (2005) contribution is significant. This brief scope of SAHES is by no means complete or representative, but merely highlights a few important contributions relevant to this research on academic staff transformation.

In addition, a few of the important scholars to have written on higher education transformation from other disciplinary locations include: Mabokela and Magubane (2004), Erasmus and de Wet (2003), van Zyl and Steyn (2003 and 2001), Webster and
Mosoetsa (2002), de la Rey (2001), Mabokela (2000), Mama (2000), and Bethlehem (1993). The strengths of these works lie within their specific disciplinary locations, theoretical outlook, and critical insights into power relations and social dynamics.

**Contemporary trends in higher education transformation scholarship**

Most scholars on transformation appear to hold a transformative perspective with regard to change, in that “existing unequal power relations, policies, practices, embedded institutional cultures and climates” must be changed in order for previously disadvantaged groups to experience both equity and equality within institutions of higher education (Subotsky, 2001: 22).

However, there has been a shift in writing on transformation within higher education. Early writing can be described as the structural approach and is typified by Cooper and Subotsky (2001), Subotsky (2001), and Gibbon and Kabaki (2002). This was concerned with statistical equity profiling as a means of identifying the extent of demographic change necessary, and as a means of measuring how institutions were progressing in terms of changing the demographics of their academic staff. This scholarship followed government policy by prioritising employment equity, and also dealt overwhelmingly with the structural dimensions of transformation.

Its major contribution was to provide a macro level understanding of the higher education landscape and to highlight where the need for change was greatest. For example, Cooper and Subotsky’s quantitative measurement of the ‘skewed revolution’ identified academic staff transformation as a priority area for change. Subotsky identified possible ‘cultural’ factors impacting on transformation by noting that historically disadvantaged universities continued to become more equitable at a faster rate than historically advantaged universities, and that senior academic posts, most specifically that of professor, continued to be above women academics’ glass ceiling (Subotsky, 2001: 36 – 37). These studies laid the foundation for higher education transformation studies and also provided the impetus for much qualitative research. Another strength of these studies, was to identify the change in academics’ legal status as they became understood as ‘employees’ for the
first time (Gibbon and Kabaki, 2002: 194 – 195). This alone could have had the potential to open up a whole new area of studies within the sociology of work.

However, this invitation appears not to have been readily accepted, as more contemporary studies appear to have moved away from investigating the economic and social dimensions of academic work, and instead overwhelmingly focus on diversity and institutional culture in higher education – thereby prioritising a focus on ideological, cultural, and psychological aspects and experiences of transformation.

This second group can be collectively described as an interpretive approach, although from the above description it should also be clear that this is by no means a singularly homogenous group. Ngazimbi (2005), Erasmus and de Wet (2003), van Zyl, Steyn and Orr (2003), and Potgieter (2002) are examples of scholarship that has shifted in this direction. Furthermore, a number of studies have also utilised autobiographical narrative as a means through which to access the various personal experiences of transformation and of the intersections of race and gender within the academy. Abrahams (2004) is an example of such an approach. Although not written with the same objective, the autobiographies of former university officials often provide useful insights to the transformation process. Examples would include: Saunders (2000), Makgoba (1997), and Shear (1996).

Essed (2002) provides an explanation for this shift in the subject of scholarship, as formal structural impediments are removed through legislation (such as employment equity), informal mechanisms of exclusion (such as institutional culture) become increasingly important in the defence of privilege and as a target for transformative intervention (Essed, 2002: 7). This shift in the mechanisms of exclusion would therefore explain the corresponding shift in the subject of scholarship. The strengths of this scholarship are that it is relevant to academics’ contemporary experience; it widens our understanding of the extent and impact of race, gender, and class exclusion; it voices marginalisation and disadvantage amongst what is often be perceived as a socio-economically homogenous group; and it highlights the continuity and change in the mechanisms of defence of
privilege. However, a potential weakness of some scholarship in this area is that it tends to prioritise culture and cross-cultural interaction, and in the process, negates the continuity of structural inequality. In addition, the concept of institutional culture is often presented as a singular entity rather than something that is continually contested over and is multiple and fragmentary.

Whilst these two approaches to higher education transformation reflect the dominant trend in the field, it is important to acknowledge that there are a few scholars who draw on the strengths of each approach to develop a third approach, the combined approach. The combined approach is based on an understanding similar to Bourdieu’s holistic understanding of capital as spanning the social, economic, cultural, and symbolic dimensions (Callewaert, 2000: 310). However, most scholars in this approach have focused largely on the relationship between historical and contemporary experiences of exclusion, thereby noting social, economic, and cultural mechanisms of exclusion. Scholars within this approach include Mabokela (2000) and some of the pieces within Mabokela and Magubane’s (2004) edited volume ‘Hear our Voices’.

It is within the combined approach that this research is situated, as it seeks to incorporate elements of both the structural and interpretive approach. However, it hopes to go further than existing studies in its incorporation of both approaches.

**Review of selected South African scholarship on higher education transformation**

Too often, academic staff transformation is seen simply as part and parcel of the broader national transformation project. Whilst academic staff transformation, by necessity, should be located within the broader social context, its profile needs to be raised in order that it transcends the status of ‘signifier without reference’ (Bertelsen, 1998: 143). As it would not be possible to do justice to all relevant scholarship on academic staff transformation and issues of race and gender at UCT and Wits, a limited selection of the most significant studies has been chosen to illustrate the major trends as well as their associated strengths and weaknesses. However, before existing scholarship is reviewed, it
is necessary to briefly locate academic staff transformation within the legislative framework.

Towards academic staff transformation: government imperatives

Academic staff transformation is explicitly and thoroughly discussed within government policy, such as the Education White Paper 3 of 1997, the Employment Equity Act of 1998, and the Skills Development Act of 1998. Accordingly, its purpose is to undo the “indefensible imbalances in the ratios of black and female staff compared to whites and males” particularly as senior academics, researchers, and management (Department of Education, 1997).

However, academic staff transformation is not merely about improving equity, or what Jansen describes as racial accounting (Jansen, 1998: 109). It is also about ensuring “fair chances of success”, “eradicating all forms of unfair discrimination” including “institutionalised forms of racism and sexism”, and the removal of “structural constraints” (Department of Education, 1997). It is also about developing representative, accountable, and transparent governance; reconciliatory institutional cultures; and encouraging racial and cultural diversity (Department of Education, 1997).

