Perceptions about gender-based discrimination in a selection of South African companies

Renier Steyn

10143521

Thesis submitted for the degree *Philosophiae Doctor* in Business Administration at the Potchefstroom Campus of the North-West University

Promoter: Prof LTB Jackson

May 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

Perceptions of gender-based discrimination in a selection of South African companies

Introduction: From a legal point of view, gender-based discrimination is not condoned in the workplace. However, perceptions that such discrimination exists persist. Understanding the extent and nature of the phenomenon may contribute to the management thereof. Aim: The aim of this research was to report on the nature and level of workplace gender-based discrimination from the perspective of managers and employees, as well as by making use of objective measures. Method: Interviews were conducted with 75 managers focusing on the prevalence of gender-based discrimination in specific organisational processes. Furthermore, 145 managers and 1 740 employees completed questionnaires on this topic. Results: Managers reported flaws in all the organisational processes investigated. According to these managers, some processes showed a pro-female bias whilst others displayed a pro-male bias. More female than male employees reported discriminatory incidents at work, but both groups reported gender-based discrimination. Gender-based discrimination was the most prominent form of discrimination reported by women. Some female respondents reported pro-male and others pro-female discrimination. The same pattern applied to men. No statistically significant gender wage gap was found and the salaries of males and females were not differentially affected by qualifications, training, workplace experience or family responsibility. Managers and employees concurred that gender-based discrimination was the primary source of discrimination in the workplace, and they reported similarly on the consequences of this problem. Conclusions and recommendations: Managers are aware of discrimination in organisational processes. This awareness can be used to initiate programmes aimed at minimising discrimination. Both males and females are exposed to gender-based discrimination and they report similar consequences. This suggests that interventions should be directed at both groups. The different, and often opposing, reports provided by the male and female groups support the social identity theory and conceptions of group-serving bias. From the objective data it can be concluded that perceptions of being discriminated against are the result of psycho-social processes and not necessarily the result of justifiable biographical differences.

Keywords: Gender; discrimination; perceptions, wage gap; South Africa.

OPSOMMING

Persepsies van geslagsgebaseerde diskriminasie in ’n seleksie van Suid-Afrikaanse besighede

Inleiding: Geslagsgebaseerde diskriminasie in die werkplek is regtens verbode. Die persepsie bestaan desnieteenstaande steeds dat dit wel voorkom. Indien bestuurslui die omvang en aard van hierdie soort diskriminasie verstaan, kan dit bydra tot die beter bestuur daarvan. Doel: Die doelwit van die navorsing was om verslag te doen oor die aard en omvang van geslagsgebaseerde diskriminasie vanuit die perspektief van bestuur en werknemers, asook met behulp van “objektiewe” toetse.Metode: Onderhoude is met 75 bestuurders gevoer rakende die omvang van geslagsgebaseerde diskriminasie tydens spesifieke organisatoriese prosesse. Altesaam 145 bestuurders en 1 740 werknemers het verder ook vraelyste oor die onderwerp voltooi. Resultate: Bestuurders rapporteer gebreke in elkeen van die organisatoriese prosesse wat ondersoek is. Volgens die bestuurders is sommige van die prosesse sydig teenoor mans en sommige van die prosesse bevoordeel vroue. Meer vroulike as manlike werknemers rapporteer insidente van diskriminasie in die werkplek en geslagsgebaseerde diskriminasie is die algemeenste vorm van diskriminasie wat vroue rapporteer. Mans rapporteer egter ook geslagsgebaseerde diskriminasie. Sommige vroue rapporteer diskriminasie ten gunste van mans en sommige weer rapporteer diskriminasie ten gunste van vroue. Dieselfde patroon is onder mans aangetref. Geen statisties beduidende verskille is tussen die salarisse van mans en vroue gevind nie, en salarisse word nie verskillend geraak deur kwalifikasies, opleiding, werkservaring of familieverantwoordelikhede nie. Bestuurders en werknemers stem saam dat geslagsgebaseerde diskriminasie die primêre bron van diskriminasie in die werkplek is en hulle is dit ook met mekaar eens oor die gevolge daarvan. Gevolgtrekkings en aanbevelings: Die bevinding dat bestuurders bewus is van diskriminasie in organisatoriese prosesse kan ’n pluspunt wees aangesien dit as vertrekpunt kan dien in programme om diskriminasie hok te slaan. Sowel mans as vroue rapporteer geslagsgebaseerde diskriminasie en ervaar soortgelyke uitkomste. Dit impliseer dat beide groepe betrek behoort te word by opleiding wat op die kwessie ingaan. Die aard van die rapportering van mans en vroue is in ooreenstemming met die sosiale identiteitsteorie en die konsep van groepbevoordelende sydigheid. Die “objektiewe” data toon aan dat persepsies oor geslagsgebaseerde diskriminasie eerder die gevolg is van psigososiale prosesse as van regverdigbare biografiese verskille.

Kernwoorde: Geslag; diskriminasie; persepsies; salaris; Suid-Afrika.

PREFACE

The reader should note that the thesis is presented in the form of journal articles. The writing styles prescribed by the selected journals were adhered to (see Annexure A). In the case of Article 1, the journal was the *South African Journal of Labour Relations*. Article 2 followed the guidelines of the *Journal of Psychology in Africa*, while Article 3 used the criteria for the *South African Journal for Economic and Management Sciences*. Article 4 adopted the writing style of *Alternation*. In Chapter 1 ('Introduction') and Chapter 5 ('Conclusions, limitations and recommendations'), as well as in the complete reference list, the guidelines of the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th edition) were followed.

All the articles have been submitted for publication, but have not yet been published.

The candidate was responsible for all aspects of the research, including matters such as identifying the research problem, formulating the research questions, the research design and execution of the research. He also drafted the articles. Prof LTB Jackson, the supervisor of this PhD thesis, was the co-author of all the articles and has granted permission for them to be submitted for degree purposes. His assisted the candidate with critical comments and guidance in drafting the articles.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the following individuals:

Professor Leon Jackson, my supervisor, who provided invaluable guidance; Lydia von Wielligh-Steyn, my wife, for her support and critical reading of the text; Professor Karen Batley, who was responsible for the language editing; as well as the 2012 MBL students of the Unisa Graduate School of Business Leadership, who collected the data.

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

This chapter serves as an introduction to the thesis *Perceptions about gender-based discrimination in a selection of South African companies*. It presents, inter alia, the background to the study. The problem statement derives from the background, followed by a statement of the goals and objectives of the study. After that, the importance of achieving these objectives is discussed, followed by an explanation of the context of the research. The disciplinary context of the research will be described, along with metatheoretical assumptions and applicable models and theories. Delineation of the research follows, as well as the limitations anticipated. Discussion of the research method follows and includes an explanation of how the literature review was conducted, as well as clarification of how the empirical part of the research was approached. The discussion on the empirical aspect of the research includes ethical considerations and a priori decisions on the interpretation of results. The chapter concludes with an indication of the chapters to follow.

1.1 BACKGROUND

Gender is generally considered to be one of the key differentiators between individuals. It is more important than any other characteristic, including race. Gender matters most in the development of the self-concept, as individuals become attuned to gender differences. Furthermore, gender exercises the greatest influence on social relationships (Stangor, Lynch, Duan & Glass, 1992). Most people would probably agree that gender constitutes a fundamental element in self-definition and in the way others define them. The feminist movement is grounded in society's recognition of gender. Feminism typically disputes stereotypical assumptions based on differences between men and women (Higgs & Smith, 2006).

At this early stage of writing, it would be appropriate to distinguish between gender and sex to explain the influence of culture on gender-related behaviour. While sex is generally understood to indicate whether someone is male or female, gender is the cultural expression of sex that often, but not always, reflects stereotypes of

masculinity and femininity (Australian Human Rights Commission, 2010; Ely & Padavic, 2007). It is important to note that gender is best understood as culturally learned beliefs about what it means to be male or female (Best, 2010). Culture plays a significant role in gender matters and also affects people's "modes of being" in the world (Kitayama, Duffy & Uchida, 2007). Gender is viewed as a social construction and there is a growing body of work that speaks of "doing gender" (Nentwich & Kelan, 2013; West & Zimmerman, 1987).

Gender differences can, of course, also be seen as the result of biology. It is naïve to think that culture alone determines behaviour (Berry, Poortinga, Breugelmans, Chasiotis & Sam, 2011; Myers, 2008). Biology, particularly when it comes to genes and hormones, plays a significant role in gender behavioural differences. On the role of genetics, Myers (2008) argues that, as genes predispose muscle development in men to hunting, so they predispose women to breast-feeding. It is quite possible to assume that genes also influence less salient gender-related behavioural attributes. Hormones clearly play a role in the behavioural differences between men and women. Myers (2008) argues convincingly that testosterone levels affect aggression intensity, particularly in young males, but as the testosterone levels between males and females level out in middle age, "women become more assertive and self-confident and men more empathetic and less dominating" (Myers, 2008: 177).

Gender differences are objectively observable in everyday life. Scientific evidence indicates that behavioural differences between males and females do exist. The seminal work of Munroe and Munroe (1975) suggests that these differences are modal, and many other researchers seem to agree. Observational studies indicate that women generally invest more in relationships (see Rossi & Rossi, 1990; Tamres, Janicki & Helgenson, 2002; Taylor, 2002), are less inclined to express dominant behaviour (see Pratto, 1996; Schwartz & Rubel, 2005; Barry, Child & Bacon, 1959), are less aggressive (see Archer, 2002, 2004; Daly & Watson, 1988) and tend to be less sexually assertive (see Segall, Dasen, Berry & Poortinga, 1990; Schmitt, 2005) than men.

Gender differences are also objectively observable in the choices women make in the workplace, and such differences already exist in the career choices women tend

to make. According to Pratto, Stallworth and Sidanius (1997), women usually gravitate towards jobs that reduce inequality, while men prefer jobs that actually accentuate it. Konrad, Ritchie, Lieb and Corrigall (2000) similarly report that women prefer positions that involve personal relations and helping others, while on the other hand men are attracted to jobs that focus on challenge and power. Women are consequently overrepresented in the so-called “pink collar jobs” (Crampton & Mishra, 1999). Division of labour along gender lines occurs in every society (Munroe & Munroe, 1975) and seems to be a function of the socialisation practices to which children are exposed (Berry et al., 2011). Another important difference involves the issue of work scheduling, particularly in the case of women who have to attend to the needs of young children (Shellenbarger, 1991). Women normally bear the bulk of family responsibilities (Cascio, 2010) and tend to prefer part-time work and flexible schedules to accommodate their family responsibilities (Robbins & Judge, 2007). This can, in turn, be linked to absenteeism in the workplace (Van den Heuvel & Wooden, 1995). Women tend to be absent from the workplace more often than men (Scott & McClellan, 1990).

Gender differences are also objectively observable in women’s behaviour in the workplace. For example, women tend to express emotion more often in the workplace (LaFrance & Banaji, 1992), excluding expressing anger (Grossman & Wood, 1993), and are better than men at reading non-verbal cues (James, 1989). Bennie and Huang (2010: 23) report that “there are significant differences between males and females with regard to how their stress and emotions are managed and expressed” in the workplace. Women tend to ruminate more than men do (Nolen-Hoeksema & Jackson, 2001) and are likely to over-think problems (Elias, 2003). They are less prone to risk-taking (Barber & Odean, 2002; Byrnes, Miller & Schafer, 1999) and less likely to pose a health or safety risk in the workplace (Mühlau, 2011). Women also tend to rate communal factors as more important in the workplace than men do (Frame, Roberto, Schwab & Harris, 2010). In general, they seem more optimistic than men about the potential outcome of their occupations (Scozzaro & Subich, 1990). It would also seem that women leaders behave differently from their male counterparts (Gilligan, 1982; Loden, 1985; Scott & Brown, 2006; Tannen, 1990). Going by readings of meta-analytical studies, however, there is little evidence to suggest that gender influences the job performance by men and women in an

important way (Robbins & Judge, 2007). Robbins and Judge (2007: 50) conclude that we “should operate on the assumption that there is no significant difference in job productivity between men and women”.

Women generally earn less than men. This should be seen against the fact that female attributes and behaviours are positively evaluated by males, as well as by females (Eagly & Mladinic, 1994; Prentice & Carranze, 2002), but at the same time these attributes and traits are also seen as less appropriate for high status jobs. In most international human resource management textbooks, there is reference to the fact that women earn lower wages and are not promoted to senior positions to the same extent that their male counterparts experience (Bernardin, 2010; Cascio, 2010; Gómenz-Mejía, Balkin & Cardy, 2007; Noe, Hollenbeck, Gergart & Wright, 2008). The textbooks by Grobler, Wärnick, Carrell, Elbert and Hatfield (2011) and Swanepoel, Erasmus and Schenk (2008) report similar results for South Africa. Baron, Branscombe and Byrne (2009) report that high status jobs are still primarily reserved for men. Men own and control most of the wealth and political power in the United States of America (Centre for the American Women and Politics, 2005). The same applies to South Africa, where men occupy more top and senior management positions and where more men are professionally qualified (Booysen, 2007). Women occupy fewer positions of power and tend to earn less than men in the workplace (Milkovich & Newman, 2008). Many other researchers echo the fact that women earn less than men (Deschenaux, 2009; Floro & Komatsu, 2011; Pfeifer & Sohr, 2009; Schneidhofer, Schiffinger & Mayrhofer, 2010; Suh, 2009).

Gender-based discrimination can be assessed “objectively”. Most assessments focus on outcomes like wage differences (Arabsheibani & Lau, 1999; McDonald & Thornton, 2011; Fang & Moro, 2011), while others focus on variables that may explain differences in the wages and appointment of women (Deschenaux, 2009; Floro & Komatsu, 2011; Pfeifer & Sohr, 2009; Schneidhofer et al., 2010; Suh, 2009). There may be many acceptable reasons why women earn less than men. There are a number of explanations for the wage gap between men and women (Amaram, 2010; Blau & Kahn, 2007; Weichselbaumer & Winter-Ebmer, 2005), which are often presented as reasons why women are excluded from senior positions (Baker & Lightle, 2001; Cotter, Hermsen, Ovadia & Vanneman, 2001; Davies-Netzley, 1998;

Judge & Livingston, 2008; Lyness & Thompson, 1997). These explanations include education, occupational choices, work patterns and child-rearing responsibilities, as well as general perceptions of gender discrimination and rhetoric pertaining to discrimination against women. While no one of these measures may be considered fully comprehensive or free of subjectivity, it is possible to at least estimate and differentiate between “objective discrimination” and perceived discrimination.

Regardless of these apparently fair reasons for discrimination, women often perceive that they are unfairly discriminated against. With what would unfair discrimination then equate? According to the South African Employment Equity Act, 1998, no person may unfairly discriminate, directly or indirectly, against an employee in any employment policy or practice, on one or more grounds, including race, gender, pregnancy, marital status, family responsibility, ethnic or social origin, colour, sexual orientation, age, disability, religion, HIV-status, conscience, belief, political opinion, culture, language, or birth (Republic of South Africa, 1999). This implies that group membership or association is central to unfair discrimination. Of particular importance are the factors mentioned earlier that could potentially limit women’s advancement in the workplace (see Amaram, 2010), namely pregnancy and family responsibility. Chapter 2, Part B, Section 10 of the Employment Equity Acts states, with specific reference to gender discrimination, that this type of discrimination may refer to any distinction, exclusion or restriction made on the basis of sex, including pregnancy, marital status, domestic or family responsibilities, which is aimed at or has the effect of impairing or nullifying the recognition, enjoyment or exercise of women or men. The authors continue that this definition of recognition, enjoyment or exercise specifically includes employment opportunities. The South African Employment Equity Act advocates that women are accommodated and instructs employers “to identify and take reasonable measures to remove any barriers to the full enjoyment of employment opportunities, by persons who were historically denied such opportunities by law or practice” (Republic of South Africa, 1999: 12). “Persons”, in this case, will refer to women, as this aspect is discussed under the act’s heading “Gender discrimination”.

Discrimination is considered fair (stated as “not unfair discrimination”; Republic of South Africa, 1999: 8) when it is the result of affirmative action measures or when

measures “distinguish, exclude or prefer a person on the inherent requirement of a job or a situation” (Republic of South Africa, 1999: 8). This implies that only affirmative action and specific job requirements constitute legally valid reasons for discrimination.

There are credible theoretical explanations for the perception that discrimination exists. Perceptions of gender-based differences and discrimination can be explained from the perspective of the social psychology theory. The most important aspect of social psychology in this case is the social identity theory (Tajfel, 1981; Turner & Reynolds, 2004), which states that individuals often contrast their own group (in-group) with others (out-group) and develop a favorable bias towards their own group (Myers, 2008). Men and women therefore tend to have a favorable bias towards their own group and favour individuals belonging to that specific grouping. This may explain why men tend to employ men, rather than women and why women, because of their positive bias towards women, may perceive discrimination more acutely. A second theory is the group-serving bias (Pettigrew, 1997). Group-serving bias explains that group members, in effect, deny the positive behaviours of out-group members, attributing this conduct instead to situational circumstances. When it comes to negative behaviours, the members of the in-group attribute these to the out-group members’ dispositions. This reinforces negative perceptions of the out-group and enforces stereotypes.

Irrespective of the objective facts of discrimination, perceptions of unfair gender-based discrimination may have a negative effect at several levels:

- Recognising that discrimination is unfairly committed against your own group, for example Jews, African-Americans, gay men or lesbians (see Schmitt, Branscombe, Kobrynowicz & Owen, 2002), affects the *mental well-being* of individuals belonging to that group negatively.[1] This is also true when women experience discrimination against their own group (Klonoff, Landrin & Campbell, 2000). One of the symptoms women experience as a result of

[1] The same authors also suggest that perceived discrimination can have a positive effect on self-esteem, when disadvantaged groups attribute failures to prejudice rather than to their own causal inabilities.

perceived discrimination is reduced self-esteem (Schmitt, Branscombe & Postmes, 2003). Pavalko, Mossakowski and Hamilton (2003) maintain that exclusion from important arenas reduces women's self-esteem far more than that of men. Self-esteem is very central to general well-being and can be defined as the individual's general attitude to him or herself (Baron et al., 2009). Other symptoms experienced by those discriminated against include feelings of hopelessness and depression (Brown & Siegal, 1988). Pascoe and Richman (2009: 351) conclude, following a meta-analysis of this matter, that "perceived discrimination has a significant negative effect on both mental and physical health. Perceived discrimination also produces significantly heightened stress responses …".

- Perceived unfair discrimination may also influence *workplace attitudes* and behaviour. Equity theory is of special interest in a diverse workplace (Hollyforde & Whiddett, 2002) and it is suggested that perceptions of unfair treatment or inequality may lead to dissatisfaction and low morale, as well as to workplace conflict. Expectancy theory explains the negative outcomes associated with unfair treatment. If a female employee is unable to be instrumental in attaining attractive outcomes (e.g. promotion) through her own actions, she will not be satisfied with her job, which may result in absenteeism and turnover (Vroom, 1964). Research indicates that "fair and equitable work environments promote cohesion" (Walsh, Tuller, Matthews, Parks & McDonald, 2010: 191) and that perceived gender discrimination relates significantly to job satisfaction and possible intent to leave the organisation among female but not among male employees (Austin, Villanova, Steed, Neil & Snizek, 1987). In South Africa, Bowen and Cattell (2008) found that discrimination on the basis of gender could have a significant relationship with job satisfaction. The results reported in a study by Ensher, Grant-Vallone and Donaldson (2001: 53) state that "perceived discrimination has an effect on organizational commitment, job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior. Contrary to predictions, however, there was no relationship with grievances". Channar, Abbassi and Ujan (2011) list decreased satisfaction and motivation, lower commitment and enthusiasm levels and increased stress as the results of perceived unfair discrimination. Others (see Carnes &

Radojevich-Kelley, 2011; Eccleston & Major, 2010; Smith, 2009) also report on the adverse effects of gender discrimination.

- Unfair discrimination could have serious *business consequences*. In his seminal book *The Economics of Discrimination* (1957), Garry Becker, a Nobel Prize laureate, explains how appointing or promoting people on grounds other than merit has a negative effect on the business's profits. Daniels and Macdonald (2005) echo this sentiment. Murphy (2010: no page) states that "if an employer discriminates against a job applicant on the basis of factors that are truly irrelevant to job performance, then the employer necessarily incurs a financial penalty. Even better, the penalty is directly proportional to how far the employer's decision was based on prejudice, rather than on merit". However, this penalty is not so blatantly evident in the governmental domain and "governments and government officials rarely bear a cost for and often benefit from, discriminating against unpopular people, which is why the greatest horror stories of discrimination are about governments" (Henderson, 2008: no page). In the South African economic context, government is currently repeating the hapless scenario of the previous apartheid dispensation and is playing an ever-increasing role in business by institutionalising discrimination against "unpopular people" by means of affirmative action (where merit is not always the deciding factor). The payoff for business in such a context could be negative. These effects would, however, not be limited to private business alone, as government itself, which applies affirmative action at many levels within its own operations, is a very large employer, with more than 1.2 million employees currently contributing to the Government Employees Pension Fund (Republic of South Africa Government Employees Pension Fund, 2011).

What exactly does gender-based discrimination in the South African workplace entail? On *Sabinet*, the African Journal Archive, a retrospective digitisation project of full-text journal articles published in Africa, 40 articles containing some relevance to the topic were found (see April, Dreyer & Blass, 2007; Boshoff, 2005; Chovwen, 2003; Dieltiens, Unterhalter, Letsatsi & North, 2009; Dlodlo & Khalala, 2008; Ebeku, 2006; English, Haupt & Smallwood, 2006; Esterhuizen & Martins, 2008; Gallinetti,

Redpath & Sloth-Nielsen, 2004; Haupt & Madikizela, 2009; Hlongwane, 2007; Johnson & Mathur-Helm, 2011; Kahn, 2009; Kane-Berman & Hickman, 2003; Kok, 2008; Lloyd & Mey, 2007; Mafunisa, 2006; Mankayi, 2006; Marais, 2002; Mavundla, 2010; Montesh, 2010; Morrison, 2005; Morrison & Conradie, 2006; Msweli-Mbanga, Fitzgerald & Mkhize, 2005; Muli, 2004; Ncayiyana, 2011; Niemann, 2002; Petersen & Gravett, 2000; Pillay & Kramers, 2003; Pretorius, De Villiers Human, Niemann, Klinck & Alt, 2002; Rabe, 2002; Serumaga-Zake & Kotze, 2004; Stone & Coetzee, 2005; Strauss, 2004; Thomas, 2003; Tsoka & Mathipa, 2001; Van Antwerpen & Ferreira, 2010; Van Zyl & Roodt, 2003; Walters & Le Roux, 2008; Zulu, 2003). On *EBSCOhost* (Business Source Complete) there were seven additional articles (see Albertyn, 2011; Booysen, Fourie & Botes, 2011; Floro & Komatsu, 2011; Hinks, 2002; Simister, 2009; Serumaga-Zake & Naudé, 2003a, 2003b) that were relevant to this research. ProQuest yielded another eight articles relating to this study (see Booysen & Nkomo, 2010; Grun, 2004; Hassim, 2005; Horwitz, Bowmaker-Falconer & Searll, 1996; Mathur-Helm, 2005; Mwaba & Simbayi, 1998; Thomas, 2002; Van Wijk, 2011). This means that 55 articles, with different levels of relevance, were located. This number should not be interpreted as reflective of a well-researched topic. On the contrary, there is a significant lacuna in this field and a disconcerting lack of scientific business information is available on the topic. This will become evident in the following paragraphs.

Despite the articles mentioned, the extent to which gender discrimination really does occur in South African companies (Objective 3) is not clear. Several studies relating to this question were located (see Booysen et al., 2011; Boshoff, 2005; Grun, 2004; Hinks, 2002; Kahn, 2009; Montesh, 2010; Msweli-Mbanga et al., 2005; Niemann, 2002; Pretorius et al., 2002; Serumaga-Zake & Naudé, 2003b; Walters & Le Roux, 2008), but they fell short of answering the question, focusing as they did on specific industries or making use of generic survey data. Only one study, which focused specifically on business, viz. the study by Thomas (2003), was conducted across several companies. This study was carried out nine years ago, so the data and findings may have become less relevant given the dynamic context of the research envisaged here.

Staying with the topic of objective measures of discrimination, the reports by the Commission for Gender Equality (Hicks, 2010a, 2010b, 2010c) describe gender discrimination in terms of the number of women in senior positions, implying that less than a 50 per cent representation equates with discrimination. This seems "accurate", as "gender equity is a key objective of government policy, as seen in the national government's target of 50:50 gender representation in senior management positions (in local government, at least) by March 2009" (Mavundla, 2010: 20). Also, the Commission for Employment Equity, established in terms of Section 28 of the Employment Equity Act, 1998, serves, inter alia, to advise the Minister of Labour on the setting of numerical goals in different sectors (Ramutloa, 2008). This suggests that representation in terms of biographical variables equates with equality and non-discriminatory practices. However, given the definition of fair discrimination, as stated in the Employment Equity Act, it may be argued that matching biographical with demographical statistics should not necessarily be seen as reflective of an equal or just society.

The literature presented in this chapter makes it clear that perceived unfair discrimination against females has a generally negative effect on those individuals. Some research on this matter, specifically relevant to the South African context, could be located (see Lloyd & Mey, 2007; Mwaba & Simbayi, 1998; Petersen & Gravett, 2000; Van Zyl & Roodt, 2003). These studies do not cover a wide range of companies or industries, so it is not clear what the exact levels of perceived gender-based discrimination in South Africa are (Objective 2). This requires further investigation.

The precise stage at which gender discrimination occurs in human resource management processes, specifically in South Africa, is not clear (Objective 1). Research was found which indicates that gender bias normally occurs during recruitment (Bang & Mitra, 2011), during interviews (Nachtigall, Agthe & Spörrle, 2011; Tosi & Einbender, 1985), in hiring (Braunstein & Heintz, 2008; Koeber & Wright, 2006; Luzadis, Wesolowski & Snavely, 2008) and during the determination of pay (Jordan, Clark & Waldron, 2007; Palomino & Peyrache, 2011). This takes place, even though Eagly and Mladinic (1994) conclude that studies on the perceived work performance of men and women have not demonstrated an overall tendency to

devalue work by women. The South African Employment Equity Act, Chapter 2, Part C, Section 14, provides some guidance on possible points in the process at which gender discrimination may occur. The Act states that no employer may unfairly or unreasonably discriminate against any person in any manner - including subscribing to and applying practices in advertising, recruitment and selection,[2] human resource utilisation, development, promotion and retention which may lead to the exclusion of persons from particular groups (Republic of South Africa, 1999). It discourages employers from subscribing to and applying policies and practices that result in "unequal pay for work of equal value" (Republic of South Africa, 1999: 13). However, as stated earlier, research conducted in South Africa is limited (see Horwitz et al., 1996; Stone & Coetzee, 2005; Tsoka & Mathipa, 2001) and information on where the discriminatory acts occur in the local business context is not currently available.

It is also not clear how management and employee perceptions of gender-based discrimination differ and to what extent these perceptions are based on "objective" indicators of discrimination (Objective 4). No such research reports were found that were applicable to the South African situation, apart from the article by Johnson and Mathur-Helm (2011), focusing on women (in senior positions) discriminating against other women (in the lower ranks). No research could be located that compares perceptions of discrimination relative to objective measures of discrimination.

1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT

A comprehensive and updated analysis of gender-based discrimination in South Africa, and local perceptions about the issue, does not as yet exist.

1.3 GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

It could be important to distinguish here between goals and objectives. Goals are generally broad, abstract statements of intentions, often concerned with the intangible, whereas objectives are narrower, concrete statements of precise and

[2] The Act refers specifically to the conduct and content of job interviews. No other such specific references are made.

tangible actions. Goals cannot be validated as is, whilst objectives can be (Lewis, 1996).

The goal (aim) of this study is to provide a comprehensive picture of perceptions of gender-based discrimination in South Africa. This goal was achieved by focusing on four research objectives. These are listed below:

Objective 1: To describe, from a managerial perspective, gender-based discrimination in the appointment, promotion and remuneration of women in South Africa.

Objective 2: To describe perceived gender-based discrimination in South Africa as experienced by employees.

Objective 3: To analyse the level of fairness in the remuneration of women in South Africa.

Objective 4: To analyse differences between managers and employees with regard to perceptions about gender-based discrimination in the workplace.

Achieving these objectives will result in the achievement of this research goal.

1.4 IMPORTANCE OF THE RESEARCH

From a business perspective, the lack of a comprehensive and updated analysis of gender-based discrimination or awareness of perceptions pertaining to the matter could pose a serious problem.

Such an analysis could provide information to managers on the specific points in the appointment, promotion and remuneration process where gender-based discrimination most often occurs. It could also alert them to these potential pitfalls. This awareness could, in turn, result in managers establishing mechanisms (see Tosi & Einbender, 1985) at these points to prevent the occurrence of such discriminatory practices.

This analysis could also provide managers with information on employees' perceptions of gender-based discrimination. As perceived unfair discrimination has a negative effect on employees both advantaged (Brown, Charnsangavej, Keough, Newman & Rentfrow, 2000; Walster, Walster & Berschield, 1987) and disadvantaged by such practices (Pascoe & Smart Richman, 2009), this constitutes important information. Access to it could possibly result in managers guiding employees in understanding the realities of gender-based discrimination (Fubara, McMillan-Capehart & Richard, 2008) and may result in employees experiencing decreased dissatisfaction with perceived unfair discrimination (Hollyforde & Whiddett, 2002).

It could also provide information for managers and employees on the actual or real levels of gender-based discrimination in their companies. Should no real discrimination be present, it could nevertheless be beneficial in minimising perceptions of discrimination among all the groups involved, as employees, belonging to particular groups tend to be biased towards their own group (Tajfel, 1981; Turner & Reynolds, 2004). Such employee groups also tend to perceive other groups as being advantaged, not necessarily on account of their abilities, but rather on account of situational factors (Pettigrew, 1997).

Such a study could also be a source of information on the fit or misfit between management and employees regarding the levels of gender-based discrimination. It could inform managers (decision-makers) about possible dissonance between their own and employees' perceptions of discrimination in their working environment, as well as about the actual levels of gender discrimination. This may result in improved management of the problem. Robbins and Judge (2007:9) maintain that the purpose of investigations in the field of organisational behaviour is beneficial only when "applying such knowledge towards improving an organization's effectiveness". Equilibrium between managers and employees is important, as this may contribute to limiting industrial action.

With baseline information available, company managers may be able to gauge their companies' level of discrimination in comparison with similar companies or companies in their own sector, or with South African companies in general. This

comparison may result in changes in policy or behaviour to align them with those of the firms with which they choose to compare themselves.

Applying the same methodology and measures across companies allows for company comparisons. This eliminates the need for meta-analysis (see Konrad et al., 2000; Pascoe & Richman, 2009; Tosi & Einbender, 1985; Weichselbaumer & Winter-Ebmer, 2005) and leads to a higher level of confidence in the results.

With a three-dimensional focus, using the angle of managers, employees and company data in one study, an inclusive picture per company could be provided. Some studies have focused on managers (Booysen, 2007; Braunstein & Heintz, 2008; Luzadis et al., 2008; Nachtigall et al., 2011; Tosi & Einbender, 1985), employees (Austin et al., 1987; Channar et al., 2011; Ensher et al., 2001; Palomino & Peyrache, 2011; Schmitt et al., 2003) or company data (Deschenaux, 2009; Fang & Moro, 2011; Floro & Komatsu, 2011; Judge & Livingston, 2008; McDonald & Thornton, 2011), but few have focused on all three elements.

Not to have researched and presented a comprehensive and updated analysis of gender-based discrimination, along with relevant perceptions, could be problematic for academia. In the first place, such an oversight represents negligence regarding an important matter. It should be rectified, at the same time enabling the university to fulfill its responsibilities towards the community.

The base of this study is intended to be broader than those of most other studies. In total, more than 20 companies were involved in the project. Although the results will not be representative of all South African companies, involving more than 20 diverse companies will hopefully contribute meaningfully to a body of information that is not currently available.

As far as the author is concerned, the lack of access to a comprehensive and updated analysis of gender-based discrimination, as well as the accompanying perceptions, is problematic. In my personal capacity as a Caucasian male, I often feel discriminated against, given the nature of the public rhetoric and the stipulations

of the Employment Equity Act. Having accurate information on the facts of gender-based bias may result in the harmonization of this dissonance. Also, as a lecturer in human resource management, dealing with diversity and gender-based discrimination became much easier after I collected and analysed empirical data on the topic. Completing this study successfully would also fulfill my aspiration of obtaining a doctoral degree from a business school.

1.5 CONTEXT OF THE RESEARCH

The context of the research will be discussed with reference to the disciplinary environment in which it operates, metatheoretical assumptions about the research, as well as the applicable models and theories.

1.5.1 Disciplinary context of the research

This research is conducted in the context of business research. Business research itself should be seen within the context of the social science disciplines, such as psychology, sociology, anthropology and economics, which inform the study of business (Bryman & Bell, 2007). Business research is:

> a process of planning, acquiring, analyzing and disseminating relevant data, information and insights to decision makers in ways that mobilize the organization to take appropriate actions that, will in turn, maximize performance (Cooper & Schindler, 2011: 4).

Business research as defined here conforms to Mode 2 research, which involves the production of practical, rather than academic knowledge (Gibbons, Limoges, Nowotny, Schwartzman, Scott & Trow, 1994). While the focus of this study was on Mode 2 research, theories of social psychology and organisational behaviour were also incorporated, as they are very useful in describing phenomena in the working and business environment (Baron et al., 2009; Robbins & Judge, 2011).

Human resource management constitutes a specific field of business research. Other fields include marketing, strategy, organisational behaviour, accounting,

finance, industrial relations and operational research (Bryman & Bell, 2007). Human resource management may be defined as “that part of the management of organisations that is concerned with all aspects that relate to, and interplay with, the work and the people who do the work of and in organisations” (Swanepoel et al., 2008: 4).

In the field of human resource management, diversity management is a common topic and sub-discipline. This is evident in the work of several authors, who include it as a chapter in their textbooks on human resource management. Examples would be Bernardin (2010), Cascio (2010), Gómenz-Mejía et al. (2007) and Noe et al. (2008), who all devote chapters to diversity management. Diversity management may be defined as a:

> planned systematic and comprehensive managerial process for developing an organizational environment in which all employees, with their similarities and differences, can contribute to the strategic and competitive advantage of the organization and where no-one is excluded on the basis of factors unrelated to productivity (Grobler et al., 2011: 79).

This research will also be anchored in the discipline of social psychology, which may be defined as “the scientific study of how people think about, influence and relate to one another” (Meyers, 2008: 4). In similar style, Baron et al. (2009: 13) describe social psychology as focusing on “understanding the causes of social behavior and social thought - on identifying factors that shape our feelings, behavior and thought in social situations”.

Another important discipline relevant to this study is that of organisational behaviour. Here the focus is on behaviour in the workplace. Morehead and Griffin (2008: 4) define the discipline of organisational behaviour as “the study of human behavior in organizational setting, of the interface between human behavior and the organization and of the organization itself”. It can also be defined as the “field of study that investigates the impact that individuals, groups and structure have on behavior in organizations, for the purpose of applying such knowledge towards improving an organization’s effectiveness” (Robbins & Judge, 2007: 9).

Gender-based discrimination, and the relevant perceptions of the topic, were analysed and discussed in this disciplinary context.

1.5.2 Metatheoretical assumptions

Metatheoretical assumptions can be defined as the philosophies that underpin the nature of the research and are seen as the teleological dimension of the research. These assumptions are different for each of the objectives and were presented as such.

Objective 1: To describe, from a managerial perspective, gender-based discrimination in the appointment, promotion and remuneration of women in South Africa.

A general underpinning of a managerial perspective on this issue could be the application of systems theory, suggesting that all phenomena (including gender discrimination) should be seen within the context of a system and that we should see the phenomena as being part of a whole (Higgs & Smith, 2006). As gender discrimination is informed by people in power, who could be managers or political leaders, critical theory may also be applicable. Critical theory, which is concerned with unmasking the truth, proposes that the truth is created and uncreated by human beings, mostly by people in positions of authority (Higgs & Smith, 2006). The primary metatheories applicable to the interpretation of data relating to Objective 1 were hermeneutics and phenomenology, as qualitative data (interviews with managers) will be interpreted to achieve this objective. Hermeneutics sees the truth as being revealed through (the subjective) human understanding of the phenomena obtained by means of the process of interpretation and dialogue (Higgs & Smith, 2006). Phenomenology, seeing truth as more personal and with an emphasis on authenticity, professes that truth lies in the individual's experience of feelings, awareness and consciousness. "We are in the world and the world is in us" (Higgs & Smith, 2006: 55).

Objective 2: To describe perceived gender-based discrimination in South Africa as experienced by employees.

With Objective 2, the general metatheoretical assumptions of systems theory and critical theory were applicable, as in the case of Objective 1. Regarding critical theory, the emphasis was on the perceptions of the suppressed. As far as the collection and interpretation of data is concerned, critical rationalism was applicable. According to Higgs and Smith (2006) a critical rationalist approach acknowledges that the truth eludes us and that scientists should try to avoid falsity. They should reject the nil-hypothesis, rather than accepting facts. This approach is relevant, as information obtained from psychometrically-sound instruments was used to achieve this objective.

Objective 3: To analyse the level of fairness in the appointment, promotion and remuneration of women in South Africa.

Systems theory, critical theory and feminism could in general be applicable to this objective. Feminism advocates that the truth wears a woman's face and that women can help to re-think and re-create the world (Higgs & Smith, 2006). Regarding data collection and analysis, critical rationalism and even logical empiricism, which submit that the truth can be found by looking at hard facts (Higgs & Smith, 2006), may be applicable, as an effort was made to link a numerical value to fairness.

Objective 4: To analyse differences between managers and employees with regard to perceptions of gender-based discrimination in the workplace.

Critical theory may also be applicable in the case of Objective 4, as the perceptions by those in power (managers) will be compared with those possessing less power (employees). As far as data collection and analysis are concerned, critical rationalism and logical empiricism (see Higgs & Smith, 2006) were applicable.

1.5.3 Models and theories

Different theories and models are appropriate for the different objectives. These will be discussed per objective.

Objective 1: To describe, from a managerial perspective, gender-based discrimination in the appointment, promotion and remuneration of women in South Africa.

The universalistic human resource perspective, based on the pioneering work of Pfeffer (1994, 1995, 1998), applies here. Pfeffer found that organisational performance depends on common human resource practices and that this is true regardless of the industry or strategy pursued. These human resource practices are: employment security, selective hiring, self-managed teams and the associated decentralised decision-making, compensation based on work-related performance, extensive training, reduction in formal status and barriers between employees and information-sharing (Pfeffer, 1998). Once a company is able to engage fully in these best practices, performance will follow. Fundamental to this approach is that employees are seen as assets to the company and, as such, are worthy of development; that all parties agree that employee skills and discretionary efforts are mutually beneficial; and that an exchange between the employer and employee will occur (Pfeffer, 1998). Here the aim would be to identify the practices that lead to gender discrimination.

Objective 2: To describe perceived gender-based discrimination in South Africa as experienced by employees.

The most important theories applying here are the social identity theory (Tajfel, 1981; Turner & Reynolds, 2004) and group-serving bias (Pettigrew, 1997). Social identity theory states, inter alia, that individuals contrast their own group (in-group) with others (out-group) and tend to develop a bias favourable to their own group (Myers, 2008). The concept of group-serving bias goes a step further. Here in-group members explain away or negate the positive behaviours of out-group members and attribute negative behaviours to out-group members' dispositions (such as

personality and values), rather than to situational circumstances (Myers, 2008). In the case of objective 3, the aim was to find differences in perceptions of gender-based discrimination, based on the group with which the respondent identified.

Objective 3: To analyse the level of fairness in the appointment, promotion and remuneration of females in South Africa.

The just world theory (Lerner, 1980) and equity theory (Adams, 1963) apply in this case. The just world theory proposes, in its simplest form, "that people (therefore) get what they deserve and deserve what they get" (Myers, 2008), because the world is just. Equity theory contends that individuals in social exchanges compare the ratios of their inputs and outputs with those of a referent group and when the ratio is deemed inequitable, they are motivated to remove this dissonance by removing the inequity (Hollyforde & Whiddett, 2002). The aim was to find out whether gender groups were treated fairly.

Objective 4: To analyse differences between managers and employees with regard to perceptions of gender-based discrimination in the workplace.

The previously-discussed social identity theory (Tajfel, 1981; Turner & Reynolds, 2004) and group-serving bias (Pettigrew, 1997) will also be applicable here, as identifiable groups will clearly be involved. Person/group discrimination discrepancy (Dixon, Durrheim, Tredoux, Tropp, Clack & Eaton, 2010) may also apply, as managers report on discrimination witnessed rather than experienced.

1.6 DELINEATION

The first delineation deals with the geographical range of the research. This research is focused on gender-based discrimination and on perceptions of such discrimination in the South African context. It is therefore limited to a specific country and does not go beyond those parameters.

Gender-based discrimination is addressed in the South African situation, focusing on South African legislation, culture and practices.

It is also acknowledged that not all the variables that contribute to gender-based discrimination or perceptions of gender-based discrimination were assessed and included in this study. Personality, for instance, the authoritarian personality discussed by Altemeyer (2004) and cognitive styles, such as spontaneous categorisation (Meyers, 2008), were not included in the analysis, even though they influence prejudice.

This study is concerned with gender differences rather than with gender-based affirmative action. The central idea is to report on levels of gender-based discrimination and on the associated perceptions. There is no intention to report on the “political” or “ethical” merit of such actions.

1.7 LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

During this research, data was collected from a large pool of companies in South Africa. It was not possible to generalise about all South African companies, but certain generalisations were made.

In the case of Objective 3, the author refers to fairness in appointments. The reader should be cautioned that this refers to actual appointments (successful applicants). The data may therefore not present an accurate picture of the fairness of the selection process, as data from the total pool of applicants (the successful and unsuccessful applicants) was not available. This may be considered a limitation to this study.

The companies involved were self-selected. Only companies that were represented by students currently enrolled for the Master of Business Leadership degree at the University of South Africa were included. Although this is a limitation, it nevertheless represents a large number of companies, and it would otherwise be very difficult to enroll such a significant group of participating organisations.

1.8 RESEARCH METHOD

The research consists of a literature review and an empirical investigation. Each of these is discussed per objective.

1.8.1 Literature review

Objective 1: To describe, from a managerial perspective, gender-based discrimination in the appointment, promotion and remuneration of women in South Africa.

The literature relating to this objective was addressed in four phases, with four aims.

One: To contextualise discrimination and gender-based discrimination with reference to South African legislation.

Two: To describe managers as active agents in discrimination.

Three: To identify possible points in human resource management processes when discrimination could occur.

Four: To discuss the manifestation of discrimination in human resource management processes.

Objective 2: To describe perceived gender-based discrimination in South Africa as experienced by employees.

The literature relating to this objective was addressed in four phases with four aims:

One: To define discrimination and gender-based discrimination.

Two: To contextualise discrimination and gender-based discrimination with reference to South African legislation.

Three: To describe the effects of perceived discrimination on mental health and workplace behaviour.

Four: To describe, from the perspective of social identity theory (Tajfel, 1981; Turner & Reynolds, 2004) and a group-serving bias (Pettigrew, 1997), the expected perceptions of individuals regarding discrimination in the workplace. Aims 1 - 3 were addressed in the background section of this article and Aim 4 was addressed in the literature review.

Objective 3: To analyse the level of fairness in the remuneration of women in South Africa.

The literature concerning this objective was addressed by means of four aims.

One: To contextualise discrimination and gender-based discrimination with reference to South African legislation.

Two: To identify, based on the principles of equity theory (Adams, 1963), inputs and outputs that may be used as identifiers when groups compare themselves with each other and that may contribute to dissonance (disequilibrium) and feelings of discrimination in the workplace.

Three: To discuss the wage gap.

Four: To discuss and list the most common factors that could be considered fair means of discrimination when it comes to differences in wages.

Objective 4: To analyse differences between managers and employees with regard to perceptions of gender-based discrimination in the workplace.

One: To contrast managers and employees as separate groups with distinct agendas within the human resource management environment in general and gender-based discrimination in particular.

1.8.2 Empirical investigation

The empirical investigation was discussed per objective and with reference to the respondents, the procedure for collecting the data, the measuring instruments and the analysis of the data, as well as with regard to the decision techniques and ethical considerations.

Objective 1: To describe, from a managerial perspective, gender-based discrimination in the appointment, promotion and remuneration of women in South Africa.

The **respondents** in this study were managers who had a direct influence on the appointment, promotion and remuneration of employees. Interviews were conducted with the most senior human resource managers and with the general managers of 15 companies. Interviews with three other senior managers of each company were also conducted, amounting to a total of five interviews per company. The companies from which the interviews were solicited were relatively large, with diverse workforces (at least 30 male and 30 female employees) who were willing to participate in the study. The companies approached were those to which students enrolled in the Master of Business Leadership programme at the Unisa Graduate School of Business Leadership had access via their employment. The sample of companies can be described as a convenient sample, while the respondents were randomly identified per gender, which makes it a stratified random sample (Rosnow & Rosenthal, 2008).

The **procedure** followed to collect the data meant that the students had to gain permission from the chief executive officer or director general of their respective companies to conduct the study. In this case, permission had to be granted to conduct interviews with the relevant respondents. Permission granted, the respondents' consent was requested and data was collected in interviews.

The **measuring instrument** was a structured interview focusing on the procedures followed when appointing, promoting and rewarding individuals. The interviews included some open-ended questions directed to managers volunteering information

on the stage at which gender-based discrimination occurs in human resource management processes. The second part of the interview was far more structured, and respondents (managers) were asked to point out, using a list of possible sources of discrimination in human resource management processes, where discrimination in their organisations occurred. It was assumed that the interview schedule, particularly the section containing the list, had face and content validity, given the overlap with the relevant human resource management literature. Figure 1 below is an abstract from the interview schedule.

1 Do you believe that there is discrimination, in favour or against women, in terms of the **appointment** of women at Company X? >>>>> In favour / against / no discrimination (encircle the appropriate word/s). >>>>> If the respondent answers in favour or against, ask: In what way does it happen? Write this down. …….. …….. >>>>> If no, move to question 2.	B-1/2/3

Figure 1: Abstract from the interview schedule.

The complete interview schedule is available in Annexure B.

Analysis of the data focused on a content analysis (Terre Blanche, Durrheim & Painter, 2008) of the interview notes. Narratives were categorised in terms of the themes identified in the literature review.

Regarding the **decision techniques**, the most frequently endorsed theme was deemed to be the most important or prominent in the respective company. When it was not possible to categorise the narratives according to the preset themes, new themes, additional to those submitted in the literature, were created. This occurred once.

Several **ethical considerations** are applicable. The first issue is the use of students as fieldworkers. The students clearly benefited from collecting the data, as they were using it in their research reports for the Master of Business Leadership degree. A possible second ethical concern could be that students were accessing the companies where they were working. This was partially addressed by the

requirement that the chief executive officer or director general first had to give permission to conduct the study (implying that the students did not have ultimate authority in the setting). The students then had to obtain the respondents' consent. The informed consent form stated that participation in the survey was voluntary. The consent form is presented on page 1 of Annexure C.

Objective 2: To describe perceived gender-based discrimination in South Africa as experienced by employees.

The **respondents** in this study were employees in a specific section of an organisation. Only employees in sections with at least 30 male and 30 female employees, and who were willing to participate in the study, were included. The ratio of men to women in the section was not considered in the sampling process. The companies approached were those to which students enrolled for the Master of Business Leadership programme at the Unisa Graduate School of Business Leadership had access because of their employment in those companies. This was an opportunity sample as far as companies were concerned, and a stratified (male-female) sample as far as the respondents were concerned. Ethical matters pertaining to this are discussed below.

The **procedure** for collecting the data was for the students to gain permission from the chief executive officer or director general to conduct the study. After they had received permission, employee lists were used to draw samples. Those included in the sample were requested to give their consent (see consent form on page 1 of Annexure C or D) and data was collected from those willing to participate. Data was collected by means of a questionnaire.

The **measuring instrument** was a questionnaire composed of multiple-choice questions on perceived discrimination (against women and men). Questions were based on those used in previous research. The Fair Treatment at Work Survey used by Grainger and Fitzner (2007) was adapted (see pages 2 - 3 of Annexure D). Other questions relating to unfair treatment from the perspective of the human resource processes were generated, following the literature review on this topic. The questions were formulated to be as simple and straightforward as possible (see page

4 of Annexure D). This questionnaire was called the Gender-Based Discrimination Questionnaire. It took the average person no longer than 15 minutes to complete both questionnaires. The validity of the Fair Treatment at Work Survey was based on the validity data collected in previous studies and the Gender-Based Discrimination Questionnaire had assumed construct and face validity. The following is an example of a question in this questionnaire:

If you consider appointments in this section, do you think (1) women get appointed easier; (2) men are appointed easier; (3) there is no real difference in the way men and women get appointed?

The **data analysis** focused on the differences in the perception of discrimination by men and women. To detect gender differences the responses to the Fair Treatment at Work Survey, Spearman's rank-order correlation was calculated. The differences between the scores for males and females for the Gender-Based Discrimination Questionnaire were calculated using the Pearson chi-square test.

Regarding the **decision techniques**, correlation with a significance level of less than .01 was considered significant. The same significance level was set for the Pearson chi-square test.

The **ethical considerations** are similar to those discussed under Objective 1. The issues concerning the use of students as fieldworkers and students accessing the companies where they were working have already been addressed. An important difference in this case was the type of respondent. While senior managers were approached in the case of Objective 1, in the case of Objective 2 it was the lower level employees who were approached, which opens up the possibility of undue influence. This matter was addressed by alerting the students to the risk and by emphasising the importance of voluntarism and the respondents' right to withdraw from the process at any time. The fieldworkers signed a declaration that the informed consent forms were read out aloud and that all the respondents participated voluntarily. The informed consent form made it clear that participation in the survey was voluntary.

Objective 3: To analyse the level of fairness in the remuneration of women in South Africa.

The **respondents** used at this stage of the study are those referred to in the case of Objective 2.

The **procedure** followed for collecting the data was the same as that for Objective 2. A questionnaire was used to collect data from employees (see page 4 of Annexure C).

The **measuring instrument** was a questionnaire focusing on biographical variables. This questionnaire, together with the questionnaire used for Objective 2, formed the battery completed by the respondents. The questions pertained to biographical variables that previous research had shown to be possible sources of discrimination. The questions were formulated to be as simple and straightforward as possible. It took the average person no longer than five minutes to complete the 18, mostly biographical, questions (see page 4 of Annexure D). The items were considered to have face and content validity based on their use in previous research. Figure 1 is an abstract from the questionnaire.

Number of companies you have worked for since age 18			_____Companies		AV
Number of years in full-time employment since age 18			_____Years		AW
Years of formal schooling	Less than 12 years	12 years (matric)	1st Degree / Diploma	Higher degree / Diploma	AX-1/2/3/4
Highest job-specific qualification		None	1st Degree / Diploma	Higher degree / Diploma	AY-3/4

Figure 2: Abstract from questionnaire

In the data analysis, three types of data, namely categorical, ordinal and continuous data, required consideration. Chi-square tests were performed for categorical and ordinal data, while for continuous data, correlations were calculated and regression analyses were carried out. The chi-square tests showed whether the rows and

columns (males and females) were independent, which quantified the influence of gender on the rows. Correlations between dependent and independent variables were calculated for males and females, and the differences were calculated using the procedure described by Field (2009). Conducting regression analysis, the regression coefficients were calculated for the combined group (men and women) and gender was entered as an independent variable. The change in the size of the regression coefficient was considered to be indicative of gender bias.

Regarding the **decision techniques**, three strategies were followed. The 1 per cent significance level was set for the Pearson chi-square test. For the difference in correlation, observed z-values larger than 1.96, or smaller than -1.96, were considered to indicate significant differences (Pallant, 2010). For the contribution to the declared variance in the regression, a statistically significant contribution (Beta; $p < .05$) was considered to indicate significant bias (Pallant, 2010). For differences in mean scores, which were calculated to test for the gender wage gap, effects larger than Cohen's $d > .2$ were regarded as significant (Cohen, 1988; Pallant, 2010).

The **ethical considerations** applicable to Objective 2 are also applicable here and were addressed under the previous heading.

Objective 4: To analyse differences between managers and employees regarding perceptions of gender-based discrimination in the workplace.

The **respondents** in this study were the managers (described above under the heading Objective 1) and the employees (described above under the heading Objective 2). As stated earlier, they represented relatively large South African organisations.

The **procedure**, as with the previous objectives, was first to gain permission to conduct the study from the chief executive officer or director general. Managers were selected according to their involvement in human resource management processes, while employees were randomly selected. In each organisation, 30 males and 30 females were selected. Those selected (managers) and those included in the sample (employees) were requested to give their consent (see consent form on page 1 of

Annexure D). Data was collected from those willing to participate by means of the two questionnaires discussed above, namely the Fair Treatment at Work Survey (Grainger & Fitzner, 2007) and the Gender-Based Discrimination Questionnaire (developed for this study). It took the average respondent no longer than 15 minutes to complete both questionnaires.

The **measuring instruments** were, as stated, the Fair Treatment at Work Survey and the Gender-Based Discrimination Questionnaire. The questions in the Fair Treatment at Work Survey had a different emphasis for managers and employees. The first question posed to managers read as follows: “In the last two years at this organisation, has anyone been treated unfairly because of any of the following?” The equivalent question to the employees was: “In the last two years with this organisation have you been treated unfairly because of any of the following?” The respondents could select any one (or more) of 19 possible reasons for having been treated unfairly. This list included age, gender, nationality, religion, race or ethnic group, and 14 other possible reasons. The second question, also originating in the Fair Treatment at Work Survey, related to the consequences of the unfair treatment mentioned. In the case of managers, it read as follows: “To what did the unfair treatment you have personally witnessed relate?” Regarding employees, Question 2 read as follows: “To what did the unfair treatment you have personally experienced relate?” The respondents could select any one (or more) of 18 possible consequences of being treated unfairly. These included salary, pension, other benefits, perks and bonuses besides pay, as well as 13 additional possibilities. Managers and employees were posed exactly the same questions in the Gender-Based Discrimination Questionnaire. An example of this is where the respondents had to select one of three options: (1) It is easier for a woman to get appointed to this organisation than it is for a man; (2) It is equally difficult for a man or a woman to get appointed to this organisation; and (3) It is easier for a man to get appointed to this organisation than it is for a woman.

The **data analysis** focused on the differences in the perception of discrimination by managers and employees. To detect differences in the list created using the responses to the Fair Treatment at Work Survey, Spearman’s rank-order correlation was calculated. The differences between the scores for managers and employees in

the case of Gender-Based Discrimination Questionnaire were calculated using the Pearson chi-square test.

When it came to the **decision techniques,** correlation with a significance level of less than .01 was considered significant. The same significance level was set for the Pearson chi-square test.

The **ethical considerations** are similar to those discussed under Objectives 1 and 2.

1.9 CHAPTER DIVISION

The following chapters are presented in the following pages:

Chapter 2: Article 1
Chapter 3: Article 2
Chapter 4: Article 3
Chapter 5: Article 4
Chapter 6: Conclusions, limitations and recommendations

CHAPTER 2

ARTICLE 1

In this chapter, the first of four articles is presented. This particular article is aimed at examining the first objective of the study, namely *to describe, from a managerial perspective, gender-based discrimination in the appointment, promotion and remuneration of women in South Africa.* The title of the article, as presented to the *South African Journal for Labour Relations*, was “Gender-based discrimination in a selection of South African organisations: A managerial perspective”. The format of the article is in line with the guidelines for authors published by the journal.

Gender-based discrimination in a selection of South African organisations: A managerial perspective

Abstract

Managers are key in the appointment, promotion and remuneration of staff, and, as such, they are the agents who are active when discrimination occurs in the workplace. This also applies to gender-based discrimination. The objective of the current research was to identify the points in human resource processes where gender-based discrimination most often occurs, as seen and experienced by managers. Interviews were conducted with 75 managers from 15 organisations. Questions were posed about the prevalence and nature of gender discrimination during different human resource processes. The responses were categorised and the overall inter-observer reliability was .88. Most cases of gender-based discrimination occur during promotion processes, which generally involve pro-female discrimination. Pro-male discrimination occurs at the appointment level, and this is often due to the inherent requirements of the job. Discrimination at the remuneration level seems to favour men, allowing them to receive higher salaries than women at the same organisational level. Discrimination occurs in structured (e.g. job descriptions) as well as less structured (e.g. decision-making after interviews) phases of human resource processes. It can be concluded that gender-based discrimination still occurs and that both genders are affected negatively. It is recommended that managers be vigilant in order to avoid these discriminatory tendencies.

Keywords: *gender; discrimination, appointment, promotion, remuneration, South Africa, management*

1 Introduction

Gender-based discrimination is against the spirit and the letter of the South African Constitution. It is stated in the Constitution that “the state may not unfairly discriminate directly or indirectly against anyone on one or more grounds, including race, gender, sex, pregnancy, marital status, ethnic or social origin, colour, sexual orientation, age, disability, religion, conscience, belief, culture, language and birth” (RSA 1996:3). It is, however, not only the state that is prohibited from unfair discrimination. South African labour legislation also prohibits such actions by employers. The Labour Relations Act (RSA 1995:141) specifically states, “unfair discrimination is prohibited, either directly or indirectly, against an employee on any arbitrary ground, including, but not limited to race, gender, sex, ethnic or social

origin, colour, sexual orientation, age, disability, religion, conscience, belief, political opinion, culture, language, marital status or family responsibility".

The fact that section 1(b) of the Constitution specifically states the aim of creating a society reflective of non-racialism and non-sexism (RSA 1995), and the fact that the Constitution also makes provision for a Commission for Gender Equality which "has the power, as regulated by national legislation, necessary to perform its functions, including the power to monitor, investigate, research, educate, lobby, advise and report on issues concerning gender equality" (RSA 1995:63), indicates that gender-based discrimination may be a problem in South Africa or may have been so in the past.

Scientific reports on gender-based discrimination in South Africa also affirm that gender-based discrimination may still be a problem. Some of these reports focus and report on female under-representation in the workplace in general (Floro & Komatsu 2011; Mathur-Helm 2005; Serumaga-Zake & Naudé 2003), while many report on female under-representation in senior positions (Kahn 2008; Mathur-Helm 2006; Mello & Phago 2007). Senior positions are usually accompanied by higher salaries, and several articles focus on gender differences in remuneration among those who hold senior positions (Grun 2004; Hinks 2002; Walters & Le Roux 2008). Many articles also discuss barriers women experience in the workplace, preventing them from optimising their potential (April, Dreyer & Blass 2007; Booysen 2007; Johnson & Mathur-Helm 2011; Nieman 2002) and from acquiring senior positions and higher remuneration. These scientific reports point to the existence of gender discrimination as a substantial problem.

The people responsible for gender-based discrimination are employers, as formulated in the legislation, which refers to the duties of employers (see Basic Conditions of Employment Act [RSA 2000]). The results of empirical studies also submit that employers discriminate against female employees (see Ncayiyana 2011; Pretorius, De Villiers Human, Niemann, Klinck & Alt 2002; Stone & Coetzee 2005). This position of disproportional power and suppression of certain groups is well explained by critical theory (Max Horkheimer) and by Marxist thinkers (such as Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels). It may therefore be necessary to focus on employers and their actions in order to pinpoint where discrimination occurs. The focus on actions (of employers) is important as discrimination is often defined in a context referring to specific action. Grogan (2007) defines discrimination (in general) as the

action whereby some are afforded benefits and others are denied access thereto, while Cascio (2010) adds a group element, stating that discrimination entails a group of individuals being *given* preferential treatment over others. With regard to gender-based discrimination, Channer, Abbassi and Ujan (2011) state that discrimination entails giving an unfair advantage or disadvantage to members of a particular gender in comparison to members of the other gender. It is therefore through actions or activities that employers discriminate against women in the workplace.

The type and frequency of discriminatory actions performed by employers have not been recorded previously and the aim of the research being reported here was to do that. This was done firstly by identifying during which of the human resource processes (appointment, promotion, remuneration) gender-based discrimination most often takes place, and then by specifying at which stage of the mentioned processes this most frequently occurs. The findings are based on an analysis of interviews with 75 managers within the human resource as well as operational domains.

2 Literature review

The aim of the literature was to compile lists of steps (actions) in human resource processes, where gender-based discrimination may occur. The literature review was also aimed at indicating how gender-based discrimination may manifest at these steps. Three processes, namely appointments, promotions and remuneration, are relevant and will be discussed with reference to the steps that make up these processes.

2.1 Steps in human resource processes

Regarding the appointment process, different authors propose very similar steps in completing this task. For example, Mondy (2012) suggests seven steps, namely preliminary screening, reviewing of applications and resumes, applying selection tests, conducting employment interviews, pre-employment screening, making a selection decision, and medical examination. Ivancevich (2010) mentions six steps: preliminary screening, interviewing, employment tests, reference checks and recommendations, selection decision, and physical examination. In their description of the selection process, Bohlander and Snell (2013) distinguish between selection

brought about by the human resource department and that done by line managers. Their process consists of eight steps: completion of an application, initial interview, employment testing, background investigation, preliminary selection in the human resource department, supervisor/team interview, medical examination and drug test, as well as the hiring decision. The importance of having job-specific information (job analysis) available before starting the process is emphasised by Nel, Van Dyk, Haasbroek, Schultz, Sono and Werner (2008). Swanepoel, Erasmus and Schenk (2008) add to this discussion by suggesting the necessity to determine the exact need before starting the process. Also important is the matter of organisational policies and knowledge about this aspect (Stone & Stone-Romero 2006). The steps proposed by other authors, such as Cascio (2010), Dessler (2011), as well as Noe, Hollenbeck, Gergart and Wright (2008), are very similar to those already mentioned and contribute little more to an understanding of the appointment process.

Given the aforementioned, the following steps in the process could be deemed to be generically representative of the appointment process:

- job analysis/post description
- advertising of post
- screening of applicants (e.g. psychometric tests and medical examinations)
- interviews with applicants
- decisions further to interviews
- salary offer
- induction of employee (orientation)
- placement of employee.

The promotion process as described by Swanepoel et al (2008) and Cascio (2010) is similar to the appointment process. Building on the literature with regard to appointments as well as personal intuition and experience, a list of possible steps in the promotion process was compiled. The promotion process could be seen as a nine-step process:

- job analysis/post description
- access to appropriate development and training
- performance appraisal of employee
- advertising of post
- screening of applicants
- interviews with applicants

- decisions further to interviews
- salary offer
- induction of employee.

During the appointment and promotion processes, remuneration is often a matter of discussion. Swanepoel et al (2008) and Cascio (2010) are in agreement that four tasks need to be completed in determining remuneration, namely job analysis, job evaluation, pay surveys, and pay structuring. These tasks seem to be central to the remuneration process, although some authors' lists are more comprehensive., According to Nel et al (2004), the remuneration process consists of the following six steps: conducting job analysis, identifying compensable factors, developing a job hierarchy, constructing job grades, carrying out a compensation survey, and lastly, establishing final pay policy. Lim, Mathis and Jackson (2010) describe similar first steps, but add the matter of performance-based pay as well as an operational need as additional factors to be considered. Lim et al (2010) list the following tasks: job analysis (job descriptions and job specifications), pay surveys and job evaluation, pay structure (pay policies), individual pay (performance appraisal), implementation, communication, and monitoring. Given the aforementioned, the following list of generic steps in the remuneration process can be abstracted:

- job analysis – identify and describe characteristics of the job
- job evaluation – determine the value of the job compared to other positions
- pay structuring – allocate monetary value to jobs based on job evaluation and market rates
- performance appraisals – effective assessment of individual performance
- decision-making practices – pay-related decisions.

These lists could be used to point out where discrimination in human resource processes may occur. Such an approach to focusing on generic activities is compatible with the universalistic human resource perspective, based on the pioneering work of Pfeffer (1994; 1995; 1998). Pfeffer found that organisational performance depends on common human resource practices, and that this is true regardless of the industry or strategy pursued. Included in his list of practices are (fair) selective hiring and compensation based on work-related performance. Once a company is able to engage fully in these best practices, performance will follow, according to Pfeffer. The aim of the current research was to identify practices that

lead to gender discrimination, thus undermining fair selective hiring and compensation based on work-related performance.

2.2 Manifestations of gender-based discrimination

The literature consulted indicated that discrimination often occurs during specific steps in the human resource processes.

2.2.1 Job analysis/post description

The first occurrence of discrimination may be during the job analysis or the compilation of the post description. The results of the job analysis should reflect what is required in the job and should serve as a basis for specifying the profile of the ideal incumbent. Bias may be introduced here because conceptions of the ideal incumbent are typically affected by the beliefs of the dominant group in the organisation. If biases were introduced at this early phase, this would affect the subsequent steps in the process (Stone & Stone-Romero 2006). Of particular concern is occupational “sex types”. Adhering to this could result in post descriptions based on the perceived masculinity and femininity associated with the post (Hareli, Klang & Hess 2008). Furthermore, related to this is the use of wording that can exclude men or women from certain positions. An example of this is a reference to prospective employees as “sales ladies” rather than “sales people”. This may intentionally or unintentionally flaw processes that follow such descriptions (Basim, Sesen & Sesen 2007). Basim et al (2007) also appeal for clear and unbiased criteria and guidelines related to job descriptions in order to minimise the possibility of discrimination.

2.2.2 Recruitment strategies

Bias or discrimination can be an issue if recruiting strategies or materials lead potential applicants to believe that they may not fit into the organisation (Stone & Stone-Romero 2006) or the job. In this regard, Swanepoel et al (2008) argue that the inherent requirements of the job must be clearly spelt out and that the prerequisites or qualifications attached to the job should be justifiable.

Discrimination may also happen when recruitment strategies leave potential applicants unaware of jobs becoming available, precluding them from applying (Bezuidenhout, Garbers & Potgieter 2007; Dessler 2011; Stone & Stone-Romero 2006; Swanepoel et al 2008). This may happen when advertisements are placed where people from a particular group are excluded or disproportionately represented (Dessler 2011; Swanepoel et al 2008). It may also happen, as in the case with job descriptions, through the use of potentially discriminatory language, for example using the word “she” when advertising secretarial positions or “he” when advertising the post of a production manager (Basim et al 2007; Swanepoel et al 2008).

2.2.3 Screening

Assessors use subjective and objective techniques as screening devices to eliminate applicants who do not possess one or more relevant specifications for the job (Grobler, Wärnick, Carrell, Elbert & Hatfield, 2011). It is, however, not only job-related information that influences assessors during screening. Other information on employment forms, such as marital status, race, age, experience, and reasons for leaving previous organisations can be used to discriminate against a candidate (Basim et al 2007). Referring to the latter, information on the application form may disadvantage female employees, as females often have long periods of unemployment due to family responsibilities, and employers tend to discriminate against those who were unemployed for prolonged periods (Mathis & Jackson 2003).

To promote an objective and non-discriminatory process, shortlisting should ideally be carried out by the interview panel, or at least by one member of the panel and another appropriate person (Armstrong 2009). This ensures that a number of people assess a candidate and individual opinions or prejudices do not dominate (Cascio & Agiunis 2011). This is important within the context of gender discrimination, as Welle and Heilman (2005) report that even when the actual qualifications of men and women are equivalent, men are viewed as having higher performance ability, are expected to perform better, and are therefore favoured over women in the selection process for male gender-typed jobs. Important to note here is that traits women “supposedly possess tend to be viewed as less appropriate for high-status positions than the traits supposedly possessed by men” (Baron, Branscombe & Byrne 2009:192). Stone and Stone-Romero (2006) further warn that

with limited material available to make initial judgements about the applicant's suitability, decision-makers are likely to base their suitability judgements on stereotypes, and this may lead to negative outcomes for applicants who are the targets of bias.

2.2.4 Psychometric assessments

Karsten (2006) states that using tests may improve the reliability and validity of the outcome of the selection decision. Employment tests must be validated for the specific jobs they are being used for, and users of tests should avoid using very general tests for many different jobs without taking specific validity into consideration (Grobler et al 2011). Apart from validity, the reliability of the tests, or the consistence of the measure, is important (Cascio 2010; Grobler et al 2011; Nel et al 2008). However, tests may be valid and reliable, but still biased against a particular group. Bias refers to a situation where the score on a test, or an item in a test, is a function of group membership, rather than the individual's attitude or ability (Meiring, Van de Vijver, Rothman & Barrick 2005). Karsten (2006) affirms this and states that an examination of the selection procedures may reveal that some groups are disproportionately advantaged or disadvantaged because of the tools used.

The use of psychometric tests for screening is often regulated legislatively (see Bohlander & Snell 2013; Cascio 2010; Gómez-Mejía, Balkin & Cardy 2007; Grobler et al 2011; Nel et al 2008). Within the South African context, the Employment Equity Act, Act no. 55 of 1998 (RSA 1998: 8) is applicable. The act states:

> psychological testing and other similar assessments of an employee are prohibited unless the test or assessment being used: 1. Has been scientifically shown to be valid and reliable; 2. Can be applied fairly to all employees; 3. Is not biased against any employee or group.

Nel et al (2008) emphasise that tests should only be used under these legal circumstances. If used correctly, psychometric measures may be an effective measure to minimise unfair discrimination and subjectivity during screening.

2.2.5 Interviews

Interviews aim to establish whether the applicant has the ability to perform the job, how motivated the individual is to be successful, and whether he or she will match the organisation's needs (Grobler et al 2011). Interviewing needs to be carried out in such a way that all candidates are treated equally and fairly (Stredwick 2005). As with the other steps, interviews have a shortfall in reliability and validity (Grobler et al 2011). Adequate preparation and using a carefully worked-through structured interview system offer the best protection against claims of discrimination (Cascio & Agiunis 2011; Stredwick 2005).

Intrusive questions, even when well structured, can have connotations of unfair discrimination (Stredwick 2005; Swanepoel et al 2008). Metcalf and Rolfe (2009) state that women are often asked questions about family situations or commitments in interviews, