

https://dspace.org/

Institutional arrangements in the coordination of policies for gender equality

Sobudula, Viwe

2020
https://hdl.handle.net/10539/30844

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS IN THE COORDINATION OF POLICIES FOR GENDER EQUALITY

Viwe Sobudula

A research report submitted to the Faculty of Management, University of the Witwatersrand, in 50% fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Management (in the field of Public and Development Management).

February, 2020

Abstract

Gender inequality is a challenge which has been inherited from the apartheid government in South Africa. The democratic government has through the establishment of various institutions such as the Department of Women, Youth and Persons with Disabilities (DWYPD) and the development of policies and laws made efforts to address gender inequalities, however, the problem still persists. The purpose of this study is to analyse how the DWYPD works with other government departments through institutional arrangements to coordinate policies for the promotion of gender equality/equity. The research found that although the DWYPD has an enabling environment for policy coordination, institutional arrangements are structurally and operationally weak. The study also found challenges such as unclear policy mandate, lack of legislative authority to coordination policies and poor communication and planning within the DWYPD for the institutional arrangements. The study gives insights into challenges faced by different departments and makes recommendations for better coordination and management.

Declaration

I declare that this report is my own, unaided work. It is submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of Master of Management (in the field of Public Policy) in the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted before for any degree or examination in any other university.

_____

Viwe Sobudula

28 February 2020

Dedication

I would like to dedicate this research to my late mother (Nomsa Eunice Sobudula) who left me just at the time I was about to begin this journey. Ncinci, the love and support you gave me when you were alive has kept me going. Thank you for EVERYTHING!

I also dedicate this research to the memory of Uyinene Mrwetyana, at the time I felt like giving up on this research, your story pushed me to do something about the status of women in South Africa. Rest in Power!

Lastly, to the fiery memory of the late Winnie Madikizela-Mandela! Your influence lives on!

Acknowledgements

I am very thankful to my former supervisor, Dr Jacqui Poltera for her guidance and support during our time working on this project. I would also like to greatly thank my supervisor Dr Caitlin Blaser-Mapitsa who has made sure that this dream of mine is realised. Lastly, thank you to my family for the love and support during this journey, especially my two children KuhleKunje and Kwamndandi-Kwakho Sobudula, you were my constant inspiration. Without their assistance and support, this research would not have been possible.

List of abbreviations

DWYPD- Department of Women, Youth and Persons with Disabilities

DBE- Department of Basic Education

DPSA- Department of Public Service and Administration

DSD- Department of Social Development

DPME- Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation

DOH- Department of Health

OSW- Office of the Status of Women

NT- National Treasury

GRPBMEA- Gender Responsive Planning, Budgeting, Monitoring, Evaluation and Auditing

NDP- National Development Plan

CGE- Commission for Gender Equality

Table of Contents

SUMMARY OF CHAPTERS

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION 10

1.1 BACKROUND OF THE STUDY 14

1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT 16

1.3 AIM OF THE STUDY 18

1.4 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES 18

1.5 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY 20

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW 21

2.1 THEME **ONE**: Theories and models of institutional arrangements 22

2.2 THEME **TWO**: Institutional arrangements specific to national gender machinery and interdepartmental public sector gender work 36

2.3 THEME **THREE**: Coordination in gender-based programming as an empirical ...43

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY 49

3.1 RESEARCH STRATEGY 51

3.3 DATA COLLECTION 51

3.4 DATA SAMPLING 52

3.5 DATA ANALYSIS 53

3.6 DATA RELIABILITY, VALIDITY, AND CREDIBILITY 53

3.7 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS 55

CHAPTER FOUR: RESEARCH FINDINGS 58

4.1 INTRODUCTORY QUESTIONS 60

4.2 **THEME ONE:** Institutional form and approach to policy making 62

4.3 **THEME TWO**: Policy initiation and planning 66

4.4 **THEME THREE**: Implementation, monitoring and evaluation 82

CHAPTER FIVE: RESEARCH ANALYSIS, CONCLUSION AND RECCOMENDATIONS 95

5.1 **THEME ONE**: Institutional form and approach to policy making 95

5.2 **THEME TWO:** Policy initiation and planning 103

5.3 **THEME THREE:** Policy implementation, monitoring and evaluation 108

5.4 CONCLUSION AND RECCOMENDATIONS 114

Summary of chapters

Chapter one: Introduction

This chapter introduces the research topic by giving an overview of gender inequality globally and in the South African context, and highlights efforts by the South African government to address gender inequality. The chapter also discusses policy coordination and institutional arrangements, as it is a major issue that the research is concerned with. The chapter also gives more context to the background of the problem, which mainly highlights the creation of the Department of Women, Youth and People with Disabilities (DWYPD) and its role of coordinating activities with stakeholder departments. The chapter discusses the research problem, which is based on the founding principle of the DWYPD and its dependence on stakeholder departments to develop and implement its policy initiatives. In addition, the chapter discusses the aim of the study, research objectives, research questions and the significance of this study.

Chapter two: Literature review

This chapter reviews literature from sources such as periodicals and journals, government publications, electronic sources and dissertations. The literature reviewed establishes a theoretical basis for the problem statement, achieving the research objectives and answering the research questions. The literature is separated into three themes. The first theme discusses theories and models of institutional arrangements. The second theme discusses institutional arrangements specific to either the national gender machinery, or the interdepartmental public sector gender work. The last theme discusses coordination in gender-based programming as an empirical manifestation of the theories and models of institutional arrangements. The discussion in the literature review is vital to the research topic. The chapter discusses different debates on institutional models and theories. These models and theories range from historic institutionalism to sociological institutionalism, normative and realist institutionalism, normative institutionalism and others. These different models and theories help us in understanding what institutions are and how they operate. The discussion finds that South African public

institutions/government departments can be linked to historical, sociological, regulative and realist institutions.

The second part of the literature review discusses institutional arrangements specific to a national gender machinery and interdepartmental public sector gender work. This gives context to the development of gender machineries in South Africa and most importantly, it discusses how gender machineries operate, how they should operate and the kind of challenges they face. The challenges that gender machineries face in policy coordination states by the literature are also established in the research findings, a few examples are: lack of clarity of mandates, lack of resources, and absence of legislative prescripts.

The last past of the literature review provides practical examples of policy coordination led by different institutions and gives examples of four policy areas which relate to the research (sanitary dignity, gender responsive budgeting, gender policy and gender-based violence). This cites different examples where multi sector approach has been taken in the development and implementation of different policies.

Chapter Three: Research Methodology

The section discusses the research methodology that has been chosen which is the qualitative research methodology and the research strategy, which is the deductive approach. In terms of the data collection, semi structured interviewed as well as document analysis were chosen as the collection method for the data. Officials from the DWYPD and other stakeholder departments were selected for the semi-structured interviews. Two policy frameworks were chosen for document analysis. The data analysis method chosen for both collection methods is thematic analysis. Themes were selected from the literature and used as a basic for presenting data findings. The themes that were chosen are, institutional form and approach to policy making, policy initiation and planning, as well as policy implementation, monitoring and evaluation. Lastly, this section discussed the ethical issues that were considered as important in conducting the research.

Chapter Four: Presentation of Findings

The chapter presented the findings of the study. The data was presented in the following manner: an introduction of each theme and a recapping of the way in which the data was gathered. The section presented the data that contributed to the findings, discussed the observations that are represented by the data. It also highlights dilemmas remaining. The section also provided a preliminary analysis of why this data is significant and what it means for theory or practice. Lastly, the section reiterated the key observations under the theme. The data indicated that an institutional model is important in policy coordination, and where institutions share the same model, it is easier to coordinate cross-sectoral work. There is a need to have a centralised system with lead departments. However, in terms of what the data indicates the lead department needs to address the challenges that it currently faces.

The data also found that many challenges arise in the coordination of cross-sectoral policies. These challenges include poor communication or total lack of communication, absence of legislative mandate, policy direction as well as poor expression of implementation and monitoring plans.

Chapter Five: Data analysis

The section presents the data analysis. Findings are presented in the following manner: an introduction to the theme, linking it back to the literature review section. The section reiterates what the research findings say about the empirical data and analyses the implications that the data have for the theoretical discussion in the literature review. Lastly, the section concludes with a discussion of the importance of the new contribution, and identifies any significant implications this has for theory and practice. The data found that there is a need to have a gender machinery such as the DWYPD and the structure of public institutions in South Africa allows for its existence. However, a lot of institutional reform is needed within the DWYPD. This reform should enable it to establish its footprint within government and establish better working relations with other government departments.

Conclusions and recommendations

Based on the empirical data, the section provides a conclusion and recommendations. The research concludes that the DWYPD is an important institution in driving the empowerment of women and gender equality. The DWYPD should focus on improving institutional arrangements and addressing the internal institutional challenges it faces. It should have a clear legislated mandate that allows it to operate in any sphere of government. The DWYPD should continue to foster good working relations with stakeholder departments.

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

Gender inequality is a global issue, and is prevalent in most societies. Its prevalence has necessitated action by women's movements, international organisations as well countries around the world to lobby against these inequalities (United Nations Development Programme, 2016). In South Africa, the adoption of the Constitution (specifically the Bill of Rights) and the development of legislations (such as the Promotion of Equality and Prevention of Unfair Discrimination Act, the Right for Termination of Pregnancy Act, the Employment Equity Act etc.) were a huge milestone in the process of trying to improve gender inequalities and advocate for the empowerment of women.

The democratic government also established several public institutions, which were tasked with the development of policies to address gender inequalities. These institutions include the Office of the Status of Women (OSW), which was mandated with gender mainstreaming in government departments, civil society and international bodies (Sadie, 2013). The OSW faced a number of challenges such as lack of skills and resources as well as poor planning and monitoring which affected its ability to create effective strategies to deal with gender inequalities. The most significant challenge the institution had was its inability to foster working relations with government departments, civil society and international organisations, which is crucial for an organisation of this nature (Sadie, 2013).

The democratic government, in an effort to enhance the performance of the OSW, created the Department of Women, Children and People with Disabilities in 2009. This department was renamed to the DWYPD after the 2019 general elections. The main objective of the DWYPD is to address gender inequality and advance women's rights. In doing its work, the DWYPD develops policies, plays an advocacy role as well as monitoring and evaluating the performance of the country in achieving gender equality and the empowerment of women.

The department has been renamed and reconfigured as part of the Cabinet reshuffling process since its existence with this, affecting the operations and direction of the department (Gumede, 2012). Its existence, however, has been seen by critics especially in the media to be ineffective in the fight for women empowerment and addressing gender inequalities. For example, according to media interviews conducted with a group of women, there is a perception that the department might as well not exist as it fails to deal with problems they face on a day to day basis (Pilane, 2016).

The existence of the department has also sparked parliamentary debates, with criticism on the operations and budget priorities of the department, which do not enable it to achieve most of its operational priorities (Davis, 2013). One of the achievements highlighted by the department was the establishment of the department itself, which is something the department cannot celebrate as an achievement, as its creation was not decided by itself. In other instances, most of the achievements highlighted by the department were as a result work done by other departments with no clear highlights of what the contribution of the department itself was (Davis, 2013). This mainly due to its dependence on other departments coordinate policies.

The coordination of policies is one of the key tasks of the DWYPD. The department is expected to work with other government departments, business, civil society organisation as well as the continental and international community. This involves a complex network of agencies, policies and institutions which support the process of policy coordination (Vitola & Senfelde, 2012).

Policy coordination is multi-level, and cross organisational including various organisations at different spheres of government. It involves Cabinet Ministers and sectoral ministries which propose policies and suggest activities to implement them, and agencies for the actual policy implementation. There are two types of policy coordination: the vertical, which focuses on the relationship between different spheres of government in policy making and implementation

and the horizontal, which focuses on managing policies across different sectors (Vitola & Senfelde, 2012)

When well executed, policy coordination allows for better collaboration of public policies and, prevents duplication and conflict of policy initiatives, therefore, policy coordination is important approach to solving complex policy issues. Policy coordination is also important for consistent policy priorities accompanied by strategic budget allocations. Institutions play an important role in policy coordination because the extent of cooperation depends on the formal framework and the behaviour of the parties involved (Vitola & Senfelde, 2012).

There are two types of policy coordination approaches, namely positive coordination (which includes collaborative drafting and negotiation of compromise) and negative coordination, which is more of a unilateral approach (Radtke, Hustedt & Klinnert, 2016). To analyse policy coordination, it is important to consider first, the organisational structure as it gives guidance on rules, which justify actors' behaviours. Secondly, the negotiation mode as an important feature of cross cutting issues highlighting different interests and perceptions. This is where actors also show cooperative and competitive aspects that assist in the analysis of how they cope with conflicting interests within negotiations (Radtke et al., 2016).

Coordination is also important because it aims to address existing policy duplications in sectors, contradictions, displacements, changing demands and cross cutting problems while ensuring that policies are implemented in a tidy way. Although policy coordination assists with integration between actors and policy initiatives, it can still present several challenges (Peters, 2018). Such challenges range from accountability, politics, power, and disagreements with performance management to the clash of beliefs, ideologies, and questions on specialisation. Therefore, networks, collaboration and hierarchy (to distinguish the role of different actors) are important factors in policy coordination (Peters, 2018).

Policy coordination therefore, requires a series of network which is organisational functionality is known as institutional arrangements. The research analysed the involvement of some key stakeholders such as the Departments of Social Development, Basic Education, Public Service and Administration as well as the NT in the development of the Sanitary Dignity Framework and the Gender Responsive Budgeting Framework. The research focused on the relationship between different levels of government in the coordination of these two policies as well as the management of policies across different sectors. This study subscribes to both the horizontal and vertical policy approaches, and can also be linked to positive policy coordination.

The research focused on inter-sectoral governance rather than coordination at the different levels of government. The research found that the institutional culture of public institutions in South Africa allows for cross-sectoral policy coordination and that the DWYPD, as the central department does have a role to play. The research however, found that there were some challenges in the institutional arrangements between the DWYPD and stakeholder departments in the coordination of the Sanitary Dignity framework and the Gender Responsive Planning, Budgeting, Monitoring, Evaluation and Auditing (GRPBMEA). The findings were that the roles of some key stakeholders were not clear in the initiation of the policy and that policy implementation as well as monitoring and evaluation plans were also fuzzy. The research found challenges with communication amongst the stakeholders. Another important finding of this research which has a significant impact on the coordination of these policies was that the implementation of the policies of the DWYPD at the provincial level will present a challenge because it does not have a legal mandate.

The institutional arrangements for these policies were not well set up in theory and practice. The disjuncture between what was stated in the framework and what the actual stakeholder departments say is indicative of the opaque and poorly negotiated institutional arrangements.

What the study recommends is for the department to initiate a process of crafting a founding legislation and establish provincial and local offices. The study also proposes better structuring within the department to address issues of budget and skills allocation. The study found the DWYPD is too dependent on other departments to implement its policies. For this reason, it needs to improve and strengthen its own institutional arrangements. This includes facilitating stakeholder engagement, deliberation and negotiation as well as communication and buy-in and accountability. The DWYPD still needs to foster a good working relationship with stakeholder departments. This means that the department needs to improve on its communication, planning and policy coordination strategies.

1.2 Background to the study

The DWYPD was founded through a Presidential announcement, and was further legitimatised through a government proclamation in 2009. The DWYPD is mandated in the Constitution as well as in the National Development Plan (NDP). Section 9 of the Bill of Rights in the Constitution emphasises achieving equality among all citizens of the country. It also places obligations on the state, private sector and civil society to eliminate and remedy gender, race and social inequalities (Department of Women, Youth and Persons with Disabilities [DWYPD]: Republic of South Africa [RSA], 2017). Section 9 (2) of the Bill of Rights, guarantees full and equal enjoyment of all rights and freedoms by all genders in the country, and further gives way for legislative and other measures to be designed to protect and, or advance people who are disadvantaged by unfair discrimination in an effort to achieve equality (DWYPD: RSA, 2017).

The NDP points out the challenge posed by the historic position of oppression, sexism and discrimination against women, particularly women in rural areas who constitute a large percentage of the poor. The plan acknowledges that, even though some progress has been made to improve the lives of women, discrimination and patriarchy still exist (National Planning Commission [NPC], 2012). Chapter 15 of the NDP envisions that by 2030, women (and other vulnerable groups) will fully participate in the economy to allow for transformation and the development of an education system that provides skills and enables them to live free from violence. The NDP also states that women should be supported in leadership positions in all sectors of society and that they should be allowed better access to basic services (NPC, 2012). The NDP plan specifically tasks the DWYPD to set clear targets for the advancement of women's rights and report on these targets on an annual basis (NPC, 2012).

The DWYPD is one of the key departments tasked with overseeing the implementation of gender equality policies. However, there are other departments that are major stakeholders in assisting with addressing gender inequalities. These include the Department of Social Development, the

Department of Health and the Department of Education (DWYPD: RSA, 2015). Unlike departments such as the Department of Public Works, which is established in terms of the Government Immovable Asset Management Act (2007) as the sole provider of government's immovable assets, the DWYPD does not have a founding legislation which gives it explicit authority for the empowerment of women and gender equality (NT: RSA, 2019). Work on gender equality and women empowerment is shared with other government departments (Kornergay, 1999). This means that DWYPD needs to share its functions with other departments and depends on their inputs and support for policy implementation. This is also expressed in the women empowerment and gender equality bill.

The research analysed the institutional arrangements of 2 of the policies of the DWYPD. The Development of the Sanitary Dignity Framework follows a commitment made by the then President in 2011 for reproductive health education and protection (Giesmar, 2018). Amongst others, the policy aims to address absenteeism of young girls from school as a result of not having access to sanitary pads (Gender Links for Equality and Justice, 2017). The framework is important in addressing barriers that girl learners still face in obtaining menstrual health products and the stigma they still face around menstruation. The barriers faced and stigma attached to menstruation highlights a need for further advocacy around menstrual health management in South African communities (Geismar, 2018).

This is a good example of a cross sectoral policy which involves multiple stakeholders and is a good reference point for the direction of the research. The implementation of the project is multi layered involving different stakeholders such other key line function departments such as the Departments of Social Development, Health, and Basic Education, and the NT, as well as provincial and local governments (DWYPD: RSA, 2017).

The second policy that will be looked at in this research is the GRPBMEA framework. The aim of the framework is to ensure that the empowerment of women and gender equality are major aspects of public policy, planning and budgeting and to ensure that there is adequate allocation of resources to

achieve gender equality and women's empowerment goals (DWYPD: RSA, 2018). This is another multi-layered policy involving different stakeholders and other key line function departments such as the NT, Department of Planning, Monitoring and evaluation, civil society, tacticians, and provincial and local spheres of government (DWYPD: RSA, 2018).

1.2 Problem statement

The DWYPD was established to create a society that promotes the socio-economic empowerment of women and the advancement of gender equality (DWYPD: RSA, 2014). Government departments that have been tasked with addressing gender inequalities should ensure that the strategies they develop are enforced (Shastri, 2014). There are several government departments that have been tasked with overseeing gender equality (DWYPD: RSA, 2015). As such, the development, implementation and monitoring of policies of the DWYPD cannot be done without coordination of initiatives with other government departments (DWYPD: RSA, 2014). The DWYPD is dependent on other stakeholders to coordinate its policies. Coordination is a central problem for public administration and policy. Public organisations have made numerous attempts to work together effectively; however, there is still no standardised approach to dealing with coordination challenges (Peters, 2018).

Poor coordination attempts contribute further to keeping women vulnerable to gender inequality and their continuing to face the usual challenges that they face. Women in South Africa still experience social discrimination because the culture as well as religion continue to promote patriarchy and the exclusion of women (Stats SA: RSA, 2018). Gender inequalities in access to education are still visible (Nkosi & Pretorious, 2019). Gender income gaps are still prevalent (DWYPD: RSA, 2015) and gender power dynamics expose women to the risk of gender-based violence (Van De Griend & Messias, 2014).

The study analysed how the DWYPD works with key stakeholder departments such as Basic Education (DBE), Social Development (DSD), Public Service and Administration (DPSA) and the NT (NT) to coordinate policies that address

gender inequality. Two policies were chosen: The Framework for Sanitary Dignity and the GRPBMEA.

A scan of the literature suggests that no academic study has been done to analyse how the DWYPD works with key stakeholder departments in the development of policies to promote gender equality. The information that currently exists is based on perceptions about and media reports on the DWYPD.

The study found that, indeed, the dependence of the DWYPD on other departments to implement its policy is a challenge. Firstly, because the plan of the DWYPD is to utilise provincial government departments to implement these policies. In the absence of a legal mandate and its own provincial offices, the DWYPD has to depend on national key stakeholder departments for implementation, monitoring and evaluation. The research looked at institutional arrangements in the development of these policies. The research found several challenges in the manner in which the DWYPD works with the stakeholder departments. Challenges such as poor specification of roles for stakeholder departments, poor communication on policy direction and poor implementation, monitoring and evaluation of plans were found by the study. The study found that the institutional arrangements were not well set up and that the stakeholders were dissatisfied with the processes and approach followed by the DWYPD.

1.4 Aim of the Study

This study analysed institutional arrangements in the coordination of DWYPD policies which aim to address gender inequality and analyse how institutional arrangements affect the implementation of the policies. The development and implementation of policies to address gender inequality is one of the department's key performance areas as stipulated in its strategic plan for the period 2015-2020. The participation of stakeholder departments in the implementation of policies affects the achievement of or failure to achieve targets set by the DWYPD, as the department develops these mechanisms for stakeholder departments to implement. The 2015-2020 strategic plan does not indicate how the involvement of stakeholder departments affects the achievement/non-achievement of the objectives of the intervention mechanisms, thereby creating a need for this study. The research therefore, investigated these institutional arrangements and how they affect policy coordination.

1.5 Research objectives

The study used the following research objectives to answer the research questions

- Analysing how the DWYPD worked with stakeholder departments in the development of the Sanitary Dignity framework, as well as the GRPBMEA framework.
- Analysing stakeholder engagement in the development of the Sanitary Dignity Framework, as well as the GRPBMEA framework.
- Analysing how the involvement of stakeholders such as the departments of DBE, DSD, DPSA and the NT have influenced the development and implementation of the policies.

1.6 Research questions

Main research question

1. How did the DWYPD work with stakeholder departments to coordinate policies to address gender inequality?

a. The DWYPD worked with several national departments in the development of these policies. The study explored the working relations between the DWYPD and the following departments; NT DPSA, DSD and DBE. The study found that there were challenges faced in the working relations between the DWYPD and its stakeholder departments.
b. The study established that provincial departments had a role to play in the implementation as well as the monitoring of the two policies. However, no interviews were held with members of this sphere of government.

Secondary questions

2. What role did stakeholder departments play in the development of the Sanitary Dignity, the GRPBMEA frameworks?
    a) The national departments as well as provincial departments contributed to the development of the policy frameworks. There are still grey areas in terms of the implementation of the policy. Clarity on the monitoring and evaluation aspects is also lacking. However, the frameworks have been developed and give some information on how the policies will proceed.

3. What challenges were faced in the process of developing the Sanitary Dignity, the GRPBMEA frameworks?
    a. Challenges highlighted speak to the absence of legislative authority for the DWYPD, which makes compliance with their policies challenging. Poor communication, lack of resources and lack of clarity in relation to implementation, monitoring and evaluation were the other challenges.

4. How did the involvement of stakeholder departments affect the coordination of the two frameworks?
    a) Stakeholders felt that their contribution was necessary and important, however, the DWYPD would have continued with this policy even without their participation. Some felt that it was

necessary to participate in order to control the scope of the project and ensure compliance with rules and regulations. Some felt that they're not participating would be misinterpreted by the public as a lack of support and would also create a negative impression in the international community.

1.7 Significance of the study

The research aims to look into highlight important legislative complexities in the institutional arrangements. The research also aims contribute to governance in the area of gender inequality and coordination at the cross-sectoral level within government. The study is significant in identifying what the DWYPD is doing in its effort to address current inequalities, and identifying how government departments work together in the coordination of cross-sectoral policies. The study also has identified challenges the DWYPD experiences in the implementation of its policies and in working with stakeholder departments. The challenges identified can assist the department and government in finding more workable solutions to the problems they face.

In addition, government has invested resources to set up the department to lead the charge in addressing challenges faced by women in society and in so doing, address policy development, implementation and monitoring and evaluation challenges that may surface from the research. The intergovernmental system is based on the principle of cooperation between government institutions as stipulated in the Constitution. The manner in which departments work together to resolve societal issues is an important Constitutional principle.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The literature review tries to make a case for the establishment of a theoretical basis for the problem statement. Gender machineries such as the DWYPD are key drivers of advocacy, policy implementation and monitoring in many countries. For his reason, the abilities of the machineries to deliver on their mandate is crucial. The ability of any institution to deliver on its mandate is guided by several operation factors such as the availability of resources, proper planning and policy implementation, collaboration and corporation with other major stakeholders.

The literature review is divided into four sections:

- The first section of the review provides an in-depth overview of relevant theories and models of institutional arrangements to provide a better understanding of the theories and models that shape the institutional arrangements in public institutions.
- This is followed by a second section, which reviews the literature on institutional arrangements specific to a national gender machinery and interdepartmental public sector gender work. The aim of this section is to explore the literature on the dynamics of institutional arrangements for gender machineries and how interdepartmental public sector gender work is conducted. This review of the literature outlines the advantages and challenges faced by institutions
- Section three regards the coordination in gender-based programming as an empirical manifestation of the theories and models of institutional arrangements. As examples, this section looks specifically at the coordination of three policies namely; Gender responsive budgeting, National gender policy, Sanitary dignity, Gender based violence.

Theme 1: Theories and models of institutional arrangements

Introduction

The structure of institutions determines the organisations' approach to policy making and their interaction with each other. Institutional theories and models are important in understanding what shapes institutional design. The study focuses on institutional arrangements; therefore it is necessary to examine institutional theories and models. Some institutions are influenced by their historical positions, in that, they try to preserve a certain history or address past injustices. This leans more towards historical institutionalism. Some institutions focus on socio economic, political and cultural influences, and therefore, need sociological institutionalism.

Public institutions are often plagued by power struggles between different actors as well as external influences. Theories such as entrepreneurial institutionalism speak to such situations. Institutional structure can be used to control the behaviour of actors. For this reason, rational choice theorists view institutions as coordinates and constrainers of self-acting agents for societal benefit. Rules and laws, a theory that the regulative institutions subscribe to can also drive institutions while actors themselves can create rules and values as in realist institutionalism (Thoenig, 2011).

In order to understand the role of the DWYPD as an institution created to address gender inequalities, especially to understand its interface with other departments in terms of policy coordination, it is important to gather knowledge on theories and models of institutional arrangements

The most important aspect of institutional theory is that specific actors play a part in the interface between institutions and policy direction, which is an important element of this research enquiry. The literature reviewed explored this relationship and resulted in findings on institutionalism, which involves actors, institutions and how they influence each other and policy making.

The key debates in this theme are centrered around the history of institutional theories and models. The evolution of institutional theories and models has moved from defining them narrowly to giving a broader and more diverse understanding of different theories that may characterise different institutions. This theory assists in demystifying institutional behaviour and how it shapes policy decisions. This is critical to the study as it explores institutional arrangements and multi sector policy coordination.

The literature revealed that a number of theories/models influence South African institutions and this is mainly based on the history of the country and its focus on addressing past injustices for the future. South African institutions also abide by the rule of law and, because of the democratic nature of the country, the institutions aim to represent the needs of citizens through service delivery.

Background of institutional theory

Key political bodies and administrative structures that govern public affairs, constitutions, organisations and procedures define public administration. The public sector relies on a strong tie of entities such as ministries and agencies to deliver on its mandate. These bodies are called institutions (Peters & Pierre, 2002). The focus of the study is government departments led by Ministers are the main actors. There is a strong tie or relationship between these departments in terms of the coordination of policies of the DWYPD. Most important is the dependence of the DWYPD on these stakeholder departments for its policy coordination.

Institutions give a guidance to behaviour, encourage social order and trust which, facilitates cooperation for social and economic progress. Actors within institutions are guided by rules and procedures, these in turn structure social interaction by guiding actors' behaviour (Heke & Levitsky, 2004, cited in Nganje, 2015). Behaviour, order, trust, cooperation as well as application of rules and procedures are important in analysing institutional arrangements of departments in coordinating a policy.

From a governance perspective, institutions are societal restraints which structure the interface of rational self-interested parties, but also to relate the beliefs, preferences and expectations of society in general (or its influential actors). Institutions serve as both instruments for enabling co-operation and stimulating collective interest of society and reflect political contestation. Actors and institutions are rooted in specific historical, political and social contexts and their interaction cannot be viewed outside of these settings (Nganje, 2015). When different actors are involved in the coordination of one policy, as is the case with the DWYPD and its stakeholder departments. It is important to note which constraints (self or institutional) exist to guide the behaviour of actors, and to assess in whose interest these actors are acting (Nganje, 2015). Ideally, institutions working together should facilitate cooperation amongst themselves and promote the collective interest of society, especially in a democratic state. Political power should be contested and the interests of different members in society should be represented (Nganje, 2015).

To understand how policy making functions inside an organisation, the following should be considered: the actual goals to be pursued, the way information, opportunities and support are built and elaborated, as well as the decision-making processes. Power issues and power games govern how public institutions function. Common goals do not exist; therefore, institutional strategies are needed to guide opportunistic behaviours of actors and warrant collective action (Peterson & Pierre, 2002). The goals that the DWYPD wants to achieve with these policies should be clear, as communication and decision-making elements are important in the achievement of the policy objectives. Power issues are important in ensuring that the DWYPD remains in control of policy coordination and most importantly are able to influence stakeholder departments to participate. The research finds that when functioning without a legislative mandate, regulating power in institutional behaviour (especially in cross sectoral policies) is becomes a challenge.

In historic terms, the nature of institutions and their control over activity in social scientific thinking was never clear and consensual. Theories ranged from economic to political and religious. Over the history of social scientific thinking,

institutional theories grew and improved, old institutionalism was driven out by the rise of conceptions of social life made up of purposive, constrained, rational and free actors (Meyer, 2007). The key concept in the new ideology of institutionalism centred on actors, varying from individuals, nation states to organisations. Society was made up of these actors and social change was a result of their activities (Meyer, 2007). Actors are vital when it comes to institutions, as it is believed that a relationship of influence exists between the two.

In this study, it was important to examine the nature of institutions and how they control the activities in social thinking. In other words, the influence should be clear. There have been new conceptions and understanding of institutional theories over the years, which will be helpful throughout the study.

In the past, institutional factors brought compliance in terms of behaviour in social settings with an emphasis on the role of institutions in bringing about conformity. In this case non-conformity by institutions to rules resulted in heavy penalties in the form of legal as well as social sanctions (Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Jepperson, 1991, cited in Biesenthal, Clegg, Mahalingam & Sankaran, 2018). It is common that organisations do not always conform to rules, myths or expectations of their own environment, but rather in other ways, such as avoidance, defiance or manipulation (Oliver, 1991, cited in Biesenthal et al., 2018). Rules always change and this creates complexities in institutional arrangements. It is important that stakeholder departments involved in the coordination of the two policies of DWYPD conform to rules and expectations of what they are expected to deliver on. Should this not be the case, it will affect policy implementation. The research did find that the DWYPD has no authority to hold the stakeholders to account for non-conformity to the rules.

It is also important to note the different relationships between different institutions. This necessitates a discussion on stakeholder theory. Stakeholders refer to people who can and are affected by actions of other connected through value chain, creation and trade. These individuals depend on each other to achieve their personal goals, and also depend firmly on others

for their existence. Although the latter definition highlights the importance of stakeholder to each other, the role definitions played should not be over emphasised. The most important element of stakeholder theory is the relations between an organisation and its stakeholders (Hörisch, Freeman & Schaltegger, 2014).

Historical institutionalism

Historical institutionalism is a perspective that sees public administration as part and parcel of political life and is against the idea that the state works as an independent agent. In terms of this theory, the outcomes of public policies are guided by existing and past institutional arrangements (Peters & Pierre, 2002). The main claim made by historical institutionalism is that policy choices made in the past, determine choices made in the present. In terms of historic institutionalism, political and administrative organisations, rules and procedures, which regulate relationships between economic actors and the state, are path dependent. The public sector is structured around disproportionate power relationships, where some groups win while others lose and competition exists. The main thrust of historical institutionalism is that politics and policies shape institutions, whereas old institutionalism holds the opposite view (Peters and Pierre 2002).

As stated in the preceding sections, historic institutionalism has a strong influence on public institutions in South Africa mainly because of its history and the conceptualisation of the country's democratic state. The emphasis on path dependence of institutions in policy coordination is the important factor that this study will be exploring about government departments.

Thoenig (2003) also emphasises the influence of political life in historical institutionalism, and questions the idea that the state machinery works as a completely undifferentiated passive agent. Historical institutionalism considers that outcomes of public policies only represent strong social forces, but are guided by existing and past arrangements. According to this theory, then, policies made in the past shape choices made today. Thoenig (2003) also

asserts that political and administrative activities together with actors are path dependant.

It is a given that agencies have different influence, some more than others with procedures that may contradict or conflict. Public institutions influence administrative and socio-political players by offering a degree of predictability and defining models of behaviour and set protocols that are stereotyped and ready for use. Historical institutionalists believe that policies and politics shape institutions (Thoenig, 2003). Power struggles and influence are important factors to consider when it comes to historical institutionalism. The system of government is controlled by politics. It is almost a given that power struggles and influence will be at play as they are characteristics of politics. Most important for this study, therefore is how power struggles and influence affect the policy coordination of the DWYPD. The study explored the kind of power and influence the DWYPD has over other departments and determined the driving force in the policy coordination. It emerged that a power struggle did play out in the institutional arrangements of the policies of the DWYPD.

Policy and structural choices made in the beginning of the institution will continue to influence the behaviour of the institution (Steinmo, Thelen & Longstreth, 1992, cited in Peters, 2000). The DWYPD was created to correct past injustices and ensure that women are empowered. The apartheid government used its political power to create a strictly hierarchal social order, which was maintained by a co-operation between religious, political and cultural leadership developed to produce hegemony (Du Pisani, 2001, cited in Morrell, Jewkes & Lindegger, 2012). Therefore, policies created by the DWYPD will always refer to past injustices while trying to create a balance for the future.

Historical institutionalism is also concerned with the relationship between specific institutions and the political, economic, social and cultural context in which they exist. In historical institutionalism, institutions do not exist because of rational actors looking to promote their self-interest in an orderly manner, but as a legacy of historic processes and complexities, which influence the

interest of political actors (Nganje, 2015). Actors in historic institutionalism should act in the interest of the institutions that they serve rather than self-interest. In coordinating cross sectoral policies, acting in self interest in not the best approach as the interest of stakeholders has to be considered.

Empirical institutionalism on the other hand is concerned with whether institutions make any difference in policy choices or political stability (Peters, 2000). What binds these theories is that structure matters and structures stay whereas people come and go. Structures also create greater regularity of human behaviour and that institutions create predictable, regular behaviour necessary for peaceful and effective political systems (Peters, 2000). Through government elections that take place in 5-year cycles, political parties contest for power. The political parties themselves are also governed by individuals who come and go while the structure of the parties remains. Whilst the governance structure that is largely governed by politics such as South Africa, it is important to take note of the influence of individuals on institutions, which in turn may give rise to institutional entrepreneurship.

Institutional entrepreneurs

Political institutions are not just structures of corporation, but also structures of power, which reflect and reinforce certain power dynamics (Moe, 2005, cited Nganje, 2015). This gives rise to institutional entrepreneurship, which is made up of powerful and resourceful actors and the concept is used to explain endogenous institutional change (Nganje 2015). In its theory, actors with interest in particular institutional arrangements can mobilise their resources and serve as facilitators for the transformation and creation of institutions. However, this may raise challenges, as it is difficult for actors who are institutionally embedded to remove themselves from pressures and act strategically (Batilana, 2006, cited Nganje, 2015).

Political structures are a key influence in the South African governance structure. This gives an opportunity to institutional entrepreneurs to have influence over the governance of public institutions (Nganje, 2015). Whether this is a positive or a negative influence is something that may need to be

explored on a case-by-case merit. It can be stated as Batilana (2006) points out that many challenges may arise because of this self-interest, which may lead to actors being challenged in terms of their abilities to act strategically. In the case of public institutions, influence of institutional entrepreneurs would come from government as previously seen in cases of state capture (Batilana 2006).

Institutional entrepreneurs are able to mobilise resources to realise interests their value (Scott, 2014, cited in Biesenthal et al., 2018). They play the game, introduce new games, or transform the rules of institutionalised games and, they can also be individual or collective agents. Institutional entrepreneurs focus not only on the creation of new business organisations, but also on the generation of new organisational models and policies that change the direction and flow of organisational activity. Opportunities are their main driving force. Institutional entrepreneurship is also an influence of strategy and power, bringing actors and agency together to the realisation of the creation of new institutions or remake existing ones (Biesenthal et al., 2018).

The study explored the extent to which institutional entrepreneurship has influence on government departments in South Africa. In the case of this study, the influence of institutional entrepreneurs would represent a different dynamic, which is outside the scope of government departments as it is known to be more for private interests than public interest. The dynamic centred on self-interest may also be one that threatens democracy as with realist institutionalism.

Realist institutionalism

Realist institutionalism prescribes to the idea that actors themselves, their existence and characters prior to the institutional regime create rules. Actors creating norms only has a binding effect over actors if they support it and actors create their own networks (Meyer, 2007). This theory puts actors at the centre over the institutions. Actors are the guiding force, they create rules, which they can break and create their own network. The institutional ideology here is centred on actors and their interest. It will be interesting to find out in a case

where a policy to be coordinated includes different actors with different interest. The question and complexity will centre on whose interest takes precedence.

This shows less path-dependence and interdependence with external actors, which lead more to sociological institutionalism. In sociological institutionalism, actors are guided by institutional structures whereas in realist institutionalism, control and power lies in the hands of actors. The theory believes that actors do not only generate the interest of states but also that of other groups, which include professionals, social movements and non-governmental structures (Meyer, 2007). A sociological institutionalist approach then, brings a different dynamic of not only looking at actors' interest but also the interest of others. In a country like South Africa with its past of oppression, a theory like realist institutionalism would be challenged in many ways as it places too much power in the hands of actors, which may represent their own self-interest, rather than that of the population at large. South Africa's democracy is centred on the voice of its citizens, as government is expected to represent the interests of its people.

Sociological institutionalism

Sociological institutionalism describes public organisations as self-dependent communities and not as a collectively deliberately constructed entities to achieve specific goals. It deals with the way in which participants are influenced, transformed and completed by structures (Peters & Pierre, 2002). It defines what institutions mean in a macro way and includes symbols, moral models and cognitive schemes. In terms of this theory, society or culture as a whole shapes structures, values and actions/non-actions of the public sector (Peterson & Pierre, 2002). This theory puts a lot of emphasis on how institutions are influenced by societal structures. Applying this theory in public institutions of South Africa that have a variety in their society and represent different interests should be challenging.

In sociological institutionalism, organisations are considered institutional actors. They promote values and interests that are embedded in the local

communities, which they operate. The theory believes in the bottom up approach. What happens at the bottom is more fundamental than what happens at the top (Thoenig, 2003). This study is concerned with initiatives towards gender equality in advanced industrialised societies. Feminist institutions often emphasise representation and voice, giving women access to policy making bodies through independent bodies (Gatens, 1998; Stetson & Mazur, 1995 cited in Siedman, 2003). In post-colonial states, feminist organisations and institutions tend to focus more on mobilising women by seeking to ensure their participation in a gendered project of national development (Molyneux, 2000; Staudt, 1998, cited in Siedman, 2003). In socialist or state-centric ideology, a top-down approach is preferred where women's policy makers mobilise women to support state efforts by creating programmes for women within the national development strategy (Siedman, 2003).

The theory believes that public bureaucracy must cope with constraints and pressures applied by the outside local context in which it operates. It also involves processes through which members of an agency acquire values that go beyond the requirements of the organisational task. Sociological institutionalism provides a frame of meaning which guides human action and is similar to cultural systems. Society or culture determine the acts and non-acts, the structures and values of the public sector (Thoenig, 2003). This idea is linked with democratic principles.

The main difference between historic institutionalism and sociological institutionalism is that the former places a great emphasis on the influence of the history and politics on institutional form; therefore, it highlights an important aspect of interdependence. While sociological institutionalism places emphasis on factors such as culture and social settings, which influence institutions, the theory also emphasises self-dependence, which is the opposite view of historic institutionalism. What is important to take from sociological institutionalism, which applies to government departments, is that policies should reflect the interest of the people and involve them in problem

solving. The DWYPD and stakeholder departments carry some elements of both of these theories.

New institutionalism

According to new institutionalism, public management is the consequence of human activities and not the result of applied techniques. Leaders are not in full control, organisations are not passive, and policy choices are not consensual (Thoenig, 2003). In terms of this theory, public administration should be action driven and actionable. It is possible to reform and control public organisations. It questions how far organised action is manageable and to what extent public order is achievable in pluralistic societies (Peters & Pierre, 2002). All the issues highlighted by new institutionalism can also be found in democratic institutions even though the institutions were not designed in that way. The environment in which institutions operate can cause them to apply techniques of new institutionalism because individuals who serve certain interest lead these institutions.

Normative institutionalism

For administration changes to occur, normative institutionalism suggests there should be a match between rules, identities and situations and successful reforms are culturally sensitive (Thoenig, 2003). People in institutions act because of normative standards over what they personally desire. Their behaviour is guided by the value of the institution (March & Olsen 1984, 1989, 1996, cited in Peters, 2000). The issue raised by Peters (2000) of individualising institutions rather than institutional systems is a key factor to consider in policy coordination. This serves as a matter of interest in policy development.

The South African governance system is largely ruled by politicians and political parties, while institutions are expected to function with more stability and adherence to the rule of law. This interface is an interesting discussion of institutional theory. There should be a match between rules, identities and situations, and context matters. Empirically grounded theories consider public institutions as pillars of political power, outcomes of societal values or self-

constrained social systems (Thoenig, 2011). Rules remain important in any institutional arrangement of policies to be coordinated, especially in cross-sectoral policies involving different departments (Thoenig, 2011). The research found that the rule of law is a cornerstone of public institutions in South Africa. Government departments function through the guidance of the Constitution and the legal mandate, which the department has been given.

Rational choice institutionalism

In terms of rational choice institutionalism, institutions are arrangements of rules and incentives and members of those institutions act according to the rules and incentives. Unlike normative institutionalism, actions of members in rational choice institutionalism do not change their preferences in relation to their membership in the institutions. Rather, members of rational choice institutionalism have their own firm preferences, which remain unchanged by their institutional involvement (Peters, 2000).

Rational choice views institutions as constraints that are designed to shape human interactions (Sheplse, 2008, cited, Nganje 2015). As such, institutions coordinate and constrain the strategic choices of rational political players and are important in resolving collective action problems (Sheplse, 2008, cited Nganje, 2015). It is assumed that rational choices of self-interested actors acting in individual interest will benefit the functions of institutions. However, there is no guarantee that actions from rational actors will be optimal and efficient for institutions. Rational choice theories help appreciate the importance of the individual/ organisational agency in institutional dynamics (Nganje 2015). Some of the participants in the semi-structured interviews allude to views relating to the rational choice institutionalism when it comes to the DWYPD, thereby impugning self-interest by the DWYPD in the coordination of the policies.

Regulative institutionalism

Regulative elements use clear explicit rules and scrutinise activities; normative elements look at strict and compulsory elements; and cultural-cognitive elements rely on shared beliefs (culture), and are dependent on individual

reasoning (Biesenthal et al., 2018). These are the key ideologies that institutions function with. Moreover, regulative institutions are characterised by laws and regulations, operating laws, knowledge of government, design and construction standards and approval processes. Normative institutions are characterised by work practices, social norms, expectations and market knowledge as well as local preferences and industry organisation, logistics and relationships, resources and productivity. Lastly, culture cognitive institutions are characterised by local cultural beliefs and language/concepts/meanings (Javernick-Will & Scott, 2011, cited, in Biesenthal et al., 2018).

Rules, regulations and processes should be the cornerstone of any cross-sectoral policy coordination; institutions would need to be confined by rules. In cases where rules are not followed, action should be taken by the responsible entity. With the coordination of the two policies by the DWYPD, rules of engagements would need to be applied. In such cases where departments work together some agreements would need to be signed which guides the participation of the different departments. Government departments would usually sign a memorandum of agreement, which gives guidance on the policy co-ordination.

Whether government institutions in South Africa are guided by the rule of law or other ideologies such as work practices, social/cultural believes is important in this study, more so, if there are clashes in ideologies of the different institutions. What is vital to the enquiry is how the different institutions resolve or deal with the conflict for the success of the policy to be coordinated.

Challenges

Complexities may arise as a result of multiple dominant or co-existing rationalities (Fincham & Forbes, 2016, cited in Biesenthal et al., 2018). The complexities may also come from rationalities that overlap as well (Fan & Zietsma, 2016, cited in Biesenthal et al., 2018). Where there are conflicting rationalities, certain institutions' preferences take precedent over others, thus creating cross arrangements of a range of competing institutional forces (Douglas, 1986, cited in Biesenthal et al., 2018). This may happen often in the

coordination of cross-sectoral policies. The complexities can give rise to a number of challenges; especially where different departments represent their respective interest in the policy. The challenges can stem from disagreement on who will own the policy, policy direction, resource allocation etc. These are led by the dominance of power and who is the most powerful actor to exercise their power. These challenges are in line with research findings.

The constraints that are referred to by the rational choice approach can be linked to rules and guidelines that restrict the actions of actors. However, it is important to note the self-interest of rational actors. In policy coordination there are cases of rational actors who look out for their own interest. This is another reason for conflict and complexities in cross-sectoral policy coordination. The main question would be whose interest takes precedence over the others. The DWYPD as the lead department should ensure that the interests of all stakeholders are accounted for and establish platforms for engagement and deliberation before any decision-making. It should be expected that all stakeholders' interests are considered as they represent their respective audiences in the policy objective.

One of the main causes of institutional dysfunction and inefficiency is the absence of political will to transform institutional arrangements (that are shaped by historical processes) to make them responsive to prevailing social conditions. Institutional inefficiencies can also be the result of conflict between different institutional orders (Nganje 2015). Political will serves as an important tool for policy coordination, in the absence of political will, it is difficult to oversee policy objectives. Political will can either be an enabler or a bottle neck to policy coordination. Political will is an important factor to discover in this study. Should there be no political will backing up the participation of all affected departments, policy coordination between the different departments will be a challenge. In terms of the research, there was no clear finding on the existence of political will (Nganje 2015). Only the representative from the DSD expressed the political will of their Minister to take part in the Sanitary Dignity Framework, otherwise, for a long time no one wanted to take ownership of the policy until the DWYPD took over.

Conclusion

This section has discussed key issues of institutional theories and models. It has established the various institutional theories/models applied in analysing public institutions. Historical institutionalism has an invasive influence as South African institutions are shaped by historic ideologies stemming from the country's political past. Institutions in the democratic country were designed to addressed past injustices and contribute towards a new democratic country. The idea that these institutions work together to deliver a better life for all is an indication of path-dependence and interdependence between the institutions.

Sociological institutionalism also has had a role to play in that South African institutions are also influenced by social, cultural and educational beliefs of group action and group interests. This is the cornerstone of the democratic country where government works to serve the needs of the people. New institutionalism also has its influence on state institutions, South African institutions are also regulative, in that, laws and regulations guide them, but there also is an opportunity for entrepreneurial institutions. Entrepreneurial institutionalism also has its effect on South African institutions.

For South Africa's diverse society, new gender institutions were conceptualised to assist with access, representation and mobilisation. South Africa's institutional framework or rather "national gender machinery" was a key part of the South African democratic transition (Siedman, 2003). The strategy adopted for South African government departments to address gender inequalities was that in each ministry, gender desks were created to examine government policies, seeking to ensure that new policies addressed sources of gender inequality (Siedman, 2003). This was almost fostering working relations between government departments and institutions created for gender quality. What was not clear was the influence that the gender machineries had in terms of making government departments account for gender quality initiatives.

Rules, self-interest, cultural, social and political aspects are some of the key influences. In the interest of the study, what influences the creation and existence of institutions in South Africa will be a guiding principle on how they work together in the coordination of policies. Especially how they address different interest amongst themselves to achieve policy objectives. Considering the colourful political history, it is expected that different schools of thought may influence institutions.

Theme 2: Institutional arrangements specific to national gender machinery and interdepartmental public sector gender work.

The section discussed institutional arrangements specific to either the national gender machinery, or interdepartmental public sector gender work. In doing this, direct reference is made to the ideas behind the creation of gender machineries in South Africa. The study also discussed other factors that might affect the work of gender machineries or interdepartmental public sector gender work. This section assisted the researcher in filling the research gap in enquiring on the working relationship between the DWYPD and its key stakeholders in the coordination of two of its gender equality policies. This section assisted in mapping out what the DWYPD is expected to do in order to function well as a gender machinery and to explore general challenges faced by gender machineries and what can be done to strengthen them.

Gender Machineries refer to formal government structures that are established to promote gender equality and rights of women, as well as their position in society. These organisations take various forms and may be established in formal statutes or political structures. It is expected that these institutions are centralised, complex and well-funded to be able to execute their mandates properly. Through their varying forms, they are expected to adopt to political winds, and changing demands of gender policy and politics (McBride & Mazur, 2012).

National machineries for the progression of women are regarded as suitable institutional mechanisms to ensure the execution of gender mainstreaming by institutions and issues of gender equality remain a key focus within public policy (Rai, 2017). There are two important themes to consider, first whether national machineries as state institutions are the most appropriate platforms for furthering women's interests. This includes the viability of women's engagements with the state and the nature of women interests. The second important theme is viability of national machineries as bodies for promoting women's interests. What is important here is whether these institutions

command the necessary resources to be able to promote women's interest (Rai, 2017).

In South Africa's post democracy, new institutions were expected to address gender inequalities at every level. The new government was expected to examine policies' impact on gender relations, seeking to address the sources of gender inequality (Siedman, 2003). The institutional centrepiece for this effort was the Commission for Gender Equality (CGE), which was established in terms of the Constitution and was there to serve as a "watchdog" for government institutions' policy implementation. The CGE was developed to guide government departments and hold them to account on Constructional principles of equality for all, thereby, reflecting the influence of historical institutionalism (Siedman, 2003).

The policy of the machinery itself must be coherent, stating its goals and priorities with clear lines of responsibility and accountability. Both policies were clear on what the DWYPD wanted to do, however, on stakeholder buy-in and accountability the policies were not clear. In practice, national gender machineries have weak, unclear and non-existent mandates and they have been developed as a result of pressures from women's movements or donors (Bell, Bryne, Laier, Baden & Marcus, 2002).

Clarity on mandate is important, some national machineries focus on their role as policy advisers and catalysts for gender mainstreaming, leaving implementation to other departments. Other machineries also get involved in the monitoring of policies implemented (Rai, 2017). The successful implementation of a policy by a national gender machinery raises its profile and can further lead to good cross-sectoral relationships with other ministries. The research found that DWYPD had an extended mandate on both policies which was not in line with their functions or capacity.

National gender machineries are often overburdened with many potential roles and strategies. These ranges of roles include advocacy or advisory, policy oversight and implementation of projects (Bell et al., 2002). An important factor

to look at is whether national machineries are going to implement their own projects (whether it will seek collaboration with other affected ministries) or whether it will try to influence or advise other ministries or agents in implementing projects (Bell et al., 2002). National machineries can also adopt the role of central advocacy. However, this poses a challenge of having to work across sectors. To ensure that gender is integrated into all sectors of government, the national machinery would need to have the authority to review and comment on all other ministries' policies and programmes (Bell et al., 2002). The DWYPD has opted to playing a central role in the coordination gender policies, however in terms of the findings of the research, the DWYPD assumed many roles in the implementation of the two policies, some of which were over and above their mandate. The research found that the DWYPD does not have any legal authority over its stakeholder departments.

National gender machineries can be effective but under conditions which include location, resources and strong democratic movements holding actors accountable. All gender machineries are embedded in certain socio-economic and political contexts with the following key elements, location within decision-making, clarity of mandate, links with civil society, human and financial resources as well as accountability for the machinery itself (Rai, 2017).

When considering the institutions set up of gender machineries, the location of the institution is important in guiding its influence in the planning process across all development sectors (Goetz, 2018). Institutional location is important in that it provides access to the technical core of policy making. However, challenges such as lack of clear mechanisms for ensuring changes in government decision such as clear means of ensuring cross-ministerial compliance with gender policies may arise (Goetz, 2018).

Location raises the profile of the machinery and enhances its economic and political resources. In some instances, the success of the machinery comes from its cross-ministerial location. The location also determined the national machinery's role at regional and global levels (Rai, 2017).

The location of the department is an important issue for policy coordination, in the case of the study the DWYPD is location in the Presidency, which is the highest office in the country and the centre of government. In 2014, the DWYPD was placed under the Presidency in order to locate it at the centre of government (DWYPD: RSA, 2015). The extent to which this has assisted the DWYPD in its influence on its stakeholder departments is something that the study explores and presents findings on.

Where the machinery is placed has in important impact on its status and ultimately its relationship with other ministries. Where a national gender machinery merges with another department, it faces challenges of competition, politically and resource wise (Bell et al., 2002). The size of the staff within the ministry also affects its ability to institutionalise gender within government policy and programmes. The level of skill of the staff is also important (Bell et al., 2002). Budget allocation is another important factor affecting national gender machineries. It is believed that all machineries are generally underfunded with limited access to execute their mandate. The limited budgets negatively affect policy commitments (Bell et al., 2002). The research did not make a strong case for resource scarcity in the DWYPD.

The research found that the location should be able to affect the influence of the department; however, in reality the location has not assisted the DWYPD. The research also found that resources are challenge in the DWYPD however; prioritisation of resources is something that the department also struggles with. Due to the DWYPD not having a legal mandate, holding actors/ stakeholder departments to account is another challenge.

The research found that the GRPBMEA was not very clear on implementation as well as monitoring and evaluation. In terms of the sanitary dignity policy, the research found complexities in the department's plan to implement and monitor the policy in other spheres of government.

The study further found that the mandate of the DWYPD was compromised in that it did not have any legal standing. Also, in line with Siedman (2003), it can

be said that the influence of women movements on the creation of gender institutions in South Africa has had a negative impact on their operations. For a long time, there have been public debates on whether the DWYPD was created as a result of political pressure to lobby support of the women's movement within the ruling party.

All these challenges may lead to poor implementation, which may compromise the position of the machinery. It is important to note that mainstreaming works through its ownership by cross-ministerial structures of government (Rai, 2017). The involvement in developing policy initiatives can involve negotiations by the national machinery and other ministries to expand the network of bodies involved in the process of mainstreaming gender equality agendas (Rai, 2017).

For national machineries to function well, it is important that they have well established mandates, which are backed up by law, and which define their powers and roles. The inclusion of the national machinery in the national development plan is also important for its success (Bell et al., 2002). If the national machinery does not have a legal basis for doing this, it will face challenges. Constraints affecting national gender machineries include: changes in their conceptualisation, weak mandates, lack of resources, location instability and appropriateness, bureaucratic resistance, conflicting roles, self-constraints, lack of autonomy and lack of accountability (Bell et al., 2002).

Formal roles of gender machineries have been made to fit within the following categories: advocacy, policy oversight or monitoring and policy implementation. It is important, then, that the mandate of the gender machinery is clearly defined (Goetz, 2018). This is an important element to the study, the role of the DWYPD and its influence on the coordination of the policy. The project of pursuing gender equality across government departments if often referred to as "gender mainstreaming". Mainstreaming measures are intended to instil gender sensitive institutional, policy and operational changes across the public sector (Goetz, 2018).

Other countries attempt it as cross-ministerial policy administration, which comes with many challenges as well, because it may deal with bureaucratic interest that may be in conflict. Most public administrators have a strong desire to protect ministerial territory and resist cross cutting interests (Goetz, 2018), especially in the context of resource scarcity, administrative heads tend to guard their own territories because development resources linked with projects and programmes give opportunities for support. This gives rise to competition among ministries (Goetz, 2018).

As such, ministerial territory will be an important aspect of this study; it explores government departments led by five different Ministers, with Ministers with different mandates and interests. The findings do allude to conflicts and complexities when it comes to ministerial territory in the coordination of the two policies. For example, the Department of Basic Education did not participate in the development of the Sanitary Dignity policy due to withdrawal by its Minister citing unclear roles and uncertainty of budget allocations.

Conclusion

National gender machineries are an important tool in facilitating gender equality, therefore the DWYPD is an important institution in South Africa. In most cases, the requirement to have gender machineries comes from international organisations, but member states are expected create their own country initiatives. In South Africa, the DWYPD was specifically created to deal with past human rights violence which saw women especially black women being oppressed and discriminated against. The legacy of the apartheid system has still not completely been eradicated.

What is important in ensuring that national gender machineries are affective is their clear mandate, suitable location, resources in the form of finance etc. The DWYPD has no legal mandate and was created in terms of a Presidential proclamation. Its role is also seen as a duplication of existing structures and departments; this causes problems when the department wants to execute its mandate. The DWYPD was placed in the Presidency in order to make it more

influential, whether this is the case practically is something that still needs to be investigated.

Most importantly, the literature also discusses what is important for gender machineries when they work in cross sector ministries. What the literature says is that the role of the gender machinery must be clear, its location must allow it to have the necessary authority or influence over other ministries and there must be common goals that the ministries are working towards. This is particularly important for this research projects as it aims to look at how the DWYPD works with key stakeholder departments in the implementation of its policies.

The implementation of the gender equality policies of government has been characterised with conflict; specifically conflicts over how government institutions relate to women movements and concerns about whether the feminists' ideal should be integrated into efforts to address racial and economic inequalities (Siedman, 2003).

What has been dominant in the institutions of South Africa lately is the role of political influence. With one dominant party remaining in power, the significant shift in South African institutions from their conceptions post 1994 is the type of leadership, which has seen some of the institutions, lose their credibility as a result of the political landscape. Specifically, when it comes to the DWYPD, there are several debates on whether the creation of the institution was led by political influence.

The section has discussed institutional arrangements specific a national gender machinery and interdepartmental public sector gender work. In doing this, direct reference is made to the ideas behind the creation of gender machineries in South Africa. The literature also discussed other factors that may affect the work of gender machineries or interdepartmental public sector gender work. The discussion around what is required for gender machineries is important, for the work of the DWYPD is coordinating its policies with other

departments. The DWYPD needs to be well established to have the influence it requires to foster relationships with stakeholder departments.

The DWYPD also needs to be capacitated and provide with resources to enable its policies to be well coordinated. Discussion on the location of a gender machinery which affects it influence is important to the DWYPD as it is currently placed in the Presidency and the research aims to find out to what extent that has worked in their favour. Issues around clarity of mandate and clearly defined roles in the coordination of its policies are also important to its success. It is also expected that challenges in the nature of resources, as well as territory will be experienced in the coordination of cross-sectoral policies. This is very relevant to the study as it aims to also investigate the possible challenges that may be experienced by the DWYPD and its stakeholder departments in the coordination of cross-sectoral policies.

Theme 3: Coordination in gender-based programming as an empirical manifestation of the models discussed above

This section discusses the examples of coordination in gender-based programming as an empirical manifestation of the models discussed in the above section. This section will discuss the coordination of the following policies: gender responsive budgeting, national gender policy in Zimbabwe, Sanitary Dignity policy and gender-based violence, specifically looking at the mutli-stakeholder approach to the policies. This is another example of a cross sectoral gender policy which was coordinated by different stakeholders similar to the two policies of the DWYPD.

Gender mainstreaming is one of the key strategies in ensuring that gender inequality initiatives are incorporated in policy making. Gender mainstreaming (in terms of horizontal policy coordination) is institutionally and conceptually limited. Institutional because structures and processes for mainstreaming gender are parallel rather than cross cutting or integrated. They are also conceptual because cross cutting issues such as gender are seen to be discreet rather than intertwined (Allwood, 2015).

For example, literature on environmental policy integration, gender mainstreaming, policy coherence for development and climate change has focused on institutional obstacles that have been encountered. Specifically, these refer to the fragmented nature of the legal-institutional structures of the European Union, the categorised character of EU policy fields and the disjointed decision-making machinery (Elgestrom & Pilegaard, 2009, cited in Allwood, 2015) and the EU's policy framework, which does not display a clear pattern or coherence (Carbone, 2009, cited in Allwood, 2015). Challenges with power imbalances within institutions also affect decision-making (Allwood, 2015). This is particularly relevant to the study, as it looks at the institutional and conceptual relationships between the DWYPD and its stakeholder departments in the coordination of policies.

Gender responsive budgeting

Gender responsive budgeting is about the devolvement of strategies for changing budgetary processes and policies for expenditures and revenues to reduce inequalities between women and men. It brings focus on issues that have constantly been overlooked in conventional budget analyses and decision making (Elson & Sharp, 2010). Institutional arrangements are an important element in the implementation of a gender responsive budget.

There are many institutional arrangements that are adopted by different countries in their efforts to engender budgets for the benefit of women that have been marginalised especially economically. In most countries, the Ministry of Finance is assigned the responsibility of leading gender budgeting initiatives. Specifically, the Ministry of Finance determines the budgeting requirements for other government departments to follow and works with revenue authorities to change tax laws or regulations (Chakraborty, 2014). In India, the Ministry of finance owned the gender responsive budgeting framework process in its multiple phases (Lahiri et al., 2000). In sub-Saharan Africa, countries such as Rwanda and Uganda ensured that goals related to gender budgeting were set up through the Ministry of Finance, with the assistance of other government agencies. In other countries, the Ministry of Women affairs or any other related Ministry together with the Ministry of Finance with other key departments are tasked with the implementation of gender responsive budgeting initiatives (Chakraborty, 2014).

The collaboration of different departments led by the Ministry of Women in collaboration with the Finance Ministry as an approach for gender responsive budgeting is a good example of the approach that the DWYPD should look at when it comes to implementing the policy. The findings of the study allude to uncertainty in terms of the institutional arrangements as well the implementation, monitoring and evaluation. As seen above, most countries attempt this policy within the Ministry of Finance, and of course, working together with the Ministry on Women Affairs. In terms of the findings, no direct working relationship has been determined between the DWYPD and the NT.

National gender policy in Zimbabwe

Other policies such as the national gender policy in Zimbabwe, in which the Ministry of Women's Affairs, Gender Community and Development has the overall responsibility in the implementation of the policy (Ministry of Women Affairs Gender and Community Development [MWAGCD]: Republic of Zimbabwe [RZ], 2013). The strategies of the policy cut across sectors and require multi sectoral collaboration in order to ensure effective implementation. The policy aims to provide a comprehensive framework for action and aims to enhance the value and effectiveness of the various actors involved in addressing gender inequalities (MWAGCD: RZ, 2013).

The Ministry of Women Affairs, Gender and Community Development is the department that is responsible for developing a detailed strategic action plan and establishing structures for the implementing of the policy. It is also tasked with developing a monitoring and evaluation framework which has targets and guidelines for achievement (MWAGCD: RZ, 2013) and with collecting, synthesising, interpreting and disseminating data as well as mobilising resources for policy implementation. Another mandate is providing support and guidance in implementing patterns and gender focal points and reporting to regional and international conventions and protocols. The Ministry of Finance was tasked with ensuring treasury support towards implementation of the policy (MWAGCD: RZ, 2013).

In this policy, we also see a clear working relationship between the Ministry of Women affairs and the Ministry of Finance. This is the kind of relationship that should be expected between the DWYPD in the coordination especially of the GRPMEA.

Gender focal points and other institutions of government were tasked with ensuring that sector policies and programmes are gender responsive, and provide guidance on the integration of gender justice in planning, budgeting, programming, monitoring and evaluation. Monitoring progress in the implementation and achievement of gender policy initiatives is outlined in the policy (MWAGCD: RZ, 2013). They are also expected to build their institutional staff capacity to ensure a systematic integration of gender issues in all sectors

by working closely with multi-sectoral stakeholders, as well as collecting information and providing progress reports in the implementation of gender policies in their sectors (MWAGCD: RZ, 2013).

Other key institutions also have a role to play. This relationship should also be expected from the DWYPD and key departments such as the DSD, NT, and DBE etc. in the coordination of the Sanitary Dignity policy. However, this collaborative relationship seems good on paper and policy position, the actual working relations and implementation of the policy in Zimbabwe cannot be concluded by looking at the policy, this is an important lesson that the research established in terms of the DWYPD policies.

Sanitary dignity framework

Menstrual hygiene management refers to the ability of women and adolescent girls to use clean menstrual management to absorb or collect blood using soap and water for washing, having access to facilities to dispose of the used menstrual material (UNICEF & WHO, 2014, cited in Ballys, 2017). The implementation of a framework for sanitary dignity also requires institutional integration (Ballys, 2017).

In order to achieve menstrual hygiene management, there must be strategic institutional arrangements and partnerships within government and between government and non-government stakeholders. Reaching menstrual hygiene management targets requires a multi sectoral approach that embraces multi stakeholder partnerships where government plays a coordinating role and makes necessary resources available (Ballys, 2017).

In India, a women's rights organisation started a social media drive on using the #LahukaLagaan to protest the government's decision to impose a 14% tax on sanitary pads categorising them as a luxury commodity. The social media drive received a lot of attention, criticism and outcry forcing government to revise the tax provision (Fadnis 2017). The South African government also after years of lobbying by society members applied a tax-free provision for sanitary towels (Pilane, 2018). The implementation of the sanitary dignity projects developed by DWYPD in South Africa is also multi-layered, involving

different stakeholders and other key line- function departments such as the DSD, DOH, DBE, and NT, provincial and local government (Shabalala, 2012).

Gender based violence

Gender-based violence as defined by Msibi and Sibanda (2016) is an act of violence, which results in psychical, sexual or physiological harm to women, including threats, coercion or denial of liberties. Bates, Schule, Islam and Islam (2004) state that gender-based violence is a common term that portrays the harm perpetrated against a person's will due to imbalances of power. It uses differences between men and women in an abusive manner. Such harm can be physical, sexual, psychological, economic, or socio-cultural. Gender-based violence is widespread across many families, communities; societies and cultures all over the world and the victims of such violence are mostly women and girls (Shabalala, 2012).

In South Africa, the responsibility for addressing gender-based violence lies with different departments. These include social development, health, justice, education, correctional services, police services and others, operating at both the national and provincial spheres. Some of the intervention programmes introduced include victim empowerment programmes, the 16 days of activism campaign as well as the 365- Day national action plan to end gender violence. For example, the 365-day national action plan to end gender violence was initiated by the Department of Justice in 2007 (Department of Justice: RSA, 2007).

The plan was a multi-sector framework and approach developed to end gender violence between 2007 and 2009. The plan recognised that no single sector, government ministry, department or civil society organisation is responsible or has the singular ability to address this challenge by itself (Department of Justice: RSA, 2007). Therefore, the plan is an institutional arrangement with Government at the national, provincial and local spheres, legislatures at national and provincial spheres, statutory bodies (for example the Chapter nine Institutions; Independent Complaints Directorate), civil society which includes unions and non-governmental organisations and traditional authorities as well as business (Department of Justice: RSA, 2007).

Although these have been highlighted as good policy initiatives, the lack of cooperation amongst government departments has been highlighted as one of the key factors that negatively affects the implementation of these programmes (Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation, 2016). In addition, in the state's efforts to address gender inequalities through its institutions, there are duplications of mandates and confusion of roles particularly with the Department of Women whose role has remained unclear since its inception by the 2014 administration and its overlapping function with the Commission for Gender Equality (CGE). The CGE was established in terms of the CGE Act, whereas no clear legislative mandate exists for the DWYPD. There also is a challenge of insufficient human and financial resources to implement laws. This goes back to the key debate of the important element of clear mandates when it comes to gender machineries.

The criminal justice system is weak with challenges in the attrition of cases and problems with the reporting of cases. The state appears unable to address these implementation problems. Lastly, there are lack of coordinated effort to address gender-based violence. For example, the National Council on Gender Based Violence was established as a multi-sectoral approach to addressing GBV in the country. However, with the lack of clarity around its existence and the status of the 365- Day National Action Plan, the space for civil society to engage with government on tackling GBV is slowly shrinking (Mpani & Nsibande, 2015).

This also presents another complex and cross cutting policy issue where multi stakeholder coordination is needed. The DWYPD however, needs to use all its available resources to take a central role in the coordination of its policies. The DWYPD needs to ensure that it has a clear enforceable mandate, provincial offices and the needed resources to implement its policy coordination role.

Conclusion

This section has discussed some policies, which have used a multi sector approach in their implementation. Although there are benefits in departments working together to achieve common goals, challenges may also arise which affect the ultimate delivery of the policy. For this reason, the research aims to

explore challenges that the DWYPD faces in the implementation of their policies, which are linked, to a multi stakeholder approach. The gap that this study aims to fill is to place the DWYPD at the centre of policy coordination to discover the institutional theory models used in coordinating its cross sectoral policies. The research will also place the DWYPD at the centre of the gender machinery to see what kind of challenges the department, together with its stakeholder departments faced in the institutional arrangements of gender policies. Lastly, these steps should enable the study to reach a conclusion on the process of policy coordination.

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This section outlines the proposed research methodology for the study. The study took a qualitative approach using interviews and document analysis. Purposive sampling of 10 participants was used. The participants, who have been working on the development of the two frameworks chosen, are from different government departments. The documents analysed are the two policy frameworks developed by the DWYPD. A thematic analysis of the data was done, using themes derived from the literature review as well as the aims and questions of the research. The researcher took steps to ensure data validity, reliability and credibility. She also ensured that permission for the research was obtained from participants and the leading department. Furthermore, the anonymity of participants could not be ensured however, the real names of participants were not revealed, and also that no harm befell the participants. In addition, she made sure that the participants were comfortable during the research process and informed them of their freedom to stop the interview process at any time, should they so desire. Strategies were employed to ensure that the participant's positionality did not affect the research process and outcomes.

Research Methodology

The research methodology chosen for this study is qualitative research. The main aim of qualitative research is to reflect values of subjectivity, individualism, holism, relativism for interpretation (Streubert & Carpenter, 1995, cited in MacDonald, 2012).

Similarly, Mackey and Gass (2015) define qualitative research as natural and controlled observations, subjective and discovery orientated. Qualitative research is process orientated, ungeneralizable single case studies assuming a dynamic reality and close to the data. The main of this research is to engage in the experiences of officials of the DWYPD and their stakeholder departments in the coordination of policies by DWYPD. This is the best method to use, as the characteristics of qualitative research suit the purpose of this research, which is to probe the experiences of different departments in their

interaction and engagements on policies coordinated by the DWYPD. Qualitative research is an applied method as it is an interactive process between the views and experiences of the researcher and the documents that are part of the policy coordination. The researcher is aware the one of the disadvantages of interviews can be subjective, therefore, document analysis was used in order to ensure that the data is triangulated and ensure validity.

In complex research projects, qualitative research can eliminate ambiguity, and allow the researcher to probe the participant to ensure accurate inputs (Pillay, 2015). The topic this research pursues is a complex one where data cannot be generated from quantitative research, which employs more of statistical analyses. In as much as qualitative research can eliminate ambiguity, it can also be open to different kinds of interpretation (Pillay, 2015). It therefore was important to the researcher to ensure that they capture and present findings, as they were to avoid misinterpretation. Furthermore, Ahmed (2015) also states that when applying qualitative methods researchers need to be careful in the way they think and plan, to ensure that they get accurate results.

Qualitative research aims to interpret and document occurrences from an individual's point of view. The aim is to uncover the world through people's eyes through a process of discovery and explanations, which reflect deep experiences (Gilbert 2001 cited in MacDonald, 2012). The research strategy deals with people's feelings, views where patterns in their inputs are revealed in the absence of control or manipulation by the researcher (Leininger, 1985, cited in MacDonald, 2012). The research is from the participant's point of view, however, leaving the interpretation/analysis to the researcher.

An approach to qualitative research method includes interviews and document analysis (Wanger, Kawulich & Garner, 2012). In the case of this study, this method is chosen because it investigated the experiences and views of government officials who had been involved in the coordination of the Sanitary Dignity policy and well as the GRPBMEA framework. The research also explored what was received in the semi structured interviews triangulated the data received with the two policy documents.

Research Strategy

Theories were used to gather, observe and interpret data. Theories and hypotheses apply in the beginning of the research looking at institutional theory (Dudovskiy n. d). Specific to the research, the prevalence of gender inequality is proved in South African history. Data shows that even in the post-democracy era, gender inequality still manifests itself. Therefore, an analysis of how the DWYPD implements the policies it develops to address gender inequalities is important. Theories and themes were generated from the data; specifically looking at how stakeholder involvement affects the implementation of policies developed by the DWYPD to achieve gender equality in the department's Social Transformation and Economic Empowerment programme. After engaging the literature and looking at the aim of the research as well as the research questions, themes were developed from the literature review where questions that fit into the themes were also generated.

Data collection

Document analysis

Document analysis was used to review strategic documents which indicated how the DWYPD planned to implement policies it develops. This provided guidance in preparing for the semi-structured interviews. In addition, it enhanced the data collection process. Document analysis also assisted in supplementing, triangulating, validating and verifying data and information collected through other data collection methods such as, the interviews (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2000). The Sanitary Dignity Framework as well as the GRPBMEA were reviewed as part of the document analysis.

Document analysis entails the review or evaluation of documents. It may contain words or images that have been recorded without the interviewer's intervention. These are analysed through finding, selecting, making sense of and synthesising data contained in documents. Document analysis is often used as a second source in qualitative research in order to triangulate data (Denzin, 1970, cited in Bowen, 2009). The researcher must draw on at least two sources of evidence for convergence and corroboration. Triangulating data provided credible evidence in this study (Eisner, 1991, cited in Bowen, 2009).

The convergence and corroboration process can also assist in eliminating potential biases that may occur (Bowen, 2009).

Looking at the literature review and the research questions, themes were developed for the data collection. Questions were developed in terms of the themes for collecting data from the two documents chosen.

Data collection through interviews

For the purpose of this study, face-to-face semi-structured interviews were used. This approach is designed to explore the ideas, experiences, beliefs, views, opinions and behaviours of respondents, which ultimately assist researchers in answering their research questions. Specifically, the research looked at interviewing people who are major players in the development of intervention strategies within the DWYPD as well as stakeholder departments.

Sample Size

The sampling method used in this study was non-probability sampling, specifically purposive sampling (Wagner et al., 2012). Purposive sampling was chosen because the researcher targeted the research participants and the relevant documents with the expectation that their knowledge would provide the information needed from the research. According to Etikan & Bala (2017), this sampling design was chosen because the researcher made a judgment about who or what would provide the best information needed for the success of the study. Ten people were interviewed from the DWYPD and stakeholder departments (three from the DWYPD and seven from stakeholder departments). The targeted sample are experts in the field and did demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the content of the study.

The researcher had initially planned to interview 5 officials from the DWYPD. However due to challenges faced in securing interview slots, the researcher was only able to interview 3 participants. This led to inadequate representation of officials to speak on the GRPBMEA. This is one of the limitations of this research. The researcher also tried to interview participants from the Departments of Health, Higher Education, Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation. However, attempts to get responses from the participants were

unsuccessful. Another limitation to the research was the researcher's inability to interview participants from key provincial stakeholder departments to give information on their knowledge and experience of policies. The two documents chosen for the document analysis were also chosen in line with purposive sampling. They are documents that are directly linked to the research topic as they are policy documents that the study relates to.

Data collection and analysis

Data preparation

In terms of the document analysis, the two policy frameworks are public documents on the website of the DWYPD. However, the version on the website is not the latest version of the document. As such, the researcher requested the latest and approved copies from officials within the DWYPD. Hard copies of the documents were printed to prepare for the findings. For the interviews, participants were approached through email, where responses were given as to whether they wanted to participate or not. The researcher used a smart phone to record the conversations (with the consent of the participant) all participants consented to the recording. Notes were taken to highlight specific points that were crucial for this research. The recorded data were saved on a hard drive and the drive together with the notes were locked away in a safe place.

Data was thematically coded according to emerging themes that would answer the research questions. The themes chosen were based on the questions asked in the research reprocess. The questions the participants were asked in the research process were directly linked to the research questions and the objectives of the research.

Data reliability, validity, and credibility

There are a number of strategies that researchers can employ to ensure validity, reliability and credibility of data in qualitative research. Researchers need to account for personal biases, which may influence the research findings (Morse, 2002, cited in Noble & Smith, 2015). The researcher should take note of biases that may exist in the sampling and ongoing reflection on the

relevance of methods and ensure they are at sufficient depth and are relevant to the data collection and analysis (Sandelowski, 1993, cited in Noble & Smith, 2015).

In terms of this research, the researcher has acknowledged that a bias may have existed because the researcher works at the NT and the DWYPD used to be one of their client departments. In order to mitigate this bias, did not use any information that was collected outside of the research process. This was to eliminate the preconceptions of this researcher based on what she already knew about the DWYPD. The researcher ensured that there was a good balance in the choice of interview participants. Three of the participants were from the department for women, while seven were from stakeholder departments. This gave a good balance of account from the DWYPD and stakeholder departments.

The researcher also needed to be careful in record keeping, which entailed a clear decision trail and ensuring interpretation was consistent and transparent (Long, Johnson, Rigour, 2000; Sandelowski, 1993, cited in Noble & Smith, 2015). The data was stored in a lockable computer with a password. This ensured that no one could tamper with the data but, more importantly, that the researcher did not lose the original data recordings.

A comparison, looking for similarities and differences across all accounts of the findings was done to ensure that the different perspectives were represented (Morse, 2002; Slevin 2002, cited in Noble & Smith, 2015). This was done by creating an excel template which set out to cast the differences and similarities. The findings representing similarities and differences across the data findings were presented. This ensured that all perspectives were captured. Dilemmas, which were outside the observations were also presented. The participation of officials from different departments also created a balance in terms of research findings.

The researcher included the exact descriptions used by participants to support the findings (Slevin, 2002, cited in Noble & Smith, 2015). She used direct quotations for interviews and direct narratives from the document analysis. She also demonstrated clarity of thought processes during data analysis and

subsequent interpretations (Sandelowski, 1993, cited in Noble & Smith, 2015). Finally, the researcher has also been engaging with other researchers to reduce research bias. Throughout the research process, the researcher established a relationship with other students in order to share research information and using each other for information sharing and guidance (Sandelowski, 1993, cited in Noble & Smith, 2015).

The research should also have truth-value, be consistent and neutral and apply data in the relevant context. (Noble & Smith, 2015). The researcher also triangulated data between documents and interviews (Fraser, 2001; Kuper, Lingard & Levinson, 2008, cited in Noble & Smith, 2015).

In order to verify data information, the researcher sent some of the transcripts back to participants to verify that transcripts were a true reflection of the interview inputs. Some of the participants sent the transcript back without changes, whilst some made changes to clarify their inputs, however the revisions did not change the content.

Ethical considerations

Ensuring that permission is obtained- consent is a key aspect of the interview process. Participants need to consent to participate in the interviews. The participants gave both written and verbal consent (see-attached appendixes). From the initial phase, the purpose of the research, as well as how the information will be used was be made clear to all the participants. The researcher also obtained a signed consent letter from each participant as an indication of their agreement with the contents before they could participate. A letter of authorisation to conduct the research was obtained from the DWYPD, refer to the attached Appendixes.

Ensuring protection of participants- The research was sensitive to the fact that participants may be subjected to adherence to a code of ethics within the institution that employed them. Government employees are also subjected to a security clearance when their work is classified as either confidential or secret. Information on the inside operations of the department are likely to be sensitive and would need to be handled with the care and sensitivity. The

information the participants were asked for was related to policies developed by the DWYPD to promote gender equality. This is information published in public documents and does not relate to secret government information. No classified information, according to the minimum-security information standards, was divulged. The participants were made aware of this, so that they were also conscious and aware to guard themselves against divulging classified information. Semi structured interviews were done on a one on one basis, therefore, any information considered confidential by the participant or researcher was not to be disclosed to others.

Anonymity could not be guaranteed throughout the data collection process because participants were identified according to the positions they held and their jobs. However, in the research findings, participants' real names were not used. Pseudonyms and de-identified codes were used for the data collection and any quotes in the research report. The participants were identified with alphabetic letters A-J.

Ensuring no harm comes to participants- interviews were conducted in an environment that maximised safety and comfort for the participants. Participants were made aware of what they were participating in and could stop the interview process or opt out of the study at any time without penalty or consequence.

Positionality

The researcher is a budget analyst in the NT, therefore, participants may feel uncomfortable about the fact that the researcher is an employee of the NT. In order to demonstrate that the researcher is doing the research for academic purposes only, the researcher was open from the beginning of the interview session about the purpose of the research and produced proof of registration and a student card. In addition, the researcher was also willing to write and sign a letter for the participants stating the purpose of the interview.

The researcher acknowledges that the previous working relationship with the DWYPD could have caused a bias in the research proceedings but the bias would have been a factor only if the researcher had used information known to her outside the research process. Information provided in the report was

gathered through the process of the research, data findings were based on actual findings as per the recordings and the documents analysed. All information on the data analysed was either referenced or accounted for in the findings. The researcher has not used any information known to her about the department for the research project.

In further mitigating the conflict of interest highlighted above, the researcher tested the interview instrument with some of the identified interviewees to assess the level of openness. She was satisfied with the level of openness in responding to questions. Had the researcher not been satisfied, proxy interviews/questionnaires would have been used. The researcher would have ensured neutrality by not utilising any information, which was not generated from the research. All the information presented in the research report was gathered during the research collection process.

CHAPTER FOUR– PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

Introduction

This section presents the research findings. Data was collected through interviewing ten participants from different government departments, who were selected by purposive sampling. Data was also collected through document analysis, which analysed the two key policy frameworks of the DWYPD, namely the Sanitary Dignity Framework and GRPBMEA.

In presenting the findings, this section introduces each theme and reiterates the way in which the data were gathered. It presents the data that contributes to the findings through quotations, discusses the observations that are presented by the data and highlights dilemmas remaining. The section provides a preliminary analysis of why this data is significant and what it means for theory or practice. Lastly, the section concludes with recapping the key observations under the theme.

The findings will be presented according to selected themes. The first theme is institutional form and approach to policy making. This theme looks at the institutional form of government departments and how it influences policy coordination. Data on this theme was gathered through semi structured interviews. The data found that government departments often work together in the coordination of cross-sectoral policies. The engagements are guided by the intergovernmental relations system which is stipulated in Chapter 3 of the Constitution. This reflects compliance with regulative institutionalism where institutions are guided by the rule of law.

In addition, the dependence of government departments on working together in cross-sectoral policies also reflects characteristics of historical institutionalism, also the political history of the country where institutions were developed to address past injustices. Government departments are also led through a political system which is guided by a ruling party that often reflects or represents the interest of its voters. This leans more towards sociological institutionalism. Government institutions are also members of international organisations, where they have signed international obligations and treaties.

This reflects realist institutionalism where different actors express their own interests in institutions.

The second theme is policy initiation and planning. This theme is linked to the first two stages of the policy cycle which are policy agenda setting and policy formulation. It looks at the identification of actors (which is linked to institutionalism) in the policy, the identification of the problem to be resolved and engagement between the different stakeholders in the initiation and planning of the policies. Data on this theme were gathered through document analysis and semi structured interviews. The data on the document analysis found that the Sanitary Dignity Framework was more detailed in terms of identifying the actors and their roles.

The GRPBMEA did not give much detailed information on the actors and their role, but gave a detailed account of proposed interventions to be effected by departments. In terms of the interviews, the data reported that officials from DWYPD had more clarity in terms of what their roles were in both policies. Stakeholder department contributions revealed that some stakeholders were not sure of their roles in terms of policy implementation and monitoring. However, their roles were clear in terms of their participation in the interdepartmental task team to represent their respective departments and provide inputs in the draft policy frameworks.

Some of the contributions stated that the relevant departments did not attend the task team meeting. Over and above this, the relevant people with decision-making powers within the participating departments were not invited to the meetings.

A discussion on the problem the policy aims to address is also important in the agenda setting phase. Data presented especially in terms of the GRPBMEA stated that some of the stakeholder departments did not in agree with the approach of making budgets gender responsive to address gender inequalities. Participants from stakeholder departments also stated that communication in the initial stage of the policy was a challenge. Officials from

DWYPD however did not state any communication challenges the department had with stakeholder departments.

The third theme deals with the last two processes of the policy cycle, which are policy implementation and monitoring and evaluation. The theme sets out the implementation and monitoring plan from data from the documents and semi structured interviews. In terms of the Sanitary Dignity Framework, policy implementation will be done by provinces. The DWYPD is responsible for developing the monitoring mechanisms and work with national departments to ensure compliance to monitoring and evaluation systems developed. However, in terms of the findings, the DWYPD does not have capacity to develop the monitoring and evaluation tool and will hand this function over to the DSD. This is not in line with the framework and further agrees with the assertion that DWYPD over estimated its role in these policies.

The participants highlighted some challenges in terms of implementation and monitoring. The absence of a legislative mandate for the DWYPD will make implementation and monitoring difficult, as will the absence of a provincial footprint. Provinces have autonomy over their functions. In essence, the DWYPD does not have authority over its stakeholders and there is no consensus on whether its location in the Presidency assists the department in having authority. The stakeholder departments' view was that although their participation in the policies were important, they felt like the policies would have continued with or without their inputs. The lack of resources was also highlighted by the officials within the DWYPD in the areas of budgets and capacity. The shortfall on budgets was contested by participants from the NT stating that the DWYPD should work to prioritise within the budget they have.

Introductory questions

The interview was conducted with ten participants, three participants were from the DWYPD, two were from the DSD, three from the NT, and one each from the DPSA and DBE. In total six participants spoke on the Sanitary Dignity policy and five spoke on the GRPBMEA framework (one participant spoke on both the policies). Participants are identified by the letters A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, J. and I.

As stated in the research methodology, participants were government officials and participated in the development of the two policies. There was no need for the researcher to test the participants' knowledge of the policy as they had been identified through purposive sampling method. It was concluded that participants understood two the policies and their objectives. In testing the understanding of the participants' knowledge of the policy, the opening question was centred on their understanding of the background of the policy. Participants showed a similar trend of having background knowledge and understanding of what the policy is about.

"This [sanitary dignity framework] was an initiative from government from the Presidential announcement of 2011. For a long time, there was no clarity on who is supposed to do what and coordinate. For a period of 3/4/5 years, no one knew what is supposed to happen. In that period, a lot of NGOs and partners went to provide sanitary products in school through their own ways. They would give packets of pads and some with toiletries. It was not structured and they went to schools that the Department of Basic Education was not involved in" (Participant D, 2019)

The participant understood where the policy framework stemmed from, and also gave a historical account of the formulation of the policy and the different debates that stem from the initiation of the sanitary dignity policy.

"*This is a policy [sanitary dignity policy] that existed within government. The DWYPD adopted and took the policy over from other departments*"- (Participant F, 2019)

The participant shows knowledge of the existence of the policy within government and where the policy was eventually placed and is relevant as a participant for the research.

"Initially, it [sanitary dignity framework] was the instruction of the former President, but it is an addition of existing services in social protection where government is already participating; for example, issuing of grants. In this department's case, it was part of ensuring that girls and women achieve their fullest potential" (Participant J, 2019)

The participant showed a good understanding of the policy. Furthermore, the participant highlighted that, in his or her own department, this initiative has been developed and implemented.

These participants also show an understanding of where the policy directive comes from within the government sphere. The participant shows an understanding of the topic at hand and of the key concepts of the Sanitary Dignity Policy.

"This [gender responsive budgeting framework] is not a new policy. When the framework started; DPSA had developed a strategic framework called the gender equality strategic framework. We also have the HOD 8 principle plan which has the public service women's management week initiatives. Now these two frameworks are very broad and they encompass GRPBMEA. It forms part of the proposals and things we want to see departments do"- (Participant E, 2019)

This participant shows an understanding of the GRPBMEA and shows previous involvement in similar policies. These are similar policies, include some, which have been developed by the DPSA for public sector departments to adhere to.

The data above on the Sanitary Dignity Framework provided by the participants is further in line with what is presented in the Sanitary Dignity Framework, which recognises and quotes a speech by the former President:

"*Given our emphasis on women's health, we will broaden the scope of reproductive health rights and provide services related to amongst others, contraception, sexually transmitted infections, teenage pregnancy and sanitary towels for the indigent"* – (Sanitary Dignity Framework, 2018 p6)

The framework also gives an account of why this policy was developed and refers to the Presidential announcement of 2011 that government aims to provide free sanitary products to indigent women and girls. This is further triangulated with the Presidential announcement in 2011 established the policy.

On the GRPBMEA, most of the participants did not give much knowledge on the history of the policy but rather that they know it through being part of the interdepartmental task team.

Theme 1: Institutional form and approach to policy making

The organisational form of institutions gives guidance on how the institutions approach policy making. Institutions can be designed to serve the work of actors they represent and most importantly, actors are at the centre stage of institutional theory and act as the principal drivers of institutional change, as well as the stabilising protector of institutions (Hwang & Colyvas, 2011). Institutions are driven by rules that need to be followed in line with its design or model. Inherently, this will affect its approach to policy making. The participants were asked to determine if working with other departments was part of their institutional form and how the different departments deal with cross-sectoral policies. This is important as it is a determining factor and is the basis of engagement or working relations between the DWYPD and other departments. Data on this theme were collected through interviews.

Presentation of data that contributes to findings

Most of the participants agreed with each other that they, as government departments, do work together in cross sectoral policies and that working together as government institutions is part of their institutional form, as guided by the IGR system. This shows characteristics of regulative institutionalism.

"*At first it [DWYPD] was not designed in that matter. We have now realised that our entry point will be the office of the Premier. We realised that DBE would not be in a position to instruct provinces. But office of the Premier would be able to instruct. We are not saying departments must not do what they are doing, but can we work in a more synchronised manner? Affected departments need each other in order to coordinate information and implement their effort*" (Participant J, 2019)

The participant states that when the DWYPD was developed, it was not required to work with other departments, but in coordinating policies, the DWYPD has realised that it needs to work with other departments. This creates

path dependence, which is linked to historical institutionalism. In terms of its work with other departments, the stakeholder departments also state that they do get involved in cross-sectoral policies, which are guided by the IGR system in the Constitution.

"*Yes, [our department] we do get involved in a way in other department's policies especially with the financial implications. The NT is designed to work with different spheres of government, we get involved in policy advice, and we have capacity to provide advice for financial implication"* (Participant H, 2019)

The participant affirms that their department does get involved in cross-sectoral policies and working with other departments is part of their organisational form. The Public Finance Division within the NT works with client departments on their policy and budget requirements.

"*It [sanitary dignity] is not the first cross sectoral policy we have participated in. There is intergovernmental work that happens. There are many of these [cross sectoral policies] that we participate in, but it depends on our role*" (Participant D, 2019)

In this response, the participant confirms that the DBE usually takes part in the policy initiatives of other departments within the intergovernmental framework. This issue is mentioned because the participant has a strong sense that before they participate in cross-sectoral policies, the role of their department must be made clear.

"*In working with cross sectoral policies, the intergovernmental system is key, it [intergovernmental system] is also key for the delivery of services for disadvantaged communities to access services. The intergovernmental system and institutional arrangements are very critical*" (Participant C, 2019).

The participant mentioned the importance of the intergovernmental system in undertaking cross-sectoral policies. The participant also raised the importance of the institutional arrangement, which is the key enquiry of this research. Furthermore, the participant also affirms that departments work to service disadvantaged communities. This is linked with sociological institutionalism.

"*We rely on the intergovernmental relations act, it says the relations of departments are interdependent and… but we also take note the autonomy*" (Participant J, 2019).

According to Participant J, when departments do cross sectoral policies, they rely on the intergovernmental act [Intergovernmental Relations Framework Act 13 of 2005].

Most important to institutional theories and models that can be linked to historic institutionalism is the interdependence of departments. Taking interdependence in context however, the participant mentions the issue of sphere autonomy, which is highlighted as an important factor in the IGR system.

Observations and dilemmas presented by the data

Most participants agreed with each other that the organisational form does allow for cross-sectoral policies. Most importantly, they do or have worked together with other departments in implementing cross-sectoral policies. As guided by the intergovernmental relations system stipulated in Chapter 3 of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa. Section 40 (1) of the Constitution also stipulates that the three spheres of government are distinctive, interdependent and interrelated. The section also stipulates the principles of a co-operative government and intergovernmental relations.

In addition to the data presented on the relations between government departments, participant C (2019) stated that it is important that these institutional arrangements be reflected in the framework. This is a very interesting dynamic, as it guides how departments will work together and is an important element to institutional arrangements. Should the institutional arrangements not be stipulated or embedded in the framework, it will make compliance with other departments challenging. Participant J (2019) raises another interesting dimension, the autonomy of other stakeholders. It is important to note that while the Constitution promotes co-operation between the three spheres, each sphere of government is autonomous and stipulated cooperation does not mean that one sphere has control over the other.

Preliminary analysis of why this data is significant and what it means for theory or practice

The data presented is important for the study in both theory and practice. The intergovernmental relations system in the Constitution creates an enabling environment for the DWYPD to do its work and it allows different departments to work together in the development and implementation of policies. This leans more towards regulative and historic institutionalism. It also is important to explain how the different spheres of government work together in fostering relations. The role of national departments is to create policies while the role of provincial departments is to provide pathways and structures for the implementation of policies and the role of local government is to be responsible for direct implementation (Malan, 2000). None of these spheres has control over the other, but they are expected to work together to serve the country. National government can only preside over provincial government if there is a dispute or the provincial government cannot regulate itself any matter (Malan, 2000). How the departments work together is important to the coordination policies of the DWYPD and to institutional arrangements of this coordination.

Conclusion with the key observations under the theme

The observations that have been identified under this theme conclude that government departments often work together in the coordination of policies guided by the intergovernmental system in the Constitution, thereby reflecting characteristics of regulative institutionalism. The Constitution does promote cooperativeness between the different national departments as well as the three spheres of government. Findings also state that even though departments are designated to work cooperatively together, the different spheres of government are autonomous. The common approach to policy making by the different departments is not surprising and government is led by the same ruling party which should subscribe to the same ideologies and beliefs. What will be different is the approach that different political heads take to policy making. This may have an impact on the policies of the DWYPD. The findings also suggest regulative institutionalism in terms of application of the rule of law and historic and sociological institutionalism in terms of path

interdependence and the ideologies centred on the creation of public institutions in South Africa.

Government departments also commit to international organisations which reflect the characteristics of realist institutionalism.

The section has reviewed the theme “Institutional form and approach to policy making”, and presented and summarised the findings. The literature shows that challenges can arise when different institutions engage in cross-sectoral policies. Therefore, institutional models are important to consider. What is important for the research is that, regardless of the challenges that may be faced, it is the norm for government departments to work with each other in cross-sectoral policies and this is guided by legislation through the constitution. The findings also state that it is important to consider the autonomy of the different spheres of government.

Theme 2: Policy initiation and planning

The critical stages of the policy cycle take the following into account: problem identification, which looks at where the policy is going, and policy formulation, which look at how it is getting there (Hill, 2013). These cover two important themes of the policy making cycle namely agenda setting and policy formulation. Public policy is a process that requires consultation and deliberation. In this process, actors are required to engage in different processes/cycles before the policy reaches implementation. This requires relevant actors, proper planning, communication which will lead to good policy implementation, monitoring and evaluation (Hill, 2013).

The first process of the public policy cycle, the role of actors within a policy, must be clearly identified. The role must clearly identified, must clarify what the actors’ role is in the policy process and how they should be executing their roles in the policy objectives. The policy initiation, planning and communication between the actors is important. Planning must be executed successfully, with a good flow of communication between the actors (Hill, 2013). Data on the theme were collected through semi structures interviews as well as document analysis. Data received from both sources are triangulated to see trends.

Presentation of data that contribute to the findings

Actors and their roles

According to the Sanitary Dignity Framework, the main actor in the policy is the DWYPD. The framework clearly states that in line with the mandate given to the DWYPD, which is to champion the advancement of women's socio-economic empowerment, and the promotion of gender equality it became important for the department to address the sanitary dignity of indigent persons through the process of developing an integrated framework (Sanitary Dignity Framework, 2019 p7).

Specifically, the role of the DWYPD is to mobilise resources for the implementation of the framework, coordinate and support the implementation of the framework. The DWYPD is expected also to create awareness of the need to address sanitary dignity and build women's capacity for economic inclusion in the value chain of supply for sanitary products. The framework also tasked the DWYPD with ensuring compliance with the South African Bureau of Standards for the product, ensure that they advocate for the inclusion of menstrual hygiene promotion in government, women, girls and community members, monitor, and evaluate the SDIF (Sanitary Dignity Framework, 2019 p34).

NT is tasked with ensuring that there is sufficient cash to fund the programme. This department will also assist in creating job opportunities by promoting the conditions that enable prosperity for women, youth and disabled persons. The DSD is tasked with identifying indigent girls and women for the supply of sanitary products according to target groups. The DSD will also identify and support cooperatives for women, youth and persons with disabilities in their local areas to be invited for capacity building and inclusion in the supply value chain. This department is also be tasked with strengthening support in resource provision and ensure prioritisation of the sanitary dignity programme in the community and government institution (Sanitary Dignity Framework, 2019 p35).

The DBE according to the Sanitary Dignity framework was tasked with ensuring capacity building for educators in teaching such subjects; identifying

learners that need sanitary products and distribute the products accordingly; ensure provision of sanitation, water and handwashing facilities and supply of hygiene products in schools; ensure appropriate waste disposal of used sanitary products; and intergrade menstrual health promotion aspects as an agenda item for school governing body committees to promote prioritisation. This department also had the responsibility of linking the programme with existing programmes and also reviewing and improving curriculum body changes subjects (Sanitary Dignity Framework, 2019 p35).

In terms of the GRPBMEA- the DWYPD is the lead department together with the DPME. These are both located in the Presidency and the centre of government (GRPBMEA, 2019 p8)

The DWYPD in the implementation is tasked with roles to play in the development of key interventions. The DWYPD together with the DPME are expected to ensure that the annual budget mandate paper includes the country's gender policy priorities based on evidence to inform budget allocations (GRPBMEA, 2019 p42)

The DWYPD together with the NPC will ensure that the National Development Plan is engendered and includes gender responsiveness as an indicator. The DWYPD and the DPME will ensure that the medium-term strategic framework includes gender policy, priorities and outcomes. The DWYPD and the DPME will ensure that the NDP outcomes on gender are monitored (GRPBMEA, 2019 p42).

The DWYPD and DPME will mainstream gender throughout the planning bill. The DWYPD will coordinate the 25 years review on status of women since 1994 focusing on 2014-2019. The DWYPD and the DPME will ensure gender mainstreaming institutional plans and implantation of programmes. These two departments will also ensure gender analysis in the situational analysis of plans (GRPBMEA framework, 2019 p42)

The DWYPD and DPME will provide gender analysis of institutions annual performance plans. The DWYPD, Presidency and DPME must create 5-year ministerial gender delivery agreements, develop annual gender priorities and intergrade them in the mandate paper. These departments also have the

responsibility of ensuring that gender is included in the budget statement by the Minister of Finance. The DPME and DWYPD should also evaluate planning and budgeting, commission and undertake evaluations, collect and analyse data and make gender responsive improvement plans (GRPBMEA framework, 2019 p43).

The DWYPD and DPME will assist Statistics South Africa in the collection of statistics. The NT together with the DWYPD should ensure that the budgeting processes include gender responsive budgeting. The DPSA should ensure that gender delivery agreements are signed (GRPBMEA framework, 2019 p42).

It is evidence from these findings that the DPME and the DWYPD have a huge role to play in the coordination of the GRPBMEA.

From the data collected in the semi-structured interviews, most of the participants agreed with each other that they had a role to play in the development of the Sanitary Dignity Framework. However, there was a difference in the detail provided by the policies and what the participants understood their roles to be, especially the stakeholder departments. The participants did not give; similar responses regarding the clarification of their roles in the actual inter-departmental task team. Some of the participants said that their roles were clear, and others that their roles were not clear at the beginning, but clarified later and yet others that their roles were not clear at all, which in turn makes them not to participate. The participants from the DWYPD were the ones who gave a detailed account of their roles and were in line with the policies.

"*First with the DWYPD, it developed and coordinated the framework. The role now is to monitor and evaluate the implementation framework. In addition, responsibility to ensure it is a funded mandate through budget submission to NT. there also is an advocacy role. The national departments have a role in contributing to the development of the framework and representing their respective departments in the inter-departmental task team. The key stakeholders at national level are: Department of social development, Department of basic education, Department of higher education and Science*

and Technology, Department of Small Business Development, Department of health, NT, Stats SA, Cogta, Correctional Services, Water and Sanitation, Environmental Affairs"- (Participant I, 2019)

The role of the DWYPD is quite detailed and broad in these findings. It entails the development and coordination of the sanitary dignity framework. The role also entails the monitoring and evaluation of the framework and ensuring that the project is funded.

"*The key stakeholders are the Department of Education (at the policy level) but at the implementation level, it is the Department of Education in the provinces. The same with the Department of Health, Social Development and Department of Small Business Development*- (Participant J, 2019)

Participants from stakeholder departments only gave account of their role in the interdepartmental task team. This was linked with the development of the framework.

"*I represented own department [DSD] in interdepartmental task team. Commented on draft framework and developed terms of reference. Part of team that design M&E tool and theory of change*" (Participant C, 2019)

The expectation the DWYPD had of the national departments was that they represent their departments in the interdepartmental task team that was created for the Sanitary Dignity Policy. The DWYPD also expected stakeholders to use their expertise to assist in areas of specific knowledge such as areas of monitoring and evaluation.

"*We commented on the draft documents"*- (participant A, 2019)

Departments that were invited and participated played their roles in proving inputs to the draft frameworks for consideration.

"*We provided inputs on the budget and financial implications*"- (Participant H, 2019)

Most of the departments participated through representation of their departments and providing inputs in terms of their departmental mandate.

"*I was invited to participate in interdepartmental task team, but did not participate. The DBE had no strategic direction and no clear mandate. The Department of Basic Education did not have a clear mandate. The implementation plan is not clear, we were not clear on who will distribute, how and from where? Who qualifies as a recipient and how? Monitoring of the policy also not clear, who will provide the data?"* (Participant D, 2019)

With concerns raised about clarity in roles, the one participant from a stakeholder department did not participate in the development of the policy citing issues such as unclear mandate, implementation as well as the monitoring and evaluation plan. These issues speak to the importance of clarity of role for different stakeholders in any policy area. Where the role is not clear, stakeholders may be reluctant to participate, or in the worst case, not participate at all.

Some of the participants from stakeholder departments also felt that relevant officials were not invited or did not attend the meetings.

"*Institutionally, stakeholders that were supposed to be involved [in the GRPBMEA] were not engaged. Not even once was DPME present in the meetings. That has always been a red flag. Planning should be in the forefront*" (Participant B, 2019)

The participant stated that a key stakeholder in the GRPBMEA which is the DPME did not attend the interdepartmental task team meetings which were meant to conceptualise the policy idea. This is an interesting dynamic as in terms of the intervention plans in the GRPBMEA framework, the DPME featured dominantly as a role player.

"*There were no CFOs, and then NT said they are not going to distribute money until departments show how they are going to use the money on women, this was something to celebrate for gender focal point. We are not sure how it would be implemented, even though it is in the policy. I feel like they didn't engage the right people. Unless it is going to go to Cabinet and they give instructions*" (Participant A, 2019)

This participant stated that chief financial officers of departments who were crucial to the implementation of the GRPBMEA were not invited to meetings. In addition, a key role player, which is the NT, did not actively participate and this would have an impact on the policy. The participant from the NT felt that this happened because the relevant people within the NT were not approached to participate in the policy.

"*From my experience, there was no clarity on who is supposed to lead within the Treasury. The framework was better placed led by the sector focusing/analyst within PF as that is the job of the sector specialists and the budget office. We should look at all policies when all is done. The reality of the work seems to be something we are tossing; therefore, it ended up being something that we thought we could continue to influence in terms of the proper implementation of the framework*" (Participant B, 2019)

"*DWYPD did not involve NT officials that worked with provinces initially. As we understood more, we started involving/proposing/extending invitation to relevant NT officials*" (Participant H, 2019)

Another view from a participant from the NT was that it [NT] could not be expected to instruct departments on how to budget. GRPBMEA should be a departmental initiative.

"*NT does not really does not say to department what money is for in terms of gender. Same as service delivery. As NT, we treat everyone the same because we are a policy department more than a service delivery department* (Participant G, 2019)

The participant highlights that GRPBMEA lies within the implementing department and should not be a policy that is implemented across government departments. This is another dynamic in the findings, where the stakeholder departments expressed the view that the approach of DWPD toward the GRPBMEA may not be the best policy approach to address the problem

Policy approach

Another key part in policy initiation is that stakeholders must agree on the policy approach in order to move forward with the policy. There were different

views that were presented by stakeholder departments on the chosen approach for the policies.

"*We had challenges with defining the problem within the project [Sanitary Dignity Framework], was it that learners are missing school or it's about the dignity of women? The DWYPD was finding it difficult to actually even use research to motivate why they want this policy, they used more emotions to motive and maybe that is why other stakeholders are not giving buy in"* (Participant H, 2019)

In terms of this participant, problem identification in the Sanitary Dignity Policy was a challenge. The problem was not defined in terms of research, at that time. There was no research link between learners' absenteeism and menstrual cycles. Stakeholder departments also had challenges with the policy approach on the GRPBMEA.

"You cannot look at gender only [when budgeting] you also have to look at things like disabilities, when the department does the budgeting; they have to think about things like that. So, for us who are responsible for the resources, we will have to report back on reprioritising for certain things. But in terms of prioritising gender that's is the department's role. So, we would be for example the sanitary pads we are asked to find money and we did. We were working with the provinces because we wanted to use systems that already assist. The difference between the sanitary [pads and the gender responsive budgeting is that the sanitary pads are a project within the department and the responsive budgeting is done across departments. The DWYPD is still a new department, they need to comply with the PFMA; the gender stuff is difficult and it lies with the implementing department all" (Participant G, 2019).

The participant raises a lot of interesting points, the most important of which is that the approach to make national budgets gender responsive may not be the best approach as one is trying to service the whole country with different needs.

This is against the view of the policy which states that GRPBMEA is vital in achieving a non-sexist society as prescribed in the Constitution. The framework aims to ensure better outcomes for women and girls, as investing

in women empowerment and reducing the gender gap is a key driver of inclusive economic growth and development, which will benefit both women, men, boys and girls (GRPBMEA framework, 2019 p5)

The framework also clarifies that gender responsive budgets are not budget deliberate for women, but are general budgets that are planned, monitored, executed and audited in a gender responsive way. The policy also seeks to validate findings of research undertaken by the IMF and the World Bank demonstrates that a reduction in gender inequality benefits the growth of the economy (GRPBMEA framework, p5-6).

The participant proposes an approach where individual government department focus on gender budgeting. The participant also speaks to the capacity of the DWYPD and where its focus should be.

"A challenge that may be faced in the policy going forward is the thought that budgets are the solution to everything. The key issue is planning and desegregating data" (Participant B, 2019)

"*Budgeting should be according to functions. For gender responsiveness, the data need to be desegregated, research needs to be done*" (Participant E, 2019)

The participant indicates that budgets may not be the solution to the addressing the challenge, other issues such as planning and data desegregation may assist with the problem.

The issues raised in the policy speak to the issues raised by the participants. The framework affirms that the aim is not to look only at gender budgets, but to ensure that budgets in general are planned and monitored in a gender responsive way.

The researcher further asked what implication the participation or non-participation of key stakeholder has had for the policies

"Our [stakeholder department] participation was important but it didn't have much impact. The policy would have continued without us, most of the stakeholder department didn't attend"- (participant A, 2019)

"The project is already running in provinces regardless of the process by DWYPD"- (Participant D, 2019)

Some of the participants felt that their participation was important in terms of giving the policy direction

"Our [stakeholder department] participation was important because it gave direction, "at times where the department wanted to go overboard. They were compromising procurement rules. Had NT not been there, the DWYPD would have included things not in line with PFMA and procurement rules. NT also helped the DWYPD to align its plans with the budget process and forced them to cost the project. Department also wanted to develop a monitoring tool which was not really their mandate" – (Participant H, 2019)

"It should be a shame for the country if the NT does not participate. It would send bad messaging to the country that women are not important and that their needs are not considered. Even for the international community, it would be unfortunate. However, NT should not be the first in line, money is not the first in line, planning is –they key" (participant, 2019)

<u>Communication</u>

Communication amongst stakeholders is important and can play a key role in policy coordination. Stakeholder departments also spoke on communication as a challenge in the initiation of the policies.

Communication was a big challenge; we would get information a day before. There were fewer engagements on the policy content- (Participant A, 2019)

The participant confirmed that the communication between the stakeholders and the DWPYD in the development of the policy was challenging. This impacted on their ability to engage on the policy documents.

"Poor capacity within DWYPD, they would call meeting after 3 months and the meeting would not take place. DWYPD was always late for deadlines" (Participant H, 2019*)*

The DWYPD planned to improve on its communication and coordination plans in terms of the GRPBMEA.

"We [DWYPD] have a number of communication and coordination plans, we are also planning awareness campaigns such as road shows; it shows what we want to do from now until beyond 2020/21. The consultation is beneficial, and it is critical" (Participant F, 2019)

Observations and dilemmas presented by the data

In terms of the sanitary dignity framework, the roles identified for the DWYPD, NT, DBE and DSD are explicitly mentioned for policy implementation. The framework identifies roles that these departments are supposed to perform in implementing the framework but does not give a clear distinction between the role of national and provincial departments. The dilemma presented here was the uncertainty of roles of stakeholder departments in the interviews.

In terms of the GRPBMEA, the actors are identified in the following way: the DWYPD as the lead department together with the DPME, The NT, DPSA and the DSD are also identified as participants and their role is ensuring that the GRPBMEA is implemented in their respective disciplines. The dilemma in the findings is that the DPME plays a dominant role in the host if interventions that are proposed for this policy. However, based on the inputs from the semi structures interviews, the DPME did not participate in this policy initiative.

The framework also suggests that the buy in of stakeholders is critical. This is against the view of the policy that states that GRPBMEA is a vital in achieving a non-sexist society as prescribed in the Constitution. The framework aims to ensure better outcomes for women and girls, as investing in women empowerment and reducing the gender gap is a key driver of inclusive economic growth and development, which will benefit women, men, boys and girls (GRPBMEA framework, 2019 p8)

The framework clarifies that gender responsive budgets are not budget deliberate for women, but are general budgets that are planned, monitored, executed and audited in a gender responsive way. The policy also seeks to validate research undertaken by the International Monetary Fund and the

World Bank which demonstrates that the reduction of gender inequality benefits the growth of the economy (GRPBMEA framework, 2019 p5-6).

According to the GRPBMEA framework, engagement and consultations were done with the NT, DPME and other government departments including Statistics SA and the Department of International Relations and Cooperation. Engagements and consultations were also done with the DPME, the DPSA and the Department of Higher Education and Training as well as the Commission on Gender Equality (CGE) as part of a high-level steering committee on GRPBMEA from June 2018 to November 2018. It is against this background of the policy that GRPBMEA is said to be vital in achieving a non-sexist society as prescribed in the Constitution.

The framework mentions some of the key stakeholders as the DPME, the NT, and the DPSA, Statistics SA etc. overall, government departments, public entities, provinces and municipalities (GRPBMEA framework, 2019, p8) their roles are:

DPSA- to assist in the refinement of Performance Management and Development System and ensure the inclusion of gender deliverables in the Performance Agreements of HODs, other senior management service members and public servants at all levels (GRPBMEA framework, 2019, p47)

NT- To ensure the gender responsiveness of the Public Finance Management Act and the Municipal Finance Management Act and ensure that budget processes include gender responsiveness (GRPBMEA framework, 2019, p45)

In triangulating what the framework says and what the participants say, none of the participants gave the information provided in the framework on their roles. This could be attributed to the fact that the policy has not yet been implemented.

In terms of the DWYPD, the framework includes the whole of government and different levels and different spheres. The dilemma here is to what extent the stakeholders have been brought into the policy.

"*The framework [GRPBMEA] is bigger than the DWYPD, It includes everybody. You know we have these three levels of government, national,*

provincial and local, all departments. We also have the judiciary, SOEs, Chapter 9 institutions. All these are contained in our framework. They all participate in terms of their mandate. (Participant F, 2019)

In the interviews, each interviewed participant stated that they had a role to play in the development of the sanitary dignity framework, but were confused about their role in the actual implementation of the policy. The question of whether the role was made clear is what remains outside the trend of the data collection. While a few of the participants state that their roles were made clear, some of the participants were unsure at the beginning of what their respective roles were.

"The role was not clear from word go, we had to direct our involvement" (Participant H, 2019)

"At the beginning their roles were not that clear, those were the enrolling challenges faced at that stage, over time, the roles were clearer. For example, the department of education at a policy level for linkages and integration put in place. In terms of funds NT would allocate funds nationally and provincial treasuries would disperse those funds to provinces" (Participant J, 2019)

Stakeholder department's felt that their role was to participate in the development of the framework by representing their departments in the interdepartmental task team and to provide inputs in the drafting of the frameworks. Data gathered only refers to the development of the framework for national departments, as interviews were not conducted with any of the provincial departments.

An interesting dynamic here is the contrast in what participant D and I are saying. Participant I says that the role of DBE was clear and was within the life skills and integration into the school health programme. This is a direct contrast of what participant D stated, which is that the DBE's role was not clear and most importantly, the financial implications of the policy were not clear. This is whilst the Sanitary Dignity framework also mentions the role of the DBE, without the contribution of DBE. The main question this leaves is whether DWYPD was expecting departments such as DBE to execute role they have not determined nor agreed upon?

However, one participant states that the DWYPD took a bigger role than their mandate allowed.

The DWYPD wanted to develop monitoring tool which was not their mandate, also did not want to engage on similar activities already happening in provinces" – (Participant H, 2019)

Some of the stakeholders felt that they were not the appropriate officials to attend to the policy.

"They [DWYPD] did not invite the right people to make decisions" (Participant A, 2019)

"I also kept quiet because even in meetings I was given pressure to commit. There is no way I could give answers without backup from my department"- (Participant D, 2019)

Some of the participants felt that the most relevant departments to the policy initiatives did not bother to participate.

"Within the task team, we expected each department to participation and represent its department. We did not have much participation from the department of basic education; it had life skills and integration school's health programme. Their role was to integrate the sanitary dignity into their programme. That is the role we know and it in the framework, their role was more on integration but we did do our own research" (Participant I, 2019)

"DBE was invited to participate in interdepartmental task team, but did not participate. There was no strategic direction and no clear mandate, the policy was not costed" (Participant D, 2019)

"*We were invited to the initial meetings, we provided inputs [on the draft framework], and we attended a pilot and development in Free State Treasury*"- (Participant E, 2019)

"*We [stakeholder departments] provided inputs on the budget and financial implications"* (Participant H, 2019)

Two of the stakeholder departments stated that they had participated by providing inputs to the draft framework.

I was not clear on how the GRPBMEA was going to be implemented. " (Participant A, 2019)

Two of the participants felt that the most relevant departments to the policy initiatives did not participate.

"Stakeholders such as the Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation" who are key to the process did not participate" (Participant B, 2019)

"On the GRPBMEA, in the task team from day 1, we spoke about how important it is to have NT on board for budgeting issues, NT would not come. From the meetings I attended, I missed one; there was only 1 meeting where NT was involved" (Participant A, 2019)

In terms of policy approach and problem identification, there was a sense from stakeholder departments that the DWYPD's proposed policy approaches were, perhaps, not the best way to solve the problems. Participants emphasised the need for research to establish the facts. This was interesting, as the participants were part of the policy development process. It raises an interesting dynamic as to whether their concerns were raised and not taken forward, or that the concerns may have not been raised at all. However, two participants attest that there were many confusing questions in the policy development process.

The GRPBMEA provides some inputs into what some of the participants have raised, concerning the framework. The aim is not to look at separate gender budgets, but to ensure that general budgets are planned, approved, monitored and audited in a gender responsive way. The framework cites research done by the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank highlighting a positive relationship between gender budgets and economic growth. The research has not made that finding; the dilemmas still is that research in the South African context is still not visible through the research findings. Further comments by participants are:

"*When probed on questions about what the DWYPD has engaged on with the provinces that are already implementing the projected and, what have you*

found, they would not have responses but were quick to want to launch in public and implement the project" (Participant H, 2019)

The questions on policy implementation were raised in the development of the policy; however, some of the questions were not addressed.

Stakeholder departments felt that their participation was important and that the DWYPD would have continued with the policies regardless of their participation. The practical case here is the issue of the DBE. The department did not participate in the development of the policy; however, they are mentioned in the policy framework and have a role to play in terms of the implementation and monitoring.
Communication was a huge challenge for some participants which affected their ability to engage on the policies. In terms of the GRPBMEA, the officials from the DWYPD outlined strategies to improve communication.

Preliminary analysis of why this data is significant and what it means for theory or practice

The data is crucial in presenting an important phase in policy coordination, which is policy planning and initiation. In the coordination of any policy, there must be a clear policy direction of how the policy is initiated. Policies cannot be initiated without the input or views of different actors. The role of each actor is important to the policies. Actors also need to know and be clear on their roles. Unclear roles make accountability difficult. In initiating and planning for cross sector policies, it is important to involve relevant people with decision-making authority and technical capabilities in the policy. The data on the roles of stakeholders is important in identifying if the actors in the policy did have a role stipulated for them to play; the research looks into how the DWYPD works with other stakeholder departments.

Therefore, it is important that key stakeholders are clear in terms of what their role is. If the role of the stakeholders in not clear, they cannot make a valuable contribution to the policy and it is not easy to hold them to account. A key

contribution was made by one of the participants who said that the role and institutional arrangements should be explicit in the framework that is the only way the DWYPD will be able to hold other departments accountable.

Policy approach in terms of problem identification and communication amongst stakeholders are also important to policy planning and initiation. A platform for information sharing must be created amongst actors to allow them to coordinate the policy effectively.

Conclusion on the key observations under the theme.

The key observations under the theme are that in terms of the frameworks, the departments were given a role to play relating to the implementation of the policies. Some felt that their roles were not clear. While the Sanitary Dignity policy makes mention of the role of the provinces in the implementation, the GRPBMEA framework does not make mention of the provincial role, however, the provinces are listed as key stakeholders. The role of the key departments in the sanitary dignity was to provide inputs and represent their departments. However, there was no management from these departments that did not participate.

For example, the DBE did not participate in the formulation of the Sanitary Dignity Framework. However, the framework was concluded and the project to start with the implementation is proceeding without their inputs. An input from participant I states that there was a follow up done by the head of the DWYPD to the head of DBE. The findings did not reveal consequent management or harsh taken against the departments that did not play their roles in the development of the policies, instead DWYPD included their inputs on their behalf, this can cause problems when it comes to accountability. The stakeholder departments did not hold convergent views to those of the DWYPD in terms of the policy approach/problem identification and policy solution proposed. The data also presented communication challenges faced by stakeholder departments in working with policies coordinated by the DWYPD.

Theme 3: implementation, monitoring and evaluation

The last critical stages of the policy cycle are policy implementation and policy monitoring and evaluation. Policy implementation is about where the policy is going and policy monitoring and evaluation is the reflection on the choices made (Hill, 2013). These stages just like the first two are interrelated and interdependent. In addition, they are also critical to the success or failure of a policy. Policy implementation, monitoring and evaluation processes should be clearly laid out to include the different stages and processes. Many challenges may raise at the two stages. In terms of the DWYPD, the policy on Sanitary Dignity was meant to be implemented through provinces and the monitoring and evaluation process was planned to be carried out by national departments working together with provinces.

The GRPBMEA was planned to be implemented throughout government at different levels and spheres and the monitoring and evaluation processes were meant for national departments working together other spheres of government. Data on this theme was collected through semi-structured interviews and document analysis.

Presentation of data that contribute to findings

Implementation and monitoring

In terms of the Sanitary Framework the policy will be implemented at provincial level and the DWYPD must develop a monitoring and evaluation framework and constantly monitor the implementation of this framework and submit a report with recommendations to the Minister, Director General and Cabinet (Sanitary Dignity Framework, 2019, p27).

Any national or provincial department responsible for the implementation of this framework must continuously monitor such implementation, make recommendation and submit a report to the Minister, Premier or MEC. The DWYPD must analyse monitoring reports received, with a view to determining whether this framework should be amended to improve implementation and impact. DWYPD must review the framework at least once every 3 years; the

DWYPD must keep comprehensive statistics relating to the implementation and impact of the framework (Sanitary Dignity Framework, 2019, p29).

In terms of the GRPBMEA policy framework, the implementation will be done in four phases. The first phase entails consultations with stakeholders. This was done in 2017/18. The second phase was done in 2018/19 and entailed broadening the focus of GRPBMEA to the policy cycle. Phase 3 was anticipated in the 2019/20 financial year and entailed implementation of gender responsive reforms. Lastly, phase 4 which is planned from 2020/21 onwards and looks at total programme rollout (GRPBMEA framework, 2019, p37-38)

The research found that as per the Sanitary Dignity framework, the DWYPD as not been to develop to the monitoring and evaluation framework due to capacity challenges. The GRPBMEA has also not been implemented in terms of the set times within the framework.

Data from the interviews in terms of the Sanitary Dignity Frameworks state that the policy is planned for implementation by provincial departments.

"*The national department is represented, but provinces will do implementation. Development is at national and implementation is at provincial level*" (Participant I, 2019)

The national departments participated in the development of the policy at the national level; the implementation of the policy was expected at the provincial level.

"*The key stakeholders are the Department of Education (at the policy level) but at the implementation level, it is the department of education in the provinces*" *Then at the provincial level, for implementation the department of education is the best department for the actual roll out. In other areas, it would be the department of social development. Department of education nationally, would ensure that there is integration in provinces at provincial level, that is why we want give to coordination to office of the Premier so that there is that integration and unnecessary duplications so that there is single purpose. We want to ensure that pads are rolled out to the right people in the right numbers. (Participant J, 2019)*

The policy implementation and monitoring and evaluation were not clear for some participants in stakeholder departments, although it seems it was clear to officials of the DWYPD. Participants therefore highlighted challenges that may rise as a result of provincial implementation.

"*They [DWYPD] do not have provincial presence. This project will be implemented in the provinces, because of this, they rely on other national departments linked with provinces and that is why some of the provinces have decided to go with DSD and some with DBE. Therefore, monitoring and reporting will be difficult; they have to negotiate with stakeholder departments*" (Participant H, 2019)

The challenge with the DWYPD not having provincial offices was raised as a possible bottleneck to implementation as well as monitoring and evaluation.

"*When we were subpoenaed before CGE and present the work of the task team provinces did not participated because they are not completed by national authority. We struggle with that as a department, now we say we are going to write to HODs saying DOW wants this information, it's going to be difficult. DOW needs legislative authority to make stakeholders accountable and it is going to be huge problem. Getting money from NT without legislative authority will be difficult*" (Participant A, 2019)

The issue of the autonomy of provinces was raised in the previous theme. Provincial autonomy will make implementation of policies difficult. Challenges around monitoring were also raised. In terms of the Sanitary Dignity policy, it was revealed in the interviews that the DWYPD does not yet have the capacity to monitor the policy

"*We don't have capacity for evaluation, I am handing over to DSD"* (Participant I, 2019)

"*Capacity to monitor. Some provinces are more advanced than others. provincial coordination is one of the major challenges as some have their own monitoring systems"* (participant J, 2019)

Stakeholder departments also highlighted challenges with reporting fatigue

"*Yes, reporting fatigue can also be a problem, there also already so many templates to report*- (Participant A, 2019)

"*If you do not have a good monitoring system in place, it will be difficult. Departments will also have reporting fatigue*" – (Participant E, 2019)

In terms of the GRPBMEA, participants revealed that plans for policy implementation and monitoring were not clear

"I'm really concerned on how it's going to go down [how it is going to be implemented]. Especially if I could go to my CFO now and tell him we are going to do GRPBMEA, he has no idea what is going to happen, even lower down to other branches. GRPBMEA was just high level. On the one hand, getting finances gender responsive is important but how it will be implemented is the problem. It must done with research; we need to have the legislative powers to implement. We must have desegregated data" (Participant A, 2019)

Inputs from Participant B also highlighted challenges of implementation of the policy under the current financial systems. In terms of the input, stating systems would need to be revamped to allow for GRPBMEA.

"*Financial systems in SA was never designed to spilt beneficiaries in terms of gender. The policy to be implemented, these systems need to be revamped*" (Participant B, 2019)

The policy implementation by the DWYPD continued to be highlighted by participants as a possible challenge. This was in light of the absence of a legislative mandate for the DWYPD.

"DWYPD not having legislative authority makes implementation difficult, especially in provinces as they are autonomous. Reporting fatigue is another challenge" (Participant A, 2019)

Legislative authority

The participant highlighted the absence of legislative authority as a challenge to implementation especially in relation to provinces, which are expected to implement this programme.

"*DWYPD does not have any front print in any of the spheres of government. Also, doesn't have a good reputation"* (Participant H, 2019)

Not having a footprint in provinces means that the DWYPD would need an entrance point to provincial offices. This can be done through departments that already have provincial departments such as the DBE, DOH and DSD. This could also mean that the DWYPD would have to foster direct relations with provinces; this is where issues of autonomy may arise should they not be in agreement with the terms of engagement.

"The NT, DPSA, Department of Labour have acts that prohibit and require and we can make determinations. The point I am trying to make is yes, we participative with the legislative mandate to provide determination. DOW does not have legislation that backs the strategies they want to put into place. The advantage they have is that they have political. GBV is the flavour of the day these days" (Participant E, 2019).

Authority of the DWYPD on other departments

The authority of the department in its ability to make stakeholder participation in the policy objectives is very important. Should the lead department not have any authority over stakeholders, no one can enforce participation. Many countries use different approaches for their gender machineries to have influence over other departments when conducting cross-sectoral policies. The aim of the findings in the section was to detect if DWYPD has any authority to enforce participation by stakeholder departments and also what the consequences are for client departments not participating in the policy.

In answering the question on whether the DWYPD has any influence on other departments, the majority of the responses from participants agreed with each other that the DWYPD does not have any authority over other government departments.

"The DWYPD doesn't have legislative authority, provinces are autonomous and location doesn't really help much" (Participant A, 2019)

An important question for the research is, if the central department does not have any authority over its stakeholders, how does that affect the policy

outcomes? It makes policy coordination difficult as actors cannot be held to account.

"It does not have any authority; it depends on the agreement between the departments in the inter-governmental system. For it to have authority, it would need to have some form of legislation maybe a bill. Have an act, which will require things at a certain point in time. For example, there are laws for gender equality, maybe they should look at gaps within those laws. Use advocacy on women issues to influence Cabinet to take issues brought forward to be taken seriously. Maybe it should start at Cabinet level and FOSAD for presence, getting buy in from ministers and dg's will assist to get the by in, maybe then a legislation won't be necessary" (Participant H, 2019)

In this participant's view, the DWYPD does not have authority over stakeholders and their engagements department on agreements between it and stakeholder departments. The participant suggests that, in the absence of legal authority, the DWYPD should look at other gaps in gender laws to facilitate change. In addition, the participant suggests other structures that can assist the department in ensuring enforcement.

Location as a means of authority

There are many other strategies used by gender machineries to ensure their influence over other departments. One of those strategies is using their location at the centre of government. For the DWYPD, this location refers to its placement in the Presidency.

"The location of the DWYPD does not matter at all; I haven't seen that, in fact if it meant anything we would be having muscles" (Participant I, 2019)

"It ought to be an advantage, but practically it hasn't been" (Participant J, 2019)

Two of the participants agreed with each other that the location of the DWYPD is important. Participant B however, somewhat agreed with Participant H that the DWYPD was not utilising its influence strongly enough.

"We [DWYPD] are the centre of government. The location of the department is very, very critical and the location of where this thing is going to be implemented is very critical, that is why we have said Ministers have

performance agreements and we have given Minister a duty to implement. We have also developed guidelines as to how to do it. We are also doing assessments to ensure that they are actually now implementing this thing" (Participant F, 2019)

The participant who is an official of DWYPD states that location is important and that it will assist the DWYPD with the implementation of tis policies as it is at the centre of government. This is an interesting finding as the other two officials from DWYPD felt that their location has not assisted at all.

"*Where the DWYPD is placed, they are empowered, they are in the Presidency, and the President could write anything to anyone. But, the was the framework [GRPBMEA] was sold to the department, it came as an option"-* (Participant B, 2019*)*

A participant from a stakeholder department felt that the location empowers the DWYPD, however the participant also mentioned a key dynamic about how the DWYPD approached other departments with the GRPBMEA framework. This is linked to participant H's contribution that maybe the DWYPD has not utilised its location to its best potential.

"it can actually help them; question is to what extent are they using it to their advantage. We have suggested this before in terms of the current non-participation challenges, that the President signs and instructs other departments to participate, but it was not considered for some reason. It did not seem they wanted to use the location within the Presidency to their advantage. The Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME) and DWPD are similar in that they both do not have legislative mandates but, the DPME has managed to get government to comply, make it work for them to sort of instruct departments to do what they request and they use that to their advance. DWYPD has not really done that, which is why maybe they have not been successful" (Participant H, 2019)

The participant compared the DWYPD with similar departments within the Presidency as states that the DPME has been able to enforce its authority on other departments.

International obligations as a means of authority

There are also other strategies raised by stakeholder departments, which include international obligations.

"Authority may lie in the fact that we are signatories to international treaties, we are obligated as the country to report and they do that work. Our country signed agreement on treaties me personally, location does make a difference; I do think it does have an impact. They will tell the president, they have access to him"- (Participant E, 2019*)*

The question of authority was asked to gather information on what the DWYPD can do to ensure stakeholder department's participant in the policies. The general finding is that the DWYPD does not have much authority over stakeholder departments. This has implications for the two policies as the DWYP cannot implement the policies without stakeholder departments.

Resources also affect the ability of departments to coordinate policies.

"*Budget it's the main issue. We need money to implement and the NT forgets that it is not its money they are just account; its government's money and they account to Parliament*. "*NT is biggest bottleneck and that's why now we had to move out with gender budgeting, it's everywhere, even in other countries. It is important that women have a hold or control over where money goes. Other departments themselves are gender blind, which is why is has been important for the DWYPD to implement this policy. The DPME also is not playing its role in terms of gender responsiveness of government policies, they have a priority paper, which did not discuss budget prioritisation of women, and even their MTSF indicators are not gender aware. We have now engendered the NDP, which has been an initiative of the DOW, but where we have massive problems is the NT. They just block us*" (Participant F, 2019)

In terms of the input from an official from the DWYPD, resources within the DWYPD are a challenge to the implementation of the GRPBMEA. The department is short of resources and does not get support from stakeholder departments such as the NT and the DPME who are key stakeholders in the policy. In terms of the participant, both these departments are not playing their

roles in ensuring the budgets are gender responsive. The NT had a different view.

"*There is no department in this country that is over funded. Everyone wants to do something. If you look at roads in the Eastern Cape, you realise that Department of Transport is underfunded, if you look at the hospitals and the queues, you realise that Health is underfunded, if you look at the ratio of teachers to pupils, some of these school its 50, they are also underfunded. This is more of a budget bid. DWYPD is small, new; they need to figure out what it is they need to do. They requested money, when we checked what they wanted to do; most of what they wanted to do is already in other departments. They are not a service delivery department. They need to have policy for departments to implement. It is not that it is not important; it was established, meaning that it is important enough"* (participant G, 2019)

Another participant from NT further emphasised that it is not merely that the DWYPD is underfunded, but that it misallocates its budgets.

"*No, the department [DWYPD] budgets more for administration than core programs, the office of the Minister's budget is bigger than all other sections. You ask yourself why, could the department not reprioritise some of the funds towards core programmes as has been advised many times. The DWYPD was also given additional funding; however, additional funding was not used for what was requested. For me you may need more, but if you cannot use the little that you have, you should be able to spend it*" (Participant H, 2019)

These were contrasting views on the budget of the DWYPD. Although the other two participants from the DWYPD did not comment on budgets, they did mention other issues such as capacity to monitor and implement. However, the GRPBMEA framework does mention challenges in terms of under resourcing of gender machineries. The framework compares the budget of the DWYPD with other departments such as the DPME, DPSA and NT. Furthermore, it cites challenges of the lack of human resources (GRPBMEA framework, p 11)

Discuss the observations presented by the data, and any dilemmas remaining

The Sanitary Dignity Framework outlines the implementation and monitoring plan. Whilst the GRPBMEA does not give much detail on the implementation plan, and gives no account of the monitoring and evaluation plans. The framework highlights a host of interventions by different departments which can be assumed to be the implementation and monitoring mechanisms. To what extent these are enforceable in terms of lead departments executing their role are something that is not clear in the framework. The framework also highlights the importance of stakeholder buy-in and does attest to the fact that there has been the lack of institutional mechanisms for the coordination of the GRPBMEA (GRPBMEA, p11).

There were many similarities in what the participants highlighted as challenges, which has an impact on the policy objectives. Participant A, J and H highlighted the issue of the DWYPD not having a legislative mandate and possibly having an effect on the implementation of the policy.

Monitoring challenges such as reporting fatigue lack of strategic direction, non-costing of responsibilities were mentioned. Challenges with lack of clarity on implementation and monitoring were highlighted by most of the participants. The Sanitary Dignity gives details of the role of the DWYPD in terms of its role in monitoring the framework; it does not consider that some of the issues highlighted are outside the scope and authority of the DWYPD.

Insufficient budget allocation was also raised in the literature review as one of the challenges that face gender machineries. A similar question was asked of participants. However, there were different responses from the officials of the DWYPD those of the NT, which shows a vast contrast.

Participants also raised issues of capacity to report as well as capacity to monitor. One participant raised an issue with the negative perception that exits about the DWYPD. This affects other department's attitude to working with them.

"A lot of negative stories have been put out there about it, a lot of people are in doubt about it, and it doesn't receive the reception expected. For example, when the project started DWYPD thought they would facilitate engagements on the project because they saw it as more of a Department of Social

Development (DSD) policy more than anything did, hoping that DSD would lead the development of the policy itself. However, there was negative attitude towards the policy with no ownership, lack of participation from other department such as the Department of Basic Education (DBE). These challenges were probably because the DWYPD do not have presence yet, and this makes it difficult to coordinate, the DWYPD also do not have a good history and support. (Participant H, 2019)

Due to the lack of legislative mandate, two of the participants agreed that the DWYPD does not have any authority over stakeholder departments. There is a balance between participants who feel that the location of the DWYPD within the Presidency is an advantage to the policy and those that do not believe that it has an impact at all. What is interesting is what two of the participants states, that in theory is should be an advantage, but in practice, it is not. One participant presented a different dynamic. Stating that the DWYPD is not utilising the location to its full potential. The participants agreed that their contribution was important, however, they felt that even if they had not contributed, the policies would have still gone ahead as it is already being implemented in the provinces. One participant remarked that had they not participated, the DWYPD would not have been able to keep within the scope of the policy and submit the relevant documents on time for funding. Another participant felt that non-participation would have brought embarrassment to his or her organisation, the country and in the international community.

Preliminary analysis of why this data is significant and what it means for theory or practice

The data is significant in that it provided the challenges that the different departments faced in the implementation and monitoring of the policy. This was both from the perspective of the DWYPD and the key stakeholders. The findings are not surprising considering that the literature had already alluded to similar challenges, which may be faced by gender machineries.

Conclusion on the key observations under the theme

The key observations under this theme were key challenges that were raised by the participants in the development of the two policies. The theme

discussed policy implementation and monitoring and evaluation challenges. It found that stakeholders were not clear on the implementation, monitoring and evaluation plans. However, the officials from DWYPD seemed to have details on the processes. The Sanitary Dignity Framework gave account of implementation, monitoring and evaluation. Whilst the GRPBMEA framework did not explain how the policy was going to be implemented and monitored, nor did it give a detailed account of interventions strategies which to some extent have monitoring and evaluation aspects.

The main observations under the theme are that there is a contestation on the authority that DWYPD has on other departments. Legislative mandate, location and international obligations were discussed under factors that may assist the DWYPD in exerting its authority over stakeholder departments. The DWYPD's lack of legal authority makes it difficult for it to enforce their authority over other departments. One participant agreed that their contribution was important, however, they felt that even if they did not contribute, the policies would have still gone ahead.

Conclusion

This section presented the research findings, which were presented according to selected themes. The first theme was institutional form and approach to policy making. This theme looked at the institutional form of government departments and how it influences policy coordination. Data on this theme was gathered through semi structured interviews. The data found that government departments work together often in the coordination of cross-sectoral policies. The engagements are guided by the intergovernmental relations system which is stipulated in Chapter 3 of the Constitution, thereby reflecting compliance with regulative institutionalism where institutions are guided by the rule of law. In addition, the dependence of government departments on working together in cross sectoral policies reflects characteristics of historical institutionalism. In addition to the political history of the country where institutions were developed to address past injustices, Government departments are also led through a political system which is guided by a ruling party that often reflects or represents the interest of its voters. This leading more towards sociological

institutionalism. Government institutions are also members of international organisations where they have signed international obligations and treaties, thus reflecting realist institutionalism where different actors express their own interests in institutions.

The second theme was policy initiation and planning. This theme is linked to the first two stages of the policy cycle which are policy agenda setting and policy formulation. It looks at the identification of actors in the policy, the identification of the problem to be resolved and engagement between the different stakeholders in the initiation and planning of the policies. Data on this theme were gathered through document analysis and semi structured interviews. The data on the document analysis found that the Sanitary Dignity Framework was more detailed in terms of identifying the actors and their roles.

The GRPBMEA did not give much detailed information on the actors and their role. In terms of the interviews, the data reported that officials from DWYPD had more clarity in terms of what their roles were in both policies. Stakeholder department contributions revealed that some stakeholders were not sure of their roles in the implementation and monitoring of the policy. However, their roles were clear in terms of their participation in the interdepartmental task team to represent their respective departments and provide inputs in the draft policy frameworks. A discussion on the problem the policy aims to address is also important in the agenda setting phase. Data presented especially in terms of the GRPBMEA stated that some of the stakeholder departments did not agree with the endangering budgets as an approach to address gender inequalities. Participants from stakeholder departments also stated that communication in the initiation stage of the policy was a challenge.

The third theme dealt with the last two processes of the policy cycle, which are policy implementation and monitoring and evaluation. The theme sets out the implementation and monitoring plan from data from the documents and semi structured interviews. In terms of the Sanitary Dignity Framework, policy implementation will be done by provinces. The DWYPD is responsible for developing the monitoring mechanisms and work with national departments to ensure compliance with the monitoring and evaluation systems developed.

The participants highlighted challenges in implementation and monitoring. Absence of a legislative mandate for the DWYPD will make implementation and monitoring difficult. Absence of a provincial footprint will also make implementation and monitoring difficult as provinces have autonomy over their functions. The officials within the DWYPD mentioned a lack of resources in budgets and capacity. The shortfall on budgets was contested by participants from the NT, who remarked that the DWYPD should work and prioritise issues within the budget they have.

CHAPTER FIVE: INTERPRETATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE FINDINGS

Introduction

This section aims to interpret and analyse the research findings in terms of the themes developed through the conceptual framework. The approach in discussing the research findings is to introduce the theme linking it back to the literature review section and recap what the findings chapter said about the empirical data. This section will then analyse the implications this data has for the theoretical discussion in the literature review and state the importance of the new contribution, and identify any significant implications this has for theory and practice. In conclusion, it discusses the challenges, areas that are functioning well in the relation between the DWYPD and its stakeholder departments and those areas that require improvement. The data is interpreted and analysed found that the institutional arrangements in the coordination of the Sanitary Dignity Framework and the GRPBMEA need to be improved.

The institutional arrangements in the coordination of the policies were affected by a number of challenges, which include lack of clarity on actor's roles, lack of clarity on implementation, monitoring and evaluation as well as poor coordination. The DWYPD does not have a founding legislation. This affects the DWYPD's ability to manage institutional arrangements. There is no evidence of the effect of location in the Presidency on the ability of the DWYPD to influence stakeholder participation. Stakeholder participation and buy-in was a challenge. These findings have assisted the researcher in achieving their research objectives and answering the research questions.

Theme 1: Institutional form and approach to policy making

Introduction

In terms of institutional models and approaches, the literature mentioned that institutions adhere to different models. The findings linked the different theories to public institutions/government departments in South Africa. Historical institutionalism states that policy choices of the past affect current policy choices of institutions; path -dependence exists between actors, rules and

procedures, which regulates relationship between actors. Politics and power relations also play a dominant role in historical institutionalism (Peters & Pierre, 2002). The apartheid system, laws and its institutions paved a way for the creation of new institutions in the democratic South Africa in/post 1994. Due to past injustices, the new institutions were created to be interdependent in order to ensure cooperation, service delivery for all and accountability.

In sociological institutionalism, organisations promote values and interest of local communities in which they operate where a bottom up approach to policy making is selected. The adoption of democracy in South Africa was based on the principle of putting people first. This means that public institutions in South Africa reflect and mirror the interest majority of the citizens. The theory believes that state institutions must cope with the pressure exerted outside the local context in which it operates (Thoening, 2003).

In realist institutionalism, actors are at the centre and they matter more than the institution. They create rules, which they can break themselves, also creating their own network (Meyer, 2007). This can be linked to international influences such those of international organisations, this can't be linked with the democratic state of South Africa, as it was meant to represent interest of the people of the country.

Institutional entrepreneurs are made up of powerful, resourceful and impactful actors who use their power to influence institutions (Nganje, 2015). This can be linked to the influence of businesses on public institutions/government departments. New institutionalism places emphasis on human activities as the driver of public institutions and not applied techniques. In terms of this theory, leaders are not in full control and policy choices are not consensual (Thoening, 2003). Due to the dominating political system, leaders are very much in control when it comes to public institutions in South Africa. However, the political environment is vulnerable to influence, both internally and externally.

Normative institutionalism occurs where the value of the institution guides behaviour over an actor's personal preference (Peters, 2000). The research findings do not make links of this institutionalism to government departments in South Africa.

Rational choice is where institutions function on rules and incentives. Actors abide by the rules in order to get the desired incentives. They are self-interested actors whose self-interest stands to benefit the institution (Nganje, 2015). The research did not show any of the participating government department to subscribe to the model.

Regulative institutionalism is found where institutions are characterised by laws, regulations and processes (Biesenthal et al., 2018). The findings have made a case for this kind of institutionalism in the context of South Africa.

Different institutions collaborate in many gender equality policy initiatives due to the cross-cutting nature of gender mainstreaming. Multi sectoral approach to this kind of policy making is a norm. A lot of countries have attempted gender responsive budgeting with the Ministry of Finance as the lead department, supported by the Ministry of Women Affairs, this kind of an approach has been used in countries such as India (Lahiri et al., 2000) and other sub Saharan Africa countries (Chakraborty, 2014).

The National Gender Policy in Zimbabwe also took a multi sectoral approach, with the Ministry of Women Affairs being the lead department, assisted by the Ministry of Finance. In this policy, just like the DWYPD, we observe the Ministry of Women Affairs adopting multiple roles and responsibilities. The policy does demonstrate a good working relationship between the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Women Affairs in Zimbabwe, however, the actual impact of the policy on its citizens cannot be determined by looking only at the policy. Sanitary Dignity is another project that has forced different institutions, even civil society to work together, for example the exception of tax from sanitary products as result of protects by women movements ibn India (Fadnis 2017). Initiatives and policies on gender-based violence which involve department such as DSD, Department of Police, DOH etc. are also good examples of policy coordination between different institutions (Department of Justice: RSA, 2007).

Recapping what the findings chapter said about empirical data

The institutional form followed by government departments is one that is regulative guided by the rule of law, the Constitution, which gives way to an intergovernmental system. The Constitution promotes co-operation between the three spheres of government, but also emphasises the autonomy of each sphere. The departments are also guided by their own departmental mandate in terms of the law. Conforming to rules, laws and processes is associated with regulative institutionalism.

The research found that the intergovernmental system is an important framework, which guides how departments work together, in terms of the system departments and how to foster good working relations with each other to promote service delivery. The research also found that institutional arrangements are also important as they spell out the different roles of departments.

The implementation of these two policies is planned at the provincial and local spheres, The DWYPD as the owners of the framework need to take into consideration the autonomy of the other two spheres of government. The dilemma which still remains is how the DWYPD without provincial and local offices will work with provinces in the implementation of the policy.

In the spirit of cooperation which is important to policy coordination and institutional arrangements, the DWYPD needs to foster good working relations with other national departments, which have direct access to provinces such as the DBE and DSD. This aspect leads to path dependence, which is associated with historic institutionalism. This may not always be easy; however, the key issue in resolving the dilemma (of the DWYPD having to go through national departments to access provincial departments to implement their policies for them) would be for the DWYPD to establish its own provincial offices.

Although co-operation is promoted, autonomy may raise challenges too. The interest of different stakeholder must be considered.

The MEC's who the provincial heads are, have the authority to instruct their department to do what they want and not subscribe to what the National sphere has instructed. In terms of the findings on the Sanitary Dignity framework, there have been challenges where the heads of department have instructed their departments not to comply with requirements of the DWYPD.

In addition, the findings also assert that where different departments and ministries work together, conflict, clash of ideologies and interests may rise

The endorsement or approval from the Minister in any department is important. Although the IGR system allows for multi stakeholder relations, departments tend to act within the interest of their political heads and to protect their interests. Should the Minister not endorse the project, it is likely that a department will pull its support or participation. Therefore, Ministerial territory is important, this was demonstrated by the withdrawal of participation by the DWYPD.

Government departments also subscribe to the influence of international organisations and treaties, which can be linked to realist institutionalism, and reflects the interests of different actors. The DWYP is a signatory to a number of international organisations such as the United Nations, to which it reports on performance indicators. In terms of the GRPBMEA framework South Africa is signatory to the Beijing Declaration and its Platform for Action (1995), United Nations (UN) Commission on the Status of Women etc. The participation of government department in issues of women development are seen as important within the country and to the international community. The representation of the country in international organisations was highlighted as one of the key things to consider in the coordination of gender policies.

The findings did not link government departments to the other forms of institutionalism such as institutional entrepreneurs, normative institutionalisms, new institutionalism and rational choice institutionalism.

<u>Analysis of the implications this data has for the theoretical discussion in the literature review</u>

The literature review revealed that there are different institutional theories and models to analyse how public institutions operate. This ultimately gives guidance on how different institutions approach policy making. Most important in institutional theory is how actors and institutions influence each other. Therefore, an important aspect will be the nature of institutions in their approach to policy making. This is followed by factors such as ideologies, interdependence and power struggles between different actors as well as external influences. From the literature, we gather that public institutions in South Africa subscribe to regulative institutionalism, which leads through the rule of law. Institutions are also guided by historical institutionalism, which is influenced by the political system prior 1994, where democratic institutions post 1994 aim work together to address political, social and economic injustices, thereby, creating path interdependence independence between the different institutions. Most of the participants agreed with a more historical and sociological institutionalism where path interdependence and regulative institutionalism which is guided by rule of law. A few examples were provided by the participants, such as the school nutrition programme as well as HIV programmes where different departments have worked together.

In terms of the link to regulative institutionalism, the most important piece of legislation, which guides the work of public institutions in South Africa, is the Constitution. This is followed by various legislations that give departments certain mandates to act within. However, what did not come out from the findings is the political system, which guides the setup of governance. It is important to note that institutions in South Africa are run through the government system. The government system works through a process of election of a ruling party that delegates its members to head public institutions. As such, government will be acting for various key actors.

In this case, the political system determines who makes the policy decision as it has the power (Venter & Landsberg, 2007 cited in Maluleke, 2011). Largely; public institutions in South Africa are driven by politics and headed by political representatives. Politicians also lead the policy structure of government through Parliament. The ideologies of politicians in some instances may come into conflict, in this case, it may affect the way institutions work each other. In

addition, most public administrators have a strong desire to protect ministerial territory and resist cross cutting interests. Ministries tend to compete on priorities, resources and opportunities which in turn have a negative impact on how public institutions work together.

Findings also reflect the interest of different actors, which is associated with realist institutionalism. Government departments subscribe to international organisations and treaties, which guide the way they work. This was also revealed in the findings. Gender machineries are catalysts in promoting gender equality and justice. International bodies such as the UN have driven state institutions through national gender machineries to commit to the gender equality agenda. The state is an arena for advocating for gender justice, however, the state is a broken and ambiguous area for women and it needs constant negotiation and bargaining for those who are internal and external (Rai, 2017). In South Africa, gender machineries such as the CGE and the OSW were driven by a group of feminists, this also included the influence of international organisations (Sadie, 2003).

In various cases, measures to institutionalise gender and development machinery in state bureaucracy have been the result of pressures exerted by foreign donors or international feminist movements such as the United Nations (Goetz, 2018). The main question often asked is whose interests they are representing and under which rules are they exerting their pressure. This is something that institutions always need to be aware of. The research also found that the DWYPD is signatory to international institutions, which assist in monitoring the country's progress towards international measurements on gender equality.

Theories such as institutional entrepreneurs and realist institutionalism focus more on actors guiding and influencing, in terms of theory and findings, this does not seem to be the system in South African institutions as they are guided more by legislation. Although there are gaps and possible opportunities for these influences of entrepreneurs and realist institutionalism, they are not

guided by law. The conformity of South African public institutions to various institutional theories can create a good opportunity for the DWYPD to implement its policies with the assistance of other departments. It is a powerful force that includes the rule of law, the political system, the influence of society, the influence of the international community and the importance of politics and leadership.

Conclusion

What has been established in the research is that in terms of the Constitution, government institutions are expected to work together to achieve policy objectives, working together with other departments is done through the IGR system which is stipulated in Chapter 3 of the Constitution. The data also revealed sphere autonomy as an important factor to consider when different spheres of government work together. This is important as it emphasises the cornerstone of the Constitution as the highest law of the land, which regulates governance.

The data revealed that government departments subscribe to various institutional forms, which assist, or is an enabler of cross-sectoral policy coordination. The data revealed that even though interdependence of government departments exists, ministerial territory and sphere autonomy are important factors to consider.

Findings on autonomy alluded to challenges that may arise in working with different spheres of government, as even though coordination is promoted, no sphere should interfere with the operations of another, unless conflict arises where the National Sphere is expected to make decisions. The findings show that there is an enabling environment for gender equality policies to be coordinated centrally through a gender machinery. None of the findings questions the existence of the DWYPD as an institution developed to address gender inequalities. The questions were around their policy approach and process which are aspects that can be improved or changed. As such gender equality policies should be coordinated centrally, however, the DYWPD should ensure that it has good relations with its stakeholder departments from all spheres of government. This should be in terms of the principles highlighted in

the Constitution. These principles also bind and place responsibilities on stakeholder departments fostering a good working relationship with the DWYPD in coordination its cross sectoral policies.

In terms of the literature, mandates of gender machineries must be incorporated in the Constitution and the National Development Plan. In addition, binding international agreements and treaties have been signed which the country is held accountable for. This of course opens the country up to many actors with different interest and may reflect theories of realist institutions.

Theme 2: Policy initiation and planning

Introduction

The literature highlights important aspects of policy planning and coordination. Policy initiation and planning form part of the first two stages of the policy cycle. These first two stages are critical for the policy development or coordination process. This process starts with the identification of the problem, (together with actors) in order to find a policy solution. Actors form an important part in these stages.

For the success of the policy, the gender machinery must have a policy, which states clear goals and priorities with clear lines of responsibility and accountability (Bell et al., 2002). It is a norm for gender machineries to have many roles and strategies. In this case, it is also important that there is clarity on whether the machineries will implement their own policies or seek coordination with other ministries or try and influence or advice other ministries in the implementation of their policies (Bell et al., 2002). In the case of the DWYPD, it was clear in the research that institutional arrangements are important for their policy coordination, they need other government structures to develop, implement and monitor and evaluate their policies.

The literature also states that the actual goals of the policy to be pursued must be clear. Clarity on the goals of a policy, especially a cross-sectoral policy with multi stakeholders must be from the perspective of both the leading institutions and its stakeholders. in terms of the findings, the goals of the two policies was

clear to the lead department and not so clear to the stakeholders, it can be concluded that the DWPD did not take time to engage their stakeholders adequately.

Information, opportunities, decision-making and support must behave a solid foundation (Peterson & Pierre, 2002). The elements highlighted can be addressed through a solid communication system between all the stakeholders involved. The way in which communication flows between the stakeholders is also a key element of policy planning and initiation. Where a gender machinery plays a central role in the coordination of a key policy, communication is a key aspect of the relations with key stakeholder departments. The research found challenges in terms of information sharing, decision making and support in this collective policy approach.

Stakeholder departments need to be informed about their role, the policy process/plans as well as the policy objectives or outcomes. Not only is the mandate of the gender machinery important, the role of different stakeholders is also important. It is therefore important that the communication line between stakeholders and the central department remain open to ensure successful implementation of the policy.

Recapping what findings chapter said about empirical data

In terms of the data presented in the document analysis, the role of stakeholders in terms of the implementation was made clear. Both the frameworks give account of what the role players are supposed to do. Although, the Sanitary Dignity gives more details on the role than the GRPBMEA framework. The role of the provinces is not clear in the GRPBMEA framework and how they feature into the policy process.

The GRPBMEA states that consultations were done with stakeholders. However, some of the participants were not aware of this consultation process at all. This is evident in some of the information that is presented in the framework being disputed by stakeholder departments.

Participant's contribution varied from not knowing their roles at all, not knowing their roles in the beginning and them understanding their roles only in terms of

commenting on the draft policies and not clear on their role when it came to implementation, monitoring and evaluation. Participants that were clear on their role were the ones from the DWYPD; they gave more a detailed account of what their department's role was. This implies that, the department applied a one-sided approach in terms of getting stakeholder buy-in.

The role of the DWYPD is stated as: coordination of the framework, monitoring and evaluation of the framework, ensuring that the project is a funded mandate and playing an advocacy role for women empowerment and gender equality. The role of the DWYPD as stated, is broader in terms of advocating for women empowerment and protection of their rights. The role extends to education on sanitary dignity. In terms of findings from both policies the DWYPD assumed a bigger role, which was to some extent longer than their reach. This implies mandate over reach on the part of the DWYPD.

In terms of the literature, it is common for gender machineries to have many roles that are outside their scope. In terms of the GRPBMEA framework, the DWYPD felt they had a bigger role to play, this role also tapped into planning and monitoring.

This creates a problem for policy coordination. For policies to be well coordinated, all stakeholders must have a clear role to play. Should the role of the stakeholders not be clear, it is almost difficult to hold them to account. Some of the stakeholders felt that they were not the appropriate officials to attend to the policy.

Policy approach

Problem identification is a key step in the policy stage, for policy coordination, problem identification is also dependant on the engagement between the different stakeholders and should not only be done in favour of one stakeholder. Some of the stakeholder departments did not agree with the approach used by the DWYPD in the policy issue. The participants felt that not enough research was done to establish the facts about both policies. The participants felt that the DWYPD used advocacy more than technical approaches in dealing with the policy need. In addition, the GRPBMEA also

does not give account of any research conducted recently and in the South African context about who needs the policy.

In terms of the importance of the stakeholder's participation, most of the participants felt that their participation was important but the policies would go ahead with or without their participation. This is only in terms of the development of the framework however; there was a balanced view that the policies cannot be implemented without the participation of the other key stakeholders

Communication

Participants highlighted poor communication from the DWYPD as another challenge faced. Specifically, this spoke to the communication of meeting dates, venue and content to be discussed in the meeting. Addressing issues around communication was highlighted as a focus going forward by the official in the DYWPD regarding the GRPBMEA framework.

Analysis of the implications this data has for the theoretical discussion in the literature review

According to Bell et al., (2002) the policy of a gender machinery must be coherent, stating its goals and priorities with clear lines of responsibility and accountability. The data has revealed a number of challenges that were faced by the DYWPD in the development of the two frameworks.

These are challenges in the form of planning, communication, clarity of policy implementation, monitoring and evaluation. To address such issues, proper consultation must take placed backed up with research and policy alternatives. The policy framework itself needs to be clear on the policy direction, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. A strong regulative framework is needed to guide processes and well as spell out consequent management. These are some of the aspects that are not clear enough in the framework and between the different departments. The most critical challenge that is highlighted as a key challenge for most gender machinery is the absence of a legislative framework establishing the department and regulating the work of the machinery.

The role of all institutions is important when approaching a multi sectoral policy. The role extends to the mandate of the gender machinery itself and the role it is expected to play, together with stakeholder departments. The findings state that there was a lot of emphasis and clarity on the role of the DWYPD but some of the stakeholder departments did not feel like their roles were clear or significant enough. The role of the officials of DWYPD was clarified in both the frameworks and through the interview process indicates that the DWYPD considered its position as the centre department more than the position of stakeholder departments. This may raise problems in cross sector policy coordination as one of the participants remarked:

The findings also emphasised the importance of having the relevant people to make necessary decisions in the policy coordination.

Significant enough in the sense that the policy continued without the participation of some of the stakeholders. A key question raised was how the frameworks were able to provide and cover inputs of the departments that did not participate. The interesting dynamic in the findings is that, nowhere in the research does it come out that there was an intervention to ensure participation of the all the stakeholders. Where a stakeholder did not participate, the issue was not escalated to the next level. In the case of the Sanitary Dignity framework it was reported in the findings that the departmental head of the DWYPD wrote from a letter to the BDE however, this intervention was done after the framework had already been processed.

The research findings also discussed the conflicting ideas on the correctness of the policy approach to address school absenteeism and ensure gender equality through engendering budgets. Both the sanitary dignity framework and the GRPBMEA do not give a convincing account need for the policy based on research done in the South African context. For example, the problems identified in the GRPBMEA which should be addressed through this policy initiative are the political, economic and social exclusion of women and weak institutionalisation of gender mainstreaming across the state machinery (GRPBMEA framework, p9), although the framework outlines work to be done

by different departments in their approach to GRPBMEA, it is still not clear how the problem will be resolved.

As Rai (2017) reveals, it is important to establish the viability of engagements of gender machineries and to ensure that the machinery commands the necessary resources to promote the interests of women. The study did not establish any findings questioning the existence of the DWYPD as a gender machinery, but spoke to the challenges around their processes in facilitating cross-sectoral work.

The finding contributes to the existing knowledge on challenges faced by gender machineries in coordinating cross-sectoral policies. The implications for the theory and practise are for government to see how best to utilise, establish, capacitate and assist the functioning of gender machineries with their cross-sectoral work. The contribution also highlights the need to clear and coherent policy focus of gender machineries. The findings also emphasise important aspects of institutional arrangements and policy coordination.

Theme 3: policy implementation, monitoring and evaluation

As revealed in the literature, gender machineries are often faced with number of challenges when they create gender policies. These challenges range from capacity within the department to skills, and budget allocations etc. Challenges may lead to poor implementation, which may compromise the position of the machinery (Rai, 2017)

Gender machineries can be effective where location and resources are favourable, in addition they need strong democratic movements which hold actors to account (Rai, 2017). The size of the ministry, skill of staff and budget allocations can also affect the machinery's ability to institutionalise gender within government policy and programmes (Bell et al., 2002).

There are many mechanisms that gender machineries can apply to ensure that they get the desired participation from stakeholder departments. One of the mechanisms highlighted in the literature is the location of the machinery. According to Rai (2017), location raises the profile and is some instances; success of the machinery comes from its cross-sectoral ministerial location.

Bell et al., (2002) also share a similar view, that the location of the machinery has an important impact on the status and relationship that the gender machinery has with other ministries. In addition, Bell et al., (2002) goes further by stating that in order for gender machinery to review work of other departments, they would need to have a legal basis in doing this, otherwise, the machinery will be faced with challenges. To ensure that gender is integrated into all sectors of government, the national machinery would need to have the authority to review and comment on all other ministries' policies and programmes (Bell et al., 2002). In terms of the research findings, the location of the DWYPD within the Presidency has not assisted the DWYPD in its operations.

Noncompliance by key stakeholders should also have consequences. These consequences can be either the framework itself or terms of reference/memorandum of understanding by the different institutions. This is reiterated by the literature that earlier ideas of institutions had institutional forces that brought compliance in behaviour in social settings where conformity was highly promoted and there were heavy penalties for non-conformity (Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Jepperson 1991, cited in Biesenthal et al., 2018). Rules changing, multiple dominating or co-existing rationalities between the institutions, rationalities overlapping are some of the reasons that lead to non-conformity (Fincham & Forbes, 2016 cited, in Biesenthal et al., 2018). In a case where there are conflicting rationalities, some institutions' preferences take precedent over others, creating cross management in policies and a number of competing institutional forces (Douglas, 1986, cited in Biesenthal et al., 2018). The DWYPD does not seem to have any consequence management for noncompliance in terms of both these policies.

Recapping what findings chapter said about empirical data

Implementation, monitoring and evaluation

The data established that there was lack of clarity on implementation, monitoring and evaluation. The framework on Sanitary Dignity is clear that implementation will be done at the provincial level and monitoring and evaluation will be done on the national level. However, the findings from the

interviews do not ascertain provincial government buy-in to this approach. To that effect, provinces are continuing with their own initiatives regardless of this policy, this can also be attributed to the autonomy that they have. Since the project were implemented at a provincial level; it is unclear how the monitoring will unfold, as the DWYPD does not have provincial presence. Affected national departments have also not been consulted on what the plan for monitoring and evaluation are, this will make it difficult for these departments to put in place the necessary systems for monitoring and evaluation.

The GRPBMEA discussed four phases of policy implementation, these are, consultations, development of the framework, implementation of reform and full programme roll out. However, the framework does not clearly state the implementation as well as monitoring and evaluation plan. What is set out are the proposed interventions and it is not clear whether stakeholders have agreed to the proposed interventions. In addition, data from the interviews revealed that stakeholders from national departments are still unclear on how the policy will be implemented and evaluated. Two participants remarked on reporting fatigue that maybe experienced by participating departments.

Legislative mandate

It was revealed several times in the research that the DWYPD does not have provincial offices and legal authority/mandate over other stakeholder departments; as such, implementation may be difficult. Unlike other government departments such as the DPSA, DOH, DSD, Public Works etc. that function in terms of a legislation, the DWYPD does not have a founding legislation. This makes it difficult for them to ensure compliance of other government departments with their policies. It also makes it difficult for the DWYPD to have authority over other departments. Compliance is a huge challenge faced by the DWYPD when it comes to its stakeholder relations. It is evident from the findings that the DWYPD does not have any measures put in place for accountability and ensuring compliance. One of the participants states that even the way in which communication from DWYPD is written to other departments, it is not enforcing its role.

Location

From the findings, it was important for the research explore what would give the DYWPD more influence over its stakeholders. The location of the department may assist in exerting influence on other departments. There was no clear finding on whether the location assist the DWYPD or not. Two participants from the DWYP felt that their location has not really helped them to be more influential in the way they work with other departments. Two participants from the stakeholder departments felt that the location of the DWYPD was not that significant. One participant felt that DWYPD is not using its location to its best advantage. While two participants from stakeholder departments felt that location is key and can assist the DWYPD to be more influential. Two participants from the stakeholder department felt that the location of the DWYPD could influence their department.

What was clear however, was that in theory location could be a tool to assist the DWYPD to be more influential. In practical terms, the location has not worked in favour of the DWYPD.

Resources

The lack of access to resources does have an impact on the ability of an institution to implement its work, especially with other departments. There were different views presented concerning resources for the DWYPD. In terms of the officials of DWYPD the department does have resource scarcity. This view is not shared by stakeholder departments, especially from the NT. Issues around budget prioritisation came out strongly in the inputs by these two participants. In terms of the inputs from the stakeholders who are responsible for resource allocations, the DWYPD should prioritise better within their means.

The officials from DWYPD did highlight issues of capacity, when it comes to monitoring the Sanitary Dignity policy. This has many implications and these are key deliverables in terms of its role in the two policies. The department has both the role to source funds and also monitor and evaluate the policies.

Analysis of the implications this data has for the theoretical discussion in the literature review

According to Bell et al., (2002), for national machineries to function well, it is important that they have well established mandates, which are backed up by law, which define their powers and roles. The mandate of the DWYPD is not established and backed up by law to define its power and roles. According to the research, the DWYPD does not have any power over its working environment. It does not have clear plans neither are the implementation, monitoring and evaluation aspects clearly set out. There is a rise in potential problems in the policy direction.

The mandate of the DWYPD extracted from the constitution is abstract and does not give the department any powers. The department refers to section 9(2) of the constitution as a mandate; this section speaks in general terms on equal rights and enjoyment of those rights by all genders. The guiding legislative framework used in the sanitary dignity policy encompasses a mix of several policy documents that have not been developed by the DWYPD. A few of these are: sexual and reproductive health and rights framework, sustainable development goals, white paper on education and training. These are credible policies; however, they do not do anything for the footprint and enforceability for the DWYPD.

In addition, the GRPBMEA also uses legislative basis based on policies and international agreements outside the department, these include: CEDAW, Beijing Declarations, African Union prescripts, women's charter, and the national development plan. When it comes to the department's own leading framework, the department has not done much. The department needs to have its own legislation.

According Rai (2017), national gender machineries can be effective but under conditions of central location, better resources and strong democratic movements holding actors accountable. The location of the DWYPD should be an advantage in terms of the ability to influence other departments. However, the practicality is that it has not utilised this advantage. The findings seem to allude to no practical operational relationship between the DWYPD and the Presidency.

When probed on whether the location of the DWYPD within the Presidency gave it authority over other departments, participants had different views. While some instantly dismissed this view, others felt that this would work well if it applied in practice. The interesting dynamic here is that even officials from DWYPD itself felt that location does not do anything for the DWYPD. An interesting dynamic was raised by another participant in that maybe the DWYPD is not utilising its location to its best advantage. It is up to the DWYPD and the Presidency to determine how it can be use location to its advantage, from the research the question on how the location assists the DWYPD with its operations seemed surprising to officials from the DWYPD.

In terms of budgets, an in interesting contract was between the inputs from the officials of the DWYPD and the officials of the NT. The DWYPD officials mentioned budget shortfalls, while participants from the NT stated that budget constraints are not the key issue faced by the DWYPD. Other issues include allocation of resources, planning and prioritisation of tasks. When looking at the budget allocation for the DWYPD, the case made by the NT is plausible.

For example, of the total budget of R159.3 million (excluding transfers to the Commission for Gender Equality) in the 2019/20 financial year, the budget for the Administration programme accounts for 53 per cent of the budget. This is while the remaining core programmes share the remaining portion. This is the trend over the medium term. Within the Administration programme, the Ministry and office accommodation subprogrammes take the largest portion at 19.8 per cent and 20 per cent, respectively (NT: RSA, 2019).

Conclusion

In terms of importance of location, it has been determined that location can play an important role in influencing a gender machinery's policies, however a gap in knowledge or literature is how to handle the case where in terms of practices the location does not have any influence; more importantly how the relationship between the gender machinery and the Presidency can be fostered. This requires engagements between the Presidency and the DWYPD on how to make the location of the department impactful.

Allocation of resources also remains an important factor. In terms of the contribution gender machineries should ensure that they utilise the resources they have to they full potential. It is also important that gender machineries know how to priorities functions, as revealed in the findings. The DWYPD tends to budget more for its support services more than core programmes, whereas this should not be the norm in government departments.

The challenges that are faced by the DYWPD in the development and implementation of the two frameworks are common challenges that are faced in most policy development processes. These are challenges in the form of planning, communication, clarity of policy implementation, monitoring and evaluation are highlighted in the literature. To address such issues, proper consultations must take placed backed up with research and policy alternatives. The policy framework its self needs to be clear on the policy direction, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. A strong regulative framework is needed to guide processes and well as spell out consequence management. These are some of the aspects that are not clear enough in the framework and between the different departments. The most critical challenge that is highlighted as a key challenge for most gender machinery is the absence of a legislative framework establishing the department and regulating the work of the machinery.

The section has discussed challenges that have been faced by the DWYPD and its stakeholders with the two policies. Challenges that are mentioned are not new to institutional work especially gender machineries. The DWYPD needs to re-think the way it engages with its departments and its approach to policy making. Most importantly, the DWYPD needs to find its footprint in other spheres of government through legislation.

This is important in highlighting that the DWYPD needs to get a legal footprint and ensure that it has influence over its stakeholders. However, in order to do this, it needs to address the internal shortcoming its stakeholders have raised. In term of the policy processes that are undertaken, there is a lot of room for improvement.

Conclusion

The study has looked at institutional arrangements in the coordination of two policies of the DWYPD. The purpose of the research was to see how the DWYPD works with stakeholder departments in the development of the two policies.

The research objectives were to analyse how the DWYPD worked with stakeholder departments in the coordination of the policies. In terms of the objective, the research found that the working relationship between the DWYPD and the stakeholders was complex where stakeholder buy-in. In the DWYPD in its own frameworks admits to the importance of stakeholder buy - in, and the importance of the consultative process.

The research also aimed to analyse the engagement of stakeholders in the coordination process. Stakeholders felt that there was not enough engagement, deliberation and collective decision making around the coordination of the policies. A number of challenges were citied such as the lack of communication, lack of clarity on policy implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the policies. Fundamentally the DYPWD does not have a legal mandate or authority to regulate the working relations of the institutional arrangements.

However, officials from the DWYPD did not highlight such challenges, these officials highlighted issues of insufficient resource allocation. It was also evident that the DWYPD has a lot if internal challenges that affect its ability to work within its mandate and ultimately work with other institutions. For example, the mandate of the department borderlines a lot of functions, between policy development, implementation, evaluation, coordination and advocacy. This is a challenge highlighted by the literature. A more focused mandate should assist the department in establishing and streamlining their focus.

Lastly, the research aimed to analyse the involvement of the stakeholders affected by the coordination of the policies. Stakeholders felt that their involvement at the national level was key, in terms of representing their sector as well as ensuring that the policy was streamlined and in line with the relevant laws and prescripts. The findings also allude to an overreaching mandate by the DWYPD. The research identified common challenges of gender machineries experienced by the DWYPD that need to be addressed. Reforms need to be applied to transform and empower the DWYPD in the coordination of its cross-sectoral policies. As much as the stakeholders felt their participation was important, they also felt that the policy would have gone through with or without their participation. This was evident in the non-participation by the DBE. Even though DBE did not participate in the policy development, factors relating to their functions were included in the Sanitary Dignity Framework. This is the same with the DPME regarding the GRB. Officials from DYPWD also stated that the policy would continue as it was a Cabinet instruction.

The study answered its research questions by using the literature and through documents analysis and semi structured interviews. The literature revealed different institutional theories and models, which helped with identifying the institutional form of government departments. The study revealed that the political history of the country affected the creation of democratic institutions in South Africa. The apartheid system was characterised by human rights violence and discrimination in terms of race and gender. New political institutions in South Africa were built to correct such injustices and ensure that institutions work together, hold each other accountable and are interdependent. This is linked to historical institutionalism and is relevant to the research questions as the probe to find out how the DYPWD worked with different departments in the coordination of its policies and whether it applied the principles of cooperation, interdependence and accountability. The research found that the department experienced challenges in ensuring cooperation and accountability in the coordination of these policies.

The study also made links in government departments with the sociological institutionalism, which focuses on the bottom up policy approach and is largely characterised by the representation of society or community interests in policy coordination. The research found that there were links in government departments to sociological institutionalism mainly due to the democratic nature of the country. Both policies were developed with the idea of assisting women and girls to access better opportunities. Although the institutional arrangement elements had challenges and some the stakeholder departments may have not agreed with the said policy approaches, the interest of the broader community was strongly considered.

Regulative institutionalism helped the study to understand the elements of government institutions, which is key and relates to rules, laws and processes. Government departments in South Africa are guided by the rule of law, more directly, the Constitution and its legal mandates. The intergovernmental relations system in the Constitution provides for a cooperative government, which is interrelated and interdependent. The creation of the DWYPD is in contradiction of the regulative institutionalism to ta certain extent as the research found that it does not have its own standing legislation and that its policies are not founded on direct legislation from the department. This in turn has created processes, coordination and accountability issues which need to be rectified.

Realist institutionalism focuses on self-interest outside the institution, in terms of the study it can be linked to government departments' relations or subscription to international organisations. The findings of the research also allude to self-interest in the DWYPD in terms of the two policies. At the centre of the policies; the DYPWD seemed to focus more on their contribution or participation rather than those of stakeholders.

The literature reviewed also assisted in giving insight into the general environment in which gender machineries operate, also gave insight on how challenges can be overcome. Challenges revealed by the findings were not foreign to the literature. For example; the literature states that gender

machineries often are overburdened with lack of clarity on their mandates, taking on a lot of roles. This was evident in both policies where the DWYPD is taking on bigger roles such as monitoring and evaluation, which they do not have capacity for and expertise of. In terms of the literature, gender machineries must also have legal mandates, suitable locations as well as resources and these affects their position and ability to influence policy. The research found that the DYPWD does not have a legal mandate, its location within the Presidency has not been to its advantage and resource allocation and prioritisation is a challenge.

The literature also gives account of different cross-sectoral policies that have been implemented successfully in other countries. For example, the gender responsive budgeting in India, Uganda and Rwanda, where the Ministry of Finance took the lead in working with the Women's Ministry. The National Gender Policy in Zimbabwe was also a collaborative effort including multiple stakeholders with different roles. Similar efforts can be made for the Sanitary Dignity Policy initiative and gender-based violence.

The document analysis and the semi-structured interviews assisted the researcher in achieving her objectives as well as answering its research questions. The sample from the DWYPD was meant to be bigger, however due to challenges of getting a hold of some participants it was reduced from 5 for 3. This did not have a negative impact on the research outcomes, as the researcher was still able to get the required information. This challenge also applied to participants who were targeted to speak on the GRB, approached participants from the DPME did not respond to the call, which limited the findings on their role and perspectives. It emerged in the research process that provinces were going to be responsible for policy implementation; the researcher did not get an opportunity to interview any provincial participants. However, the inputs from national department representatives was sufficient to answer the research questions.

The research questions were determined in terms of the themes developed from the literature. The first section of the literature discusses institutional

models and theories. The literature attempts to see how government departments fit within the theories and models. As such, the first question asked of participants was what the institutional approach to cross-sectoral policy making is. The last approach was to look at the policy implementation cycle, considering section 2 of the literature review which looks at the dynamics of policy implementation for gender machineries. This was the bulk of the research where the study aimed to answer the research question on how the DWYPD works with stakeholder departments, what the respective roles were, challenges that were faced and how participation of stakeholder departments affected policy coordination.

In conclusion, the research has established a good theoretical basis which determined an enabling environment for institutional arrangements amongst government departments in the coordination of cross-sectoral policies. The study determined challenges in the set -up of arrangement for the policies of the DWYPD. These challenges were both internal and external, some were within the control of the DWYPD, and some were outside their control. Critical elements of institutional arrangements were overlooked in the development of the policies. These include issues of poor communication, planning, engagement and deliberation. In addition, issues of stakeholder buy-in for the process of implementation, monitoring and evaluation were overlooked. The Sanitary Dignity Policy is still in the stage of initiation of implementation. The DWYPD can still facilitate for better stakeholder buy-in. The GRB has not reached the implementation stage. Therefore, the DWYPD still has an opportunity to establish a good foundation and polish up on its institutional arrangements.

Recommendations to DWYPD

The research is significant to the DWYPD in how it can improve on its stakeholder relations in order to enable it develop and drive its own policies. Based on the findings, the DWYPD needs to work on better stakeholder relations with other departments specifically focusing on issues of consultation, planning and communication. This can also be applied to stakeholder

departments. The processes of the DWYPD need to be changed to be more collaborative.

The DWYPD's main challenge is also working without legislation, although its mandate it mentioned in the NDP, it is still not enforceable. A clearly defined and legal mandate will assist the DWYPD in its relations and ability to make stakeholder departments accountable. The department must strengthen its institutional arrangements and policies and ensure that there is stakeholder buy -in throughput the policy cycle. Where challenges may arise an open line of communication and accountability should be applied.

The location of the DWYPD in the Presidency can only be useful if the political heads make it impactful. This requires strategic thinking and implementation from both political heads and technical staff of the two departments.

There needs to be effective communication at all levels. The DWYPD also needs to refine its mandate and manage its work scope. The DWYPD needs to work within the government system to establish a legal mandate for its operations as well as provincial and local offices, which make them more reachable to their target to implement their work. The challenge with the lack of mandate affects not only its policy development, implementing and monitoring aspect, but it also its advocacy role and its ability to be the champion for the rights of women. The DWYPD needs to establish its own footprint to ensure visibility and responsiveness to issues that are facing women in South Africa.

Recommendations for future research

The research involved officials from the DWYPD and key national stakeholder departments and touched on their views and experiences of how they worked together in the development of two policies. Although officials from provincial departments were not interviewed, the findings did give an indication of the policy implementation and monitoring which involved them. Perhaps because the research was focused on activities that had already taken place, instead of on the actual policy implementation and monitoring, which involves provinces, has not yet been done. Once the policies have been fully implemented, it will

be worthwhile to investigate views and experiences of provincial departments in their work with the DWYPD.

Bibliography

Allwood, G. (2015). Horizontal policy coordination and gender mainstreaming: The case of the European Union's Global Approach to Migration and Mobility. *Women's Studies International Forum*, *48*, 9-17. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2014.10.004.

Biesenthal, C., Clegg, S., Mahalingam, A. & Sankaran, S. (2018). Applying institutional theories to managing megaprojects. *International Journal of Project Management, 36*, 43-54. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2017.06.006.

Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, *9*, 27–40. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027.

Bell, E., Byrne, B., Laier, J., Baden, S., & Marcus, R. (2002). *National Machineries for Women in Development: Experiences, lessons and strategies*. BRIDGE Report. Brighton, UK: Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research methods in education*. London & New York: Routledge.

Chakraborty, L. (2014) Gender-responsive budgeting as fiscal innovation: Evidence from India on "processes". *SSRN Electronic Journal.* https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2430260.

Dudovskiy, J. (n. d). *Deductive Approach (Deductive Reasoning)*. Retrieved on [10 October 2017] from: https://research-methodology.net/research-methodology/research-approach/deductive-approach-2/

Davis R. (2013). Analysis: Is the Department of Women worth the money? Retrieved on [10 October 2018] from https://www.dailymaverick.co.za/article/2013-05-28-analysis-is-the-department-of-women-worth-the-money/

Elson, D., & Sharp, R. (2010). Gender-responsive Budgeting and Women's Poverty. *The International Handbook of Gender and Poverty: Concepts, Research, Policy*, 522-527. doi: https://doi.org/10.4337/9781849805162.00097.

Etikan, I & Bala, K. (2017). Sampling and sampling methods. *Biometrics & Biostatistics International Journal*, *5*, 215-217. Retrieved from: http://medcraveonline.com/BBIJ/BBIJ-05-00149.pdf.

Fadnis, D. (2017). Feminist activists protest tax on sanitary pads: attempts to normalize conversations about menstruation in India using hashtag activism. *Feminist Media Studies*, *17*, 1111-1114. DOI: 10.1080/14680777.2017.1380430.

Geismar, N. (2018). Participatory Development and Menstrual Health Management in South Africa: A Case Study of Project Dignity. https://digitalcollections.sit.edu/isp_collection/2846.

Goetz, A. M. (2018). *National women's machinery: State-based institutions to advocate for gender equality*. Manchester University Press.

Gumede, V. (January 2012). Youth development and women empowerment in an evolving post-apartheid South African developmental state. University of Johannesburg. Retrieved from: https://www.vusigumede.com/content/2012/JAN%202012/Youth%20&%20Women%20in%20SA%20(website%20academic%20paper,%2030%20January%202012).pdf

Hwang, H., & Colyvas, J. A. (2011). Problematizing Actors and Institutions in Institutional Work. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *20*, 62–66. https://doi.org/10.1177/1056492610387705.

Hill, M. (Eds.). (2014). The Public Policy Process. In The Public Policy Process (Ed.) New York: Routledge.

Hörisch, J., Freeman, R. E., & Schaltegger, S. (2014). Applying stakeholder theory in sustainability management: Links, similarities, dissimilarities, and a conceptual framework. Organization & Environment, 27(4), 328-346.

Kornergay, E. (1999). Framework for Prepared by : The Office on the Status

Of Women. Statistics, 1–64. Retrieved from:

https://www.environment.gov.za/sites/default/files/docs/national_policy_framework.pdf.

Meyer, J., W. (2007). *Reflections on Institutional Theories of Organizations*. The SAGE Handbook of Public Administration. London: SAGE Publications.

Morrell, R., Jewkes, R., & Lindegger, G. (2012). Hegemonic Masculinity/Masculinities in South Africa: Culture, Power, and Gender Politics. *Men and Masculinities*, *15*, 11–30. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184X12438001.

McDonald, C. (2012). Understanding participatory action research: a qualitative research methodology option. *Canadian Journal of Action Research, 13,* 34-50. Retrieved from: https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/3b78/ecfe0b4a0a7591d2ea068c71e8ea320ff451.pdf.

Mackey, A., & Gass, S., M. (Eds.). (2015). Second language research: Methodology and Design. New York & London: Routledge.

Ministry of Women Affairs Gender and Community Development. (2013). T*he national gender policy (2013-2017*). 1–26. http://www.zw.undp.org/content/dam/zimbabwe/docs/Governance/National Gender Policy 2013.pdf.

Mpani, P., & Nsibande, N. (2015). U*nderstanding Gender Policy and Gender-Based Violence in South Africa*. *S*oul City: Institute for Health & Development Communication, 1–52. https://doi.org/10.1177/00333549061210040.

Malan, L., P. (2002). Conservation Management and Intergovernmental Relations: the case of South African national and selected provincial parks (Masters Dissertation). Retrieved from: https://repository.up.ac.za/handle/2263/26679.

Maluleke, S., M. (2011). Managing the implementation of the assessment policy in the Senior Certificate Band (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from: https://repository.up.ac.za/handle/2263/25138.

McBride, D., & Mazur, A. (2012). Gender machineries worldwide.

Nkosi, N. N., & Pretorius, E. (2019). The Influence of Teenage Pregnancy on Education: Perceptions of Educators at a Secondary School in Tembisa, Gauteng. *Social Work/Maatskaplike Werk (South Africa*), *55*, 1. Retrieved from: http://dx.doi.org/10.15270/55-1-698.

Noble, H., & Smith, J. (2015). Table 1: Terminology and criteria used to evaluate the credibility of research findings. *Evidence Based Nursing, 18*, 34–35. Retrieved from: http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/id/eprint/23995/1/SmithIssues.pdf.

Peters, B., G. & Pierre, J. (2002). *The SAGE Handbook of Public Administration.* London: SAGE Publications.

Pilane, P. (October 2018). *Mboweni zero-rates sanitary pads and allocates funds for their free disbursement*. Retrieved on [10 January 2020] from:

https://www.dailymaverick.co.za/article/2018-10-24-mboweni-zero-rates-sanitary-pads-and-allocates-funds-for-their-free-disbursement/

Pilane, P. (2016). *What Department of Women? For many, it may as well not exist.* Retrieved on [10 October 2018] from https://mg.co.za/article/2016-06-30-00-what-department-of-women

Peters, B. G. (2000). *Institutional Theory: Problems and Prospects*. Political Science Series, 69(69). http://opensigle.inist.fr/handle/10068/86548.

Pillay, V. (2015). Strategic Leadership and Employee Engagement at the University of the Witwatersrand (Masters Dissertation). Retrieved from: http://wiredspace.wits.ac.za/jspui/bitstream/10539/18823/1/Final%20Masters%20Research%20-%20Vanishree%20Pillay%202015%20(728397).pdf.

Radtke, I., Hustedt, T., & Klinnert, A. (2016). Inter-Ministerial Working Groups Panacea for Coordination Problems? *Der Moderne Staat – Zeitschrift Für Public Policy, Recht Und Management, 9*, 65–81. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/304451770_Inter Ministerial_Working_Groups_as_a_Panacea_for_Coordination_Problems.

Rai, S., M. (2017). *Mainstreaming Gender, Democratising the State? Institutional Mechanisms for the Advancement of Women*. New York: Routledge.

Republic of South Africa: Department of Women, Youth and Persons with Disabilities. (2014). Department of Women, Youth and Persons with Disabilities, Strategic plan 2015-2020. *DWYPD Strategic Plan.*

Republic of South Africa: Department of Women, Youth and Persons with Disabilities. (2015). Department of Women, Youth and Persons with Disabilities, Status on Women report in the South African Economy.

Republic of South Africa: Department of Women, Youth and Persons with Disabilities. (2017). Department of Women, Youth and Persons with Disabilities, Annual performance plan 2018/2019. *DWYPD Annual performance plan.*

Republic of South Africa: NT. (2019). The 2019 Estimates of National Expenditure. http://www.treasury.gov.za/documents/national budget/2019/ene/FullENE.pdf.

Republic of South Africa: Statistics South Africa. (2018). Gender Series Volume IV Economic Empowerment, 2001-2017. Pretoria: Statistics South Africa: http://www.statssa.gov.za/publications/03-10-17/03-10-172017.pdf.

Sadie, Y. (2014). Gender policy and legislation during the first 20 years of democracy. *Strategic Review for Southern Africa*, *36*, 111-125. Retrieved from: https://www.up.ac.za/media/shared/85/Strategic%20Review/Vol36(2)/08-sadie-pp-111-125.zp39580.pdf.

Shabalala, M., M. (2012). An investigation of the causes of gender based violence in Kwa-Nongoma area (Masters Dissertation). Retrieved from https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/0630/43e7d172a454c007e3598be808d13558f0c3.pdf.

Seidman, G., W. (2003). Institutional Dilemmas: Representation versus Mobilization in the South African Gender Commission. *Feminist Studies, 29,* 541–63. Retrieved from: https://www.ssc.wisc.edu/soc/faculty/pages/docs/seidman/Feminist%20Studies.pdf.

Shastri, A. (2014). Gender Inequality and Women Discrimination. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, *19*, 27-30. Retrieved from: http://www.iosrjournals.org/iosr-jhss/papers/Vol19-issue11/Version 7/E0191172730.pdf.

Thoenig, J., C. (2011). *Institutional Theories and Public Institutions. New Agendas and Appropriateness. The Handbook of Public Administration*. London: SAGE Publications.

Van De Griend, K. M., & Messias, D. A. K. H. (2014). Expanding the Conceptualization of Workplace Violence: Implications for Research, Policy, and Practice. *Sex Roles, 71*, p33–42. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-014-0353-0.

Wanger, C., Kawulich, B., & Garner M. (Eds.). (2012). *Doing Social research: a global context*. Maidenhead: Berkshire. McGraw-Hill Education.

Participant Information Sheet

Dear participant,

My name is Viwe Sobudula. I am a Masters student at Wits University. As part of my studies, I am required to carry out a research project. The title of my research is, "INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS IN THE COORDINATION OF POLICIES FOR GENDER EQUALITY". The research will be focused on understanding how stakeholder involvement affects the implementation of intervention initiatives developed by the Department of Women, Youth and Persons with Disabilities (DWYPD) to address gender inequalities. The research aims to find evaluate how the department ensures implementation of these initiatives and how the role of stakeholder involvement affects the implementation or non-implementation of these initiatives.

I would like to invite you to take part in a one on one interview that will take a maximum 1 hour 30 minutes of your time. There is no compensation for participating in the research; the research is purely for academic purposes. The research will not disadvantage you in anyway as it only aims to provide the researcher with information on activities conducted by the department. As a participant, you can withdraw your consent at any time of the interview, also you can choose not to answer question that you feel are uncomfortable. Pseudonyms will be used for the research result; therefore, information provided by the participant will be kept confidential. The research will be submitted for obtaining a Master's degree, in addition, these findings may also be used for reflection by the DWYPD in order to assist the department in the implementation of its initiatives if

desired. The research may attract further publications. You can contact me on the below numbers if you need have any questions.

Yours sincerely,

Viwe Sobudula

VSobudula@yahoo.com, 0605049137

An evaluation of the implementation of gender equality intervention mechanisms developed by the Department of Women, Youth and Person with Disabilities

Do you agree to the researcher using a recorder to record the interviews?

Yes	
No	

Do you understand that your real names will not be used at any point in the research?

Yes	
No	

Do you understand that there will be no financial benefits if you participate in the research?

Yes	
No	

Do you understand that you have the right not to continue with the interview when you feel uncomfortable?

Yes	
No	

Would you like to participate in the research?

Yes	
No	

Participant name _____

Participant signature _____

Date _____

Interview Questions (GRPMEA)
Interviewer: Viwe Sobudula

- My name is Viwe Sobudula and I am the creator of this questionnaire. I am part of the Masters of Management in Public Policy at the University of Witwatersrand where I am doing a research report looking at the formulation of the Gender Responsive, Planning, Budgeting, Monitoring, evaluation and Auditing Framework
- My research report topic is "evaluating initiatives by the Department of Women, Youth and Person with Disabilities (DWYPD) to address gender inequalities"
- The information is collected purely for research purposes and will be used for anything other than that
- There are 6 main questions which will be accompanied by follow up questions/engagement

Unstructured interview questions

1. Who are the key stakeholders involved in the development and implementation of the Gender Responsive, Planning, Budgeting, Monitoring, evaluation and Auditing Framework?
2. What is the role that key stakeholder departments play?
3. Is the DWYPD designed execute its mandate in collaboration with other departments?
4. How does their involvement/non-involvement affect the implementation and monitoring of the Gender Responsive, Planning, Budgeting, Monitoring, evaluation and Auditing Framework?
5. What are the policy implementation challenges that are faced with the involvement of stakeholder departments in the implementation of DWYPD policies?
6. What authority does the DWYPD have over other stakeholder departments to ensure effective implementation Gender Responsive, Planning, Budgeting, Monitoring, evaluation and Auditing Framework

Interview Questions
Interviewer: Viwe Sobudula

- My name is Viwe Sobudula and I am the creator of this questionnaire. I am part of the Masters of Management in Public Policy at the University of Witwatersrand where I am doing a research report looking at the formulation of the Gender Responsive, Planning, Budgeting, Monitoring, evaluation and Auditing FrameworkMy research report topic is "evaluating initiatives by the Department of Women, Youth and Person with Disabilities (DWYPD) to address gender inequalities"
- The information is collected purely for research purposes and will be used for anything other than that
- There are 5 main questions which will be accompanied by follow up questions/engagement

Unstructured interview questions

7. Your department is part of the inter-departmental committee on the Gender Responsive, Planning, Budgeting, Monitoring, evaluation and Auditing Framework, what do you understand your role to be in the implementation of the policy?
8. How does your department work with dealing with cross sectoral policies? Is this part of your institutional form?
9. What are the policy development/implementation challenges that have been faced or do you foresee being faced in working with the DWYPD on the Gender Responsive, Planning, Budgeting, Monitoring, evaluation and Auditing Framework?
10. What authority does DWYPD have to ensure the involvement of participation of your department in this policy initiative?
11. What impact will your participation or non-have on the policy?

Interview Questions (Sanitary Dignity Framework)
Interviewer: Viwe Sobudula

- My name is Viwe Sobudula and I am the creator of this questionnaire. I am part of the Masters of Management in Public Policy at the University of Witwatersrand where I am doing a research report looking at the formulation of the sanitary dignity framework
- My research report topic is "evaluating initiatives by the Department of Women, Youth and Person with Disabilities (DWYPD) to address gender inequalities"
- The information is collected purely for research purposes and will be used for anything other than that
- Participants' real names will not be used after data collected. The researcher will use pseudonyms and deidentified codes for data collection and any quotes in the research report.
- There are 5 main questions which will be accompanied by follow up questions/engagement

Unstructured interview questions

12. Your department is part of the inter-departmental committee on the sanitary dignity, what do you understand your role to be in the implementation of the policy?
13. How does your department work with dealing with cross-sectoral policies? Is this part of your institutional form?
14. What are the policy development/implementation as well as monitoring and evaluation challenges that have been faced or do you foresee being faced in working with the DWYPD on the sanitary dignity framework?
15. What authority does DWYPD have to ensure the involvement of participation of your department in this policy initiative?
16. What impact will your participation or non-have on the policy?

Interview Questions
Interviewer: Viwe Sobudula

- My name is Viwe Sobudula and I am the creator of this questionnaire. I am part of the Masters of Management in Public Policy at the University of Witwatersrand where I am doing a research report looking at the formulation of the sanitary dignity framework
- My research report topic is "evaluating initiatives by the Department of Women, Youth and Person with Disabilities (DWYPD) to address gender inequalities"
- The information is collected purely for research purposes and will be used for anything other than that
- There are 5 main questions which will be accompanied by follow up questions/engagement

Unstructured interview questions

17. Who are the key stakeholders involved in the development and implementation of the sanitary dignity framework?
18. What is the role that key stakeholder departments play?
19. Is the DWYPD designed execute its mandate in collaboration with other departments?
20. How does their involvement/non-involvement affect the implementation and monitoring of the sanitary dignity framework?
21. What are the policy implementation challenges that are faced with the involvement of stakeholder departments in the implementation of DWYPD policies?
22. What authority does the DWYPD have over other stakeholder departments to ensure effective implementation sanitary dignity framework

Semi- structured interviews:

Officials from DWYPD

Questions:	**Methodology and how it answers questions**	**Analytical framework**
Who are the key stakeholders involved in the policies? What is their role	**Qualitative research- Semi structured interviews- triangulating themes in line with research questions**	Searching for similar codes on who the key stakeholders are what their role is Triangulating what is being said in the interview to what appears in the policies and link to literature **Develop findings on who the key stakeholders are and what their role is**
How does their involvement/non-involvement affect the implementation of the sanitary dignity framework policy	**Qualitative research- Semi structured interviews- triangulating themes in line with research questions**	Search for similar codes create and themes on what the involvement of the key stakeholders is Triangulating what is being said in the interview to the policies and link to literature **Develop findings on: impact of stakeholder participation**
What are the policy implementation challenges that are faced with the involvement of the key stakeholder departments?	**Qualitative research- Semi structured interviews- triangulating themes in line with research questions**	Search for similar codes create and themes on what challenges were faced by the DWYPD

		Triangulating what is being said in the interview to the policies and link to literature **Develop findings on challenges faced by DWYPD**
What authority does the DOW have over other stakeholder departments to ensure effective implementation of the sanitary dignity framework policy	**Qualitative research- Semi structured interviews- triangulating themes in line with research questions**	Search for similar codes create and themes on what authority the Triangulating what is being said in the interview to what appears in the strategic plan and framework

Officials from stakeholder departments

Questions:	**Methodology and how it answers questions**	**Analytical framework**
The Sanitary Dignity Framework/ GRPBMEA Framework mentions your department as a stakeholder, what is your role?	**Qualitative research- Semi structured interviews- triangulating themes in line with research questions**	Searching for similar codes on who the key stakeholders are what their role is Triangulating what is being said in the interview to what appears in the policies and link to literature **Develop findings on who the key stakeholders are and what their role is**
How does your department usually work with cross-sectoral policies?	**Qualitative research- Semi structured interviews- triangulating themes in line with research questions**	Searching for similar codes on whether the department's organisational form allows for cross sectoral policies Triangulating what is being said in the interview to what appears in the policies and link to literature **Develop findings on how the department works on cross sectoral policies**
How does their involvement/non-involvement affect the Sanitary Dignity Framework/ GRPBMEA Framework policy	**Qualitative research- Semi structured interviews- triangulating themes in line with research questions**	Searching for similar codes on the impact of the involvement of the department on the policies Triangulating what is being said in the interview to what appears

		in the policies and link to literature **Develop findings on how involvement if stakeholders impact the policy**
What are the policy challenges that are faced with the involvement of the key stakeholder departments?	**Qualitative research- Semi structured interviews- triangulating themes in line with research questions**	Searching for similar codes on Challenges faced/anticipated Triangulating what is being said in the interview to what appears in the policies and link to literature **Develop findings on what challenges are faced/foreseen**
What authority does the DOW have over other stakeholder departments to ensure effective implementation of the sanitary dignity framework policy	**Qualitative research- Semi structured interviews- triangulating themes in line with research questions**	Searching for similar codes on authority that DWYPD has on other departments Triangulating what is being said in the interview to what appears in the policies and link to literature **Develop findings authority that DWYPD has on other departments**

Document analysis:

Important aspects to look at	Methodology and how it answers questions	Analytical framework
Who are the key stakeholders involved in the policies and what is their role?	**Qualitative research- Document Analysis- triangulating themes in line with research questions**	Look at whether the document identified role players Look at the specific role identified Triangulate role player mentioned in the frameworks with role players mentioned in policy and link to literature Triangulate the role of role players mentioned in the frameworks with role players mentioned in policy and link to literature **Develop findings on: Role players and their specific role**
How does their involvement/non-involvement affect the implementation of policies?	**Qualitative research- Document Analysis- triangulating themes in line with research questions**	Look at what the frameworks say about involvement/non-involvement of stakeholder and impact thereof Triangulate what the frameworks say about involvement/non-involvement of stakeholder and impact thereof with interviews and link to literature **Develop findings on: impact of stakeholder participation**
What are the policy implementation challenges faced with the	**Qualitative research- Document Analysis- triangulating themes in line with research questions**	Look at challenges mentioned in the frameworks

involvement of the key stakeholder departments?		Triangulate challenges mentioned in framework with data from interviews and link to literature **Develop findings on challenges faced in the development, implementation and monitoring and evaluation of the framework**
What authority does the DWYPD have over other stakeholder departments to ensure effective implementation of the sanitary dignity framework policy	**Qualitative research- Document Analysis- triangulating themes in line with research questions**	Look at what the framework says about authority the DWYPD has over other departments Triangulate challenges mentioned in framework with data from interviews and link to literature **Develop findings on the framework on the authority that DWYPD has over other departments**