The Education White Paper 3 (EWP3) gives further specification on the components of academic staff transformation, with which human resource development plans (a part of three year rolling plans) need to engage. This includes:

- staff recruitment and promotion policies and practices
- staff development, including academic development, that is improved qualifications, professional development and career pathing, instructional (teaching) development, management skills, technological reskilling, and appropriate organisational environment and support
- remuneration and conditions of service, taking into account the increasing competition from the public and private sectors for well-qualified black people, and women
- reward systems, including sabbaticals, conference attendance, academic contact visits, and
- the transformation of institutional cultures to support diversity” (Department of Education, 1997: s2.96).
From this it is evident that institutions are required to address the structural, cultural, and ideological impediments to the advancement of designated groups.

Furthermore, the Employment Equity Act also provides for equal opportunity and fair treatment of designated groups in the workplace, including the provision of equal opportunities, equal representation, and equal remuneration (Republic of South Africa, 1998: s2 (a) & (b)). This piece of legislation also provides for the elimination of discrimination on the grounds of “race, gender, sex, pregnancy, marital status, family responsibility, ethnic or social origin, colour, sexual orientation, age, disability, religion, HIV status, conscience, belief, political opinion, culture, language, and birth” (Republic of South Africa, 1998: s7 & s8).

In addition, the implementation of ‘academic staff transformation’ legislation is monitored through Three Year Rolling Plans, and Employment Equity Plans and Reports. Lastly, government provides some assistance for the realisation of these goals through the National Skills Development Fund, and encourages employers to utilise learnerships and skills programmes to develop their staff’s skills (Republic of South Africa, 1998: s16, s17 & s22).

Therefore, academic staff transformation is firmly embedded within national legislation on education and workplace transformation. It is concerned with both structural and ideological barriers to black and women academics’ advancement within the academic workplace. However, one critique that can be made of the EPW3 is that, whilst it is sensitive to, and engages with, institutional barriers affecting women academics’ advancement, it does not give equal consideration to racial barriers that black academics may face, except to suggest that these can be overcome through exposure to different cultures, increased tolerance, and improved facilities and capacity building mechanisms for students (Department of Education, 1997: s1.28 & s3.42).

The emerging discourse from the legislation is one of all encompassing change. However, the most concrete and tangible aspects of it have to do with equity, and this is
likely for the reductionism of expansive legislation into ‘racial accounting’ in everyday practice. Furthermore, it prioritises barrier removal in the case of gender-based transformation and capacity development, and cultural harmony or reconciliation for race-based transformation. Finally, much of the policy is underscored by ‘redress for past inequalities,’ illustrating that the rationale for academic staff transformation is embedded within the social justice perspective.

**Scholarly engagement with academic staff transformation**

The existing scholarship has been divided into five main categories according to the angle from which the author has written. It is crucial to note that the allocation of scholarship into clusters has been based on the content of the scholarship that was explored, and may not be the chosen or fixed ideological position of the author. The review includes: i) selected works from the sociology of work perspective which are used to motivate for the examination of academia as a workplace, ii) structural scholarship on academic staff transformation, iii) interpretive scholarship on academic staff transformation, iv) combined approach on academic staff transformation, and v) scholarship on transformation initiatives.

Selected works from the sociology of work perspective

The following selected sociology of work scholarship can be classified as structural, since it is concerned with macro societal functioning and the interconnections between the economy and society. For the purposes of framing this discussion, two principle theoretical positions shall be discussed: labour market segmentation and the apartheid workplace regime. The contribution that each of these make to the study of institutional transformation will also be assessed.

**Labour market segmentation**

The importance of labour market segmentation (and labour market theory in general), is the fundamental realisation that social phenomena and social relationships impact and
define what constitutes a labour market (Kenny, 2004: 48). That is, who is looking for those specific type of workers, who is looking for that specific type of work, under what conditions will the workers be expected to work, and for what kind of reward (Fevre, 1997: 10 - 13). Labour market theory states “inequality in occupational structures was built into the labor market and was not the result of individual capacities or incapacities” (Peck in Kenny, 2004: 60).

Labour markets are social constructs that are shaped by capital, labour, and the state (Kraak, 1996). Historically, labour markets have been bifurcated/fragmented by the triple axes of race, class, and gender. In South Africa, informal practices of labour market segmentation were historically entrenched through colonial land conquest, migrant labour, and residential segregation; all of which forced black labour into cheap labour (Kraak, 1996). In addition, practices of job reservation and closed shop further protected the exclusivity of white labour (Kraak, 1996). Apartheid sought to formalise these trends through the legalisation of inequality in education (through the policy of Bantu Education), through Section 77 of the Industrial Conciliation Act of 1956 (which gave legal backing to the widely practiced policy of job reservation), and through the importation of foreign labour (Nqimade, 1991: 100).

Furthermore, there is a dialectic between the workplace and society. Von Holdt (2005) builds on Moodie and Ndatshe stating that “the workplace social structure allocates ‘rights and resources unequally within particular historical structures among differently socialised actors’” (Von Holdt, 2005: 47).

Labour market segmentation is relevant to this study because universities are made up of multiple segmented labour markets including an academic, administrative, and a support staff labour market – each of which has historically employed a very specific type of worker. For the purpose of this report, the focus is primarily on the academic labour market, which is an exclusive labour market both in terms of entry and upward mobility.
Firstly, a high level of education is required for entry into junior academic positions, and upward mobility is dependent on the fulfilment of strict and rigorous criteria. Secondly, the presence of an internal labour market (favouring white men) has led to the subversion of the above criteria for workers embedded in the ‘right’ social networks and has also led to the active discrimination and exclusion of those workers not sufficiently connected. Thirdly, in addition to the various ways that black people were kept out of the professions’, academic segmentation was further entrenched through the establishment of separate universities for black staff and students, and through threats to apply job reservation to academia.

An understanding of the academic labour market is useful because it provides a systemic way in which to understand the sector as a whole, and the way in which extra-economic factors (such as race, class, and gender) impact at both a macro and micro level. Transformation of the workplace is about changing the influence these factors have on one’s entrance and experience within the labour market. Hence, findings from this study will contribute to a discussion on continuity and change within labour markets.

*Apartheid workplace regime*

Labour market segmentation in South Africa led to the crystalisation of exclusionary and discriminatory work practices collectively known as the apartheid workplace regime. Von Holdt has described the apartheid workplace regime as characterised by the racial segmentation of labour, authoritarianism, and social segregation (Von Holdt, 2005: 48 – 52). More specifically, the apartheid workplace regime is defined by the: racial division of labour, racial structure of power, racial segregation of facilities, migrant labour, and the location of workplaces in a bifurcated industrial geography (Bezuidenhout, 2004: 76 - 89).

The apartheid workplace regime is also an important framework through which university employment relations can be understood, as higher education itself did not escape the bifurcation of the workplace. Firstly, university staffing exhibited a racial division of labour, with white people mostly occupying the position of academics and
administrators, and black men (Coloured men at UCT and African men at Wits) largely fulfilling the role of maintenance workers.

Secondly, there was a racial structure of power. In all sectors, white men were at the helm of the institution, making the decisions and giving orders. Furthermore, within the academic sector, black academic staff remained at junior levels, even when they had attained higher degrees. This illustrates the operation and defence of academic colour bars, as reinforced by institutions themselves in the case of Vilakazi, and by the state in the case of Mafeje.

Thirdly, the segregation of facilities mainly applied to black maintenance staff who were housed in on-campus hostels at Wits, although segregated student dwelling was also practiced. The widespread practice of social segregation between white and black students was fuelled by the same ideology that perpetuated segregation of facilities in other instances.

Fourthly, migrant labour was less important for universities, except that the housing of black maintenance staff in hostels reinforced the migrant labour system, and the predominance of coloured maintenance staff at UCT equally reinforced the Coloured Preference Policy. In addition, the academic labour market is a global labour market and this was also reinforced by universities in their hiring of foreign academics.

Fifthly, the bifurcation of industrial geography applies to universities in that they are located within urban areas which were deemed the ‘white man’s permanent sojourn’ and the ‘black man’s temporary sojourn’. Furthermore, both Cape Town and Johannesburg were pivotal centres for the establishment of colonialism and the enforcement of apartheid.

In terms of contemporary relevance, Bezuidenhout (2004) details the emergence of the ‘post-colonial workplace regime’, where
“a number of elements of the apartheid workplace regime are reconfigured in new ways, but that this process of reconfiguration mirrors some key characteristics of the logic underlying the apartheid workplace regime – there is continuity in change” (Bezuidenhout, 2004: 92).

In Bezuidenhout’s study of the Engineering sector, three key attributes of continuity are found: i) the incapacity of the state to completely enforce equity legislation provides space for an informal wage colour bar and an upward floating colour bar to continue, ii) racial despotism as a form of worker control continues through the use of market forces and neo-liberalism to coerce and enforce discipline amongst workers, and iii) the predominance of fixed-term contracts has the same effect as migration, as it leaves workers vulnerable to exclusion (Bezuidenhout, 2004: 92 – 94).

However, a weakness of the apartheid workplace regime (and its corresponding successor in the post-colonial workplace regime) is its tendency to homogenise black worker’s experience of exclusion. It is able to provide a very general framework through which to understand racial segmentation in general, but requires adaptation and specification when applied beyond blue-collar work. As a result, it does not transfer easily and completely to explain the experience of black white-collar workers. Furthermore, it does not rigorously consider how gender intersects with race to give effect to workplace experience for white and black women.

Therefore, although the apartheid workplace regime does explain the experience of apartheid blue-collar workplaces, a more nuanced approach is needed when considering other types of work, particularly one as specific as academia. The same applies to the post-colonial workplace regime, whilst it is nuanced for capturing both continuity and change, its transferability to the academic sector also requires adaptation.

The strengths of these structural accounts are their ability to explain overarching patterns of exclusion and inclusion within society (segmented labour market) and within a specific type of capitalism (apartheid workplace regime). Furthermore, for the purpose of this report, it provides a basis from which a historical comparison can be made to gauge the extent of change. The contradictions that emerge when historical patterns of race and class diverge (particular to a colonial context), illustrate white resistance within the
workplace, and result in the employment of various strategies of continued closed shop or the informalised internal labour market. These are all important factors to consider when analysing academia as a workplace.

However, these theories are not without their limitations, such as their tendency towards essentialism, assuming that all workplaces or all experiences of exclusion are similar. Some of the specifics of the academic workplace illustrate that this is not the case. Yet even despite these peculiarities of the academic workplace, the general model of the apartheid workplace regime and the post-colonial workplace regime are useful.

Another criticism is that an analysis of gender remains silent within these accounts. Lastly, these accounts centre on economic and social experiences of exclusion without noting the importance of cultural and symbolic phenomenon, such as institutional culture.

The structural cluster on academic staff transformation

This approach incorporates a fairly wide cluster of scholarship, including those who focus on demographic change, governance change, institutional policies and procedures, research and knowledge production, and managerialism. At the heart of this scholarship is a concern with historical and contemporary social and economic inequality.

Statistical employment equity profiling studies are a pivotal part of this type of scholarship. They reveal both historical and contemporary trends in staffing at a national, institutional, and intra-institutional level, and by institutional type. These studies help identify the extent and location of ‘problems’ as well as provide quantitative measurement of progress. Although this criticism cannot be made of social science scholars who conduct statistical employment equity profiling studies, it is a preoccupation with racial equity statistics that Jansen describes as ‘racial accounting’ (Jansen, 1998: 109).
However, this criticism raises an important point, which is that academic staff transformation is about much more than just equity in academic positions. Structural scholarship also focuses on the structural and procedural issues that affect academics and academic work. For example, Webster (1998) highlights the need to address “glaring racial and gender inequalities in the production of intellectuals and the production of knowledge” (Webster, 1998: 119). His article reveals that during the eighties and nineties, a mere 20 percent of articles were written by black academics, whilst 30 percent were written by women academics (Webster, 1998: 119).

In a similar exercise, Alexander (2005) found that between 2001 and 2004, black scholars only contributed 21.8 percent of all articles which is only 0.8 percent more to Society in Transition than they had in the 1997 to 2000 period. However, women academics contributed significantly more (4.8 percent) and accounted for 45.7 percent of all scholarship between 2000 and 2004 (Alexander, 2005: 9). Furthermore, Buhlungu and Metcalfe (2001) reflect on the power dynamics of both knowledge production and research, in which black academics (and women) are principally junior partners in research endeavours, and that typically black people fulfil the role of knowledge transmitters whilst white (typically men) occupy the role of knowledge producer (Buhlungu and Metcalfe, 2001: 68 & 69).

In addition, Prozesky’s (2005) research into journal productivity according to gender reveals very interesting patterns. On a national scale, women produce less than 17 percent of the academic publication output (CENIS in Prozesky, 2005:1). Furthermore, she found that women hold lower ranks and are promoted less than men, no matter how much they publish (Prozesky, 2005: 8 – 10). Although these studies are not always definitive as to why, they definitely illustrate that in the academic labour market, rank and promotion are intricately segmented according to race and gender. Therefore, these studies are of pivotal importance to this research, which aims to explore both the macro and micro dimensions of structure on academics. Two weaknesses of this cluster of scholarship are that it does not identify, and therefore try to explain, structural relationships between race and gender. It also concentrates on the perspective of the excluded with only implicit
impressions of mechanisms of inclusion. This research aims to at least keep these weaknesses in mind throughout the process.

A second strand of scholarship within the structural cluster examines the impact of macro socio-economics on academic work. Scholars such as Johnson (2005), Deem (2004), Webster and Mosoetsa (2002), and Bertelsen (1998) are examples of the diversity of scholarship within this strand. Deem, Webster and Mosoetsa, and Bertelsen have examined the impact of globalisation on the changing nature of academic work. This impacts on racial and gender transformation, as staff at junior levels are more likely to become ‘flexible academic workers,’ and given the transformation agenda, a greater proportion of junior academics are black and women academics. Therefore, the macro economic context continues to entrench race and gender exclusion within academia.

Johnson, and Bertelsen examine the impact of managerialism on academia and the transformation project. Whilst Bertelsen examines this issue from many points of view, the most relevant for this research is the impact of managerialism on transformation. Cooper highlights the internal tension between the market and social justice or development imperatives within institutions (Cooper in Bertelsen, 1998: 138). However, Bertelsen herself implies that through management, institutions have chosen the market, and in fact go as far as to use corporate branding as an illusionary haze of change to mask the de-prioritisation of social justice imperatives (Bertelsen, 1998: 142 – 144).

Johnson’s work is pivotal in this regard, as it explicitly identifies how management has usurped academics’ power and recast transformation (as a social justice imperative) as a restructuring exercise. She explains “therefore instead of transformation from below we have witnessed transformation from above” (Johnson, 2005: 7). She identifies the effects of ‘contrived collegial managerialism’ as a loss of academic leadership as deans and heads of schools become managerial conduits, senate is downgraded, management upgraded (through the establishment of senior executive teams), with the final result being that decision-making and power moves out of the hands of academics and into managerial boardrooms (Johnson, 2005: 5, 297 – 301). Whilst the research being
undertaken does not aim to significantly contribute to the debate on managerialism, there are a number of pivotal questions to pose about academic staff transformation in the context of contrived collegial managerialism\textsuperscript{10}.

The major strength of the structural cluster is that it identifies macro trends within and affecting the academic workplace and academics. It is able to identify links between the workplace and social positioning, and therefore to identify that academia is segmented along racial and gender lines. It is also able to trace the origins of this back to socio-economic inequality under apartheid. However, there are some aspects of academic staff transformation that the structural cluster is less able to answer, such as, the individual interpretation, meaning, and experience that is given to these social experiences; the interconnections between social, cultural, and psychological aspects of academic staff transformation; and individual differences within and between categories of race and gender. It is these questions that the third cluster, the interpretive cluster, seeks to answer.

The interpretive cluster

The interpretive cluster is enormously wide ranging and for other purposes could be further divided. For analytical ease, it is maintained as one cluster here, as many of the subcomponents are interconnected in complex ways within the realm of experience. This cluster is essentially concerned with the cultural, ideological, psychological, and symbolic meaning, interpretation, and experience of academic staff transformation. This cluster embodies a significant amount of scholarship on social change. It is concerned with institutional culture; diversity; ideological perspectives and experiences of race, class, and gender; and symbolic or cultural diversity signifiers.

This cluster is important for a number of reasons. Firstly, institutional culture has been noted as one of the key reasons why black and women academics do not stay within institutions of higher education for long periods of time (Potgieter, 2002). Secondly, as historically ‘white’ institutions become increasingly heterogeneous, questions of diversity and inter-cultural interaction become increasingly important. Thirdly, as noted by Essed
(2002), as increasing numbers of previously disadvantaged people enter a workplace, informal mechanisms of exclusion become increasingly utilised in the defence of privilege (Essed, 2002: 2 - 5). Fourthly, citizenship is the bedrock of equality and democracy. As national resources, higher education institutions have an obligation to work towards the realisation of citizenship amongst its workforce and student body (See, for example, van Wyk, 2003).

The bulk of literature that singularly fits into this cluster is normally very specific and based on a particular piece of research, which is why it assumes a very narrow theoretical perspective. Examples include Duncan (2005), Ngazimbi (2005), Erasmus and de Wet (2003), Potgieter (2002), Erasmus (2001), Alfred (1997) and Nzhimande (1991).

Potgieter (2002) and Sigolo, and Kasese-Hara and Brinton Lykes (2001) have been particularly concerned with the experiences of black academics within institutions of higher education. Potgieter, in particular, was concerned with the experiences that led black academics to leave an institution or academia altogether. Her study revealed mainly cultural explanations, including: racial prejudice and discrimination (institutional racism), assumed sameness (liberalism), unrealistic expectations (unrealistic standard setting), assumed homogeneity, and specialisation of black academics (essentialism)11. The strength of this study was that it located the responsibility for lack of retention within institutions and provided a range of intervention strategies. The major weakness, however; was that it was unable to explain why some black academics stay within ‘white’ institutions.

Another crucial piece of scholarship that details the relationship between white and black employees in the workplace is Nzhimande’s (1991) ‘Corporate Guerrillas’, that focuses on African Personnel Practitioners (APP). Nzhimande’s argument is important as it identifies the reformist and oppositional role of the White Corporate Petty Bourgeoisie (WCPB) in shaping the experience of the APP.
Nzimande also notes the contradictory location of the APP, whose ‘in-between’ status meant that they were ‘neither here nor there,’ and led to simultaneous exclusion and inclusion within the workplace (Nzimande, 1991: 281 –289). For example, although the APP had access to some benefits as a part of the middle class, they were denied access to real decision-making and were expected to assimilate into the workplace environment (Nzimande, 1991: 200).

Furthermore, Nzimande notes the emergence of “three principal expressions” of what he calls the “ideological instruments” of the WCPB. These include: explicit racism, subtle racism (such as blaming failure on African culture), and the use of the ideology of meritocracy to invoke reverse discrimination (Nzimande, 1991: 240 - 242). These were used to abate the threat the WCPB experienced from the ACPB (Nzimande, 1991: 281).

This study, like Potgieter’s, highlights how white employees significantly impact upon black workers as they reinforce the status quo and their positions of power within the status quo (Nzimande, 1991: 195).

Other scholarship has been concerned with exploring the perceptions and experiences of both black and white people within an organisation. This is clearly a more nuanced view, as it tries to understand inter-cultural interaction from a holistic perspective involving all actors. Erasmus and de Wet (2003) and van Zyl and Steyn (2001) are examples of this type of scholarship.

Erasmus and de Wet (2003) compare the salience of race as experienced by black and white students at UCT’s medical school. They explain how black and white people work with race in fundamentally different ways, with black students carrying the burden of race through acknowledging race, being stereotyped, labelled, marginalised and experiencing anxiety and anger because of the effects of race (Erasmus & de Wet, 2003: 4). Meanwhile, white students are virtually free of race work, they have little to say, and are less aware of its presence on campus and its effects (Erasmus & de Wet, 2003: 5). Interestingly, they were critical about ‘unfair advantages’ which they thought black students had, and which they labelled as reverse racism (Erasmus & de Wet, 2003: 5).
This study is of pivotal importance as it identifies cultural comfort and race privilege embedded in ‘colour blindness,’ and cultural discomfort as a form of disprivilege associated with carrying the burden of race, thereby illustrating how an informal mechanism of exclusion operates in practice. It illustrates how people are not only affected by economic structures, but also by the cultural and social significance and weight of difference. This study’s interacts with culture in a more nuanced way than the Potgieter study, as it is able to illustrate how cultural inequality operates. This study is of relevance because the research to be undertaken seeks to explore transformation from multiple vantage points and is also partially located at UCT.

Acknowledgement of the psychological dimensions of difference and discrimination are increasingly gaining repute for the psychoanalysis of race relations. Furthermore, understanding the importance of these aspects of experience also allows for the realisation that marginality leads to emotional strain and psychological responses (Luhabe, 2002: 183) The negative implication is the ease with which this perspective can get translated into hypersensitivity, trivialisation, and denial of reality (Duncan, 2005: 6).

There is also a recognition of internalised oppression, in which social norms and values are internalised and limit the potential and actions of black people (Luhabe, 2002: 184). However, acknowledgment of self-workings with race allow for individual transformation and provide for individuals to actively contribute to collective transformation (Cather in Luhabe, 2002: 189 & Erasmus, 2001: 1 - 6). During interviews on transformation, one’s experiences of race and gender can in themselves be cathartic or problematic, and therefore, it is important to be sensitive to the ways in which individual’s work with race, as with gender.

Ngazimbi builds on the notion that there are a variety of responses to institutional culture within universities. Her study focuses on black management at UCT, noting the multiple ways in which staff negotiate home and work worlds. This study is crucial in that it has a unique approach, focusing more on the individual and his/her response to living, in some
instances, a contested and contradictory home/work life. Ngazimbi’s participants’ experienced either congruent or different/divergent worlds. When worlds were congruent, participants either experienced smooth transitions or effectively managed border crossings. When worlds were incongruent, participants either experienced border crossings as difficult or resisted border crossing altogether (Ngazimbi, 2005: 41 – 80). This study aptly provides insight into the individual’s experience of diversity within one’s own life, and it also highlights the heterogeneity of black experience. However, it does not address the collective and structural dimensions of identity negotiation – an area that this research will focus on.

Lastly, within this cluster, Duncan also writes on the symbology of universities as racialised spaces. This is important in terms of the messages of belonging or alienation, and affirmation or neglect, of particular groups of people, that an institution reveals (Duncan, 2005: 10 – 11).

This cluster of scholarship is important because it focuses on meaning and experience of race, and is able to generate substantial understanding about individuals. It is therefore useful for transformation initiatives that are based at the level of the individual. However, on its own, it is not a considerably useful approach for this research as the focus is on both collective and individual experiences.

The combined approach cluster

This cluster seeks to utilise the strengths of both the structural and interpretive approaches. Whilst most scholarship appreciates the need for a combined approach, there are less scholars that fully utilise it. Those who do, include Potgieter and Moleko (2004), Mabokela and Magubane (2004), van Wyk (2003), Mabokela (2000), Mama (2000), as well as Larsen (2004), van Zyl, Steyn and Orr (2003), Louw and Franchiliscu (2003), and Ismail (2002).
The combined approach has been used to explain the experiences of women academics: Bagihole (2000), Martineau (1997), and Bethlehem (1993); black academics: van Zyl, Steyn and Orr (2003), and Mabokela (2000); and especially the experience of black women academics: Mama (2000), Mabokela and Magubane (2004), and Potgieter and Moleko (2004). It is also used by van Wyk to identify the scope of transformation. Lastly, Luhabe’s (2002) exploration of black managers is also used to highlight both the structural and cultural exclusion of black managers, and how their experiences change over time.

The combined approach is utilised to explain multiple axes of exclusion and discrimination, which are structural, ideological, and cultural. For example, black women academics experience the structural inequities in workload and remuneration that accompany junior positions, and they also experience specific racialised and gendered inequalities in knowledge production and research. In addition, they also experience racialised and gendered discrimination based on cultural and ideological constructions of what is means to be a black woman within academia (See specifically: Potgieter and Moleko). The strength of the African feminism perspective, in particular, is its recognition of multiple (although interconnected) axes of exclusion, and its acknowledgment of the cumulative effects of disprivilege.

Van Wyk identifies four conditions for transformation which capture what scholars within the combined approach assert, mainly: equity and redress, critical inquiry, communicative praxis, and citizenship (van Wyk, 2003: 153). The review will now briefly examine general transformation research located within the combined approach.

A number of studies have examined transformation from a broad perspective, however there are two main categories of studies. The first category includes Larsen (2004) and Mabokela (2000), who have compared transformation, in general terms, between a historically Afrikaans and historically English-medium university. Mabokela’s comparison of UCT and Stellenbosch provides a comprehensive analysis of these institutions’ histories and key issues of staffing and student concerns.
Whilst English-medium institutions generally have better profiles of black academics, and more developed equity policies and programmes, they do not escape criticism. Mabokela criticises UCT for employing a liability perspective towards black people. She notes that there is a lack of understanding of difference and the environment is non-supportive towards black academics and students. Furthermore, she reflects on how the equal opportunity employment policy has not gone far enough in facilitating either structural or institutional culture change. Her research also captures complexity and heterogeneity within black people’s experience at UCT, as she discusses how African people were perceived to be more welcome at UCT, whilst there was an expectation that Coloured people would prefer Stellenbosch (Mabokela, 2000: 99 & 117 - 143).

Mabokela’s study is pivotal because it incorporates both macro and micro perspectives, in addition to providing key statistics for the period under review 1983 – 1995. Furthermore, it is important because of its examination of transformation before the passing of equity legislation, therefore capturing a time when institutions had an opportunity for ‘organic change’. It also provides an early account of both structural and cultural dynamics of change at UCT, and provides a solid footing for this research to build on, and to compare UCT, ten years later.

Comparative studies are useful as they provide an indication of commonalities across institutions. However, a weakness can sometimes be the insufficient recognition of difference within a single institution. The second category of studies addresses this issue, and its scholars include: van Zyl, Steyn and Orr (2003), Louw and Finchilescu (2003), and Ismail (2002). Each of them examines transformation within one institution, from the perspective of institutional culture. This perspective allows for the hearing of internal similarity and difference, particularly as these studies targeted a wide range of university employees.

The van Zyl et al study focuses on Wits, whilst the others focus on UCT. The studies of Ishmail and van Zyl et al both use focus groups to access the perceptions and experiences
of institutional culture. Each concurred that the institutional culture was largely
Anglocentric, liberal, and patriarchal. In addition, prejudicial attitudes, glass ceilings,
exclusion, inconsistent application of university policies, and the dominance of a white
men’s network are all noted as highly problematic. Management was criticised for being
top-down and unconcerned with the experience of academics on the ground.

Louw and Finchilescu also aim to provide a synopsis of the institutional climate. Their
study utilises a survey method and is therefore able to quantify the findings, thereby
enabling a thorough glance at the perceptions and experiences of all staff. Their study
was particularly nuanced for identifying key differences between African men and
women academics, in addition to noting high levels of discrimination, harassment, and
neutrality around management’s ability to act fairly. All of which are key factors for the
institution to take note of.

These studies identify both the broad and specific problems of the implementation of
transformation and the response of academics in general. Those that focus on institutional
culture (such as van Zyl et al) prioritise attitudes and networks. Whilst relationships of
power are identified, they are not necessarily viewed as the root of the problem, and from
a structural point of view, this undermines the salience of structural factors in black and
women’s experiences of exclusion.

Lastly, within the combined approach, the review shall examine ‘Defining Moments’ by
Luhabe (2002). Although her study is concerned with black managers, it is pivotal
because it traces the progression of black managers between the seventies and nineties,
and shows how their experiences change during this time. Therefore, it may also be
useful in explaining the experiences of black academics.

Her explanation of the seventies concurs with Nzimande’s as she notes the lack of
recognition of black personnel who enter corporations through black economic
advancement programmes but who remain as perpetual trainees (Luhabe, 2002: 19 - 20).
During the eighties, some recognition was given to black personnel in terms of increased
role and salary but significant mistrust prevailed and the contradictory class location continued to marginalise and alienate black managers (Luhabe, 2002: 21 - 23).

The nineties were an era of policy change, as the door was really opened for black managers to move into real positions. However, institutional culture change was slow to come into effect, and social networks remained relatively impenetrable (Luhabe, 2002: 27 – 30). During the nineties, the gender struggle also began to gain momentum (Luhabe, 2002: 30). See table 2 below for a summary of black managers’ key concerns over the past thirty years.

Luhabe’s study is useful because it periodises change and illustrates that both structural and interpretive factors shape black managers experiences. It also shows the durability of exclusive and discriminatory practices, and therefore reinforces the importance of substantive change. Lastly, it notes that race-based transformation took centre stage, with gender-based transformation being appreciated only later on. As this is a thorough study amongst corporates, it will be interesting to see how easily or accurately it transfers across to academia.

**Table 2: Black managers’ top six concerns in the seventies, eighties and nineties**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Seventies</th>
<th>Eighties</th>
<th>Nineties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reduced recognition</td>
<td>Reduced recognition</td>
<td>Reduced recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Access to information</td>
<td>Slow progress</td>
<td>Reduced expectation from white colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Absence of role models</td>
<td>Racist attitudes</td>
<td>Access to information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Slow progress</td>
<td>Under employment</td>
<td>Slow progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Unjust remuneration</td>
<td>Absence of role models</td>
<td>Alienation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Racist attitudes</td>
<td>Absence of professional black image</td>
<td>Racist attitudes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transformation initiatives cluster

A gap in the literature identified thus far is the absence of scholarship which examines the perceptions and experiences of transformation in specific contexts, such as within transformation programmes. This cluster examines scholarship that deals with actual transformation initiatives. Whilst there is significant writing about the need for academic development and the need for mentoring, there is very little literature that examines actual academic staff transformation initiatives in South African higher education.

Firstly, it is important to provide a framework through which transformation initiatives can be evaluated. Nimoko identifies four approaches to demographic diversity and labour market participation (Nimoko in Essed, 2002: 10). This is described as the 4D model and includes: the deficit, difference, discrimination, and diversity approach (Nimoko in Essed, 2002: 10 – 12). Initiatives conducted from a deficit perspective assume there is some deficiency within the previously disadvantaged group, generally a lacking in cultural capital, and that this needs to be enhanced or developed. These initiatives tend to build on existing stereotypes and foster discrimination (Essed, 2002: 10). Initiatives that operate from a difference perspective assume that the amelioration of cultural difference through increased understanding and tolerance are crucial to the management of diversity. However, whilst this approach can be cathartic, it is largely problematic as it does not address power relations (Essed, 2002: 11).

Initiatives conducted from the discrimination perspective identify structural and systemic exclusion, such as “glass ceilings and racial walls”. However, these focus on group as opposed to individual empowerment and can therefore neglect an individual’s needs (Essed, 2002: 11). Approaches form a diversity perspective aim for widespread inclusivity of the previously disadvantaged (Essed, 2002: 12). However, Essed criticises this as it amounts to the ‘management’ of diversity where business logic dominates. It is culturally reductionist, as it is based on the priority of difference and therefore, Essed concludes, it has “the taste of old wine in new bottles” (Essed, 2002: 14). Whilst this is a useful framework, it is also clear that transformation initiatives could be rooted in more
than one perspective because of the complexity of how initiatives emerge and develop. None-the-less, since this research will be exploring transformation initiatives, this framework could prove to be a useful analytic tool.

Four South African studies which discuss transformative initiatives in higher education were identified. They are Metcalfe (forthcoming), Larsen (2004), Mkhwanazi and Bajinath (2003), and Buhlunugu and Metcalfe (2001). Nzimande’s (1991) study on Corporate Guerrillas’ is also included, as he provides an evaluation of Black Advancement Programmes in the corporate sector.

Mkhwanazi and Bajinath’s study is a peripheral scope of what they term ‘Equity Development Programmes’ across the country. Although equity is the prioritised aspect of these programmes, it is questionable whether it is appropriate (given the challenges facing black academics) to conceive of these programmes as equity rather than transformation programmes. Furthermore, the authors state that these programmes are designed to address the under-representation of black, women, and disabled people; however, they only give one example of a programme that does not target black academics. The main weakness here is that they do not explain whether this is the only such programme, or whether it is the only one they profile.

In addition, their report does not provide insight into the specifics of these programmes, it merely lists what exists. However, they do acknowledge that “indications are that there are very few meaningful, successful EDPs in existence at SA higher education studies” (Mkhwanazi & Bajinath, 2003: 106). Whilst this is a necessary start for a topic on which very little exists, the fact remains that there is a considerable gap in scholarship within this area. Larsen (2004) also provides a brief examination of the programmes at Wits. Her showcase example is the Growing our own Timber (GooT) project, in which her interview with the coordinator strongly illustrates the deficit ideology behind the programme (Larsen, 2004: 77 – 81). Her account is both informed and critical, and provides a good base from which to compare the GooT programme\textsuperscript{17}. The weakness though is that she was unable to interview any GooT participants.
Metcalf (forthcoming) has been conducting an extensive, in-depth, long-term study into GooT, and will provide the foundation for this kind of research in the future. Her main conclusions point to many inadequacies and faults with the programme, and whilst these may reflect negatively on the programme, they will provide very rich material for future transformation initiative planners to consider. This analysis cannot draw on Metcalfe’s report (forthcoming), and neither will it compare in depth, detail, and insider understanding with her analysis. However, the strength of this research is likely to be its foundation on comparisons between several transformation initiatives within and between institutions.

Buhlunlu and Metcalfe (2001) review the SWOP internship programme at Wits. This study also benefits from insider knowledge and experience, which the authors use to reflect on the important lessons that they have learned through the process (as internship mentor and manager). They illustrate the importance of being an effective mentor rather than a supervisor, the necessity of having an administrator and intellectual leader as a co-ordinator, the fundamental connection between knowledge production and publication, the need to provide an intellectually welcoming and safe environment for the interns, and of course, funding (Buhlunlu & Metcalfe, 2001: 78 – 81). This illustrates a thorough conception of a transformation programme and will be a good base from which to compare the transformation initiatives of UCT and Wits.

Lastly, Nzimande’s study on APP is also useful in this regard, as he traces the emergence and effectiveness of Black Advancement Programmes (BAP) within the corporate sector. These emerged in the early seventies, when internal collective resistance against apartheid began to be violently reasserted. They were reformist in nature and aimed at “improving black-white relations within the work environment” (Nzimande, 1996: 190). They were characteristic of the liberal paternalism of the time, in that they were largely based on the deficiency paradigm and hence focused on soft skills acquisition (Nzimande, 1991: 211). Although, there was a wide variety of BAP, most did not focus on African upward mobility (Nzimande, 1996: 193).
By the late-seventies, the economic impact of both increasing international pressure and internal resistance began to be felt. The Sullivan Code of Employment Practice was developed to provide opportunities for black advancement through equal employment opportunities in corporations (Nzimande, 1991: 191). At this time personnel managers, who managed the newly established equal employment opportunities, were a source of African upward mobility (Nzimande, 1996: 192). With this, black advancement became an end in itself, and by the eighties, paper policies increasingly became translated into practice (Nzimande, 1991: 217). However, the results were often poor largely due to the lack of both physical and ideological space for APP growth within corporations (Nzimande, 1996: 194). Furthermore Nzimande states that BAP as managed by WCPB were effectively set up to fail, or at the least, not to disrupt white privilege and racialised hegemonic power (Nzimande, 1996: 195). This study is useful as it highlights intention, response, and effect of advancement programmes that are restrictively controlled, and despite appearing to be transformative (on the surface), actually are conservative and restore white hegemonic power.

**Research gap**

This review has identified a number of gaps in the literature, including: i) research into the academic workplace that compares contemporary experiences of race and gender with historical experiences in order to note continuity and change; ii) evaluative transformation studies from the perspectives of academics (as opposed to accounts of how race and gender are institutionally experienced); iii) scholarship on transformation initiatives, especially transformation or equity development programmes; and iv) explorations on white racialised experiences, particularly on white men academics’ experiences.

In addition, there are also other areas that have not been significantly addressed by existing scholarship. These are: i) a thorough historical tracking of racialised and gendered experiences within ‘white’ institutions, from the perspective of academic staff;
and ii) sufficient engagement, from sociology of work scholars, on the academic workplace. This research does not aim to fill all or most these gaps, however it hopes to shed light on some of these issues, and to provide a basis from which further research can be conducted. In particular, this research seeks to use a sociology of work perspective to understand these institutions as workplaces undergoing historical change through the process of transformation\textsuperscript{19}. Furthermore, it hopes to present more than an application of the apartheid workplace regime in academia by factoring in the dynamics of gender and class.

**Conceptual framework**

The conceptual framework consists of those concepts which need to be explicitly defined or have specific meaning for this research, they include: academic staff transformation, institutional culture, race, gender, class, and capital.

*Academic staff transformation*

Academic staff transformation is premised on an understanding of academic staff as ‘workers’ within a workplace that has historically been both elitist and exclusive in terms of race, class, and gender. Therefore, transformation of this workplace refers to attempts to ensure equity, equality, and a progressive institutional culture within the workplace. More specifically, academic staff transformation incorporates government directive, deliberate institutional attempts, and organic change, with the aim of affecting demographic, procedural, attitudinal, and experiential change amongst academic staff, in addition to any unintended consequences that accompany such change.

*Institutional culture*

Institutional culture is understood as “the prevailing ethos, the deep rooted sets of norms, assumptions and values that predominate and pervade most of the environment on a day-to-day basis” (University of the Witwatersrand, 2004: 31). However, it is also “an active process of meaning-making and contestation over definition, including of itself” (Street in Wright, 1999: 27).
**Race, Gender and Class**

Race, gender, and class are all understood as social constructs that have been historically used as mechanisms of social stratification. They have also been utilized as a determinant of inclusion or exclusion within academia. As such, this approach is cognizant of how the university as a racialised, gendered, and classist space shapes both the world view and experience of academics. In addition, these concepts are understood not only as factors which shape our access to material resources but also our access to social, cultural, and symbolic capital. Furthermore, the research adopts Hill-Collins’ cumulative impact approach, in that the interactions between race, gender, and class are seen as being both dynamic and complex – which further bifurcates experience (throwing up complexity and contradiction along the way).

A further elaboration on the use of ‘class’ and ‘capital’

According to Bourdieu, “individuals are always structurally located in a multidimensional social space defined broadly in terms of social class” (Seidman, 2004: 148). His notion of class is expansive, including not only one’s “access to resources, social ties and social opportunities” but is also shaped by one’s occupation, educational status, age, gender, and race (Seidman, 2004: 148). My use of class follows a similar path, focusing mainly on the experience of institutional class (a derivative of the broader socio-economic class with its own specificities due to the particularities of the academic social field). In understanding the ‘full’ experience of class, Bourdieu’s notion of capital is also utilised in order to examine the variety of different experiences had by academics within academia.

Bourdieu differentiates between four types of capital: economic, social, cultural, and symbolic. Economic refers to wealth; social refers to social ties, influential relations, and confidence; cultural refers to a variety of objectified (paradigms, methods), personified, (dispositions) and institutionalised (titles and credentials) symbolic capacities; and
symbolic refers to honour and prestige (Callewaert, 2000: 309 - 310 & Seidman, 2004: 149). These are of particular use in identifying the multitude of factors that impact on the experience and location of an individual(s), particularly, the experience and location of academics within the academy.

Bourdieu does speak of academia as a distinctive ‘social field’ made up of “individuals – positioned in relation to the objective social relations set out by universities, disciplines, and faculties – who compete for authority, power, and prestige, by using available resources (e.g. social ties and knowledge) (Seidman, 2004: 149). However, this research is more concerned with the macro positioning of academics and their access to the various forms of capital. It therefore utilises the perspective of a workplace regime, rather than social field, to understand the experiences of academics in a context of change.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has provided a scope of the existing literature on academic staff transformation. It has focused mainly on South African literature in order to capture the particularities of context. The current research has been positioned within and in contrast to the existing literature, and in so doing it has motivated the development of a critical sociology of higher education.
Chapter Three Endnotes

1 Whilst these scholars are pivotal in their fields, their work is not reviewed here as it is a little too specialised. Their contribution however, is noted.


3 van Zyl and Steyn (2001), and van Zyl, Steyn and Orr (2003).

4 The location and significance of this research will again be revisited and solidified later within this chapter.

5 This issue will be returned to later in the report.

6 Historically, academics have been highly skilled white men, administrators have been skilled white men and women, and maintenance staff have been less skilled black men and women.

7 ‘Professions’ is being used here to simply denote occupations that require a high standard of education.

8 A major South African sociological journal.

9 For example, 46% of women are high producers but are non-professorial whilst the comparable amount for men is 24%. At the same time, 10% of women professors have low productivity compared to 36% of men professors (Prozesky, 2005: 8).

10 These questions are posed in chapter eight.

11 Whilst some of these findings could be interpreted as structural factors, Potgieter has located most of them within the realm of attitudes, hence their description as cultural.

12 Larsen examined Wits and the, then, Rand Afrikaans University (RAU) focusing particularly on issues of ‘academic equity’ in terms of access and retention of academic staff and students (Larsen, 2004: 8).

13 These studies share a common understanding of transformation as including the transformation of the cultural milieu, in addition to social values, and social and economic positioning (van Zyl, Steyn & Orr, 2003: 5).

14 Each of them explored the perceptions of university employees by race, gender, occupational type, and rank. Furthermore, these three studies were also closely allied to the institutions where they took place, in that they were either commissioned and/or formally approved by the institution, and were therefore also part of the institution’s own transformation process.

15 Although van Zyl and Steyn conducted a similar type of study at UCT in 2001.

16 During the seventies, items 2 to 6 were equally ranked at number 2.

17 The details of Larsen’s findings on GooT are reflected on in chapter five.

18 ‘Deficiency paradigm’ refers to the view that African development is lacking because Africans themselves lack skill; therefore programmes seek to redress this. These programmes often reinforce the inequality they are trying to remove by not focusing on the appropriate skills.

19 See the conceptual framework for the explicit definition of academic staff transformation adopted in this research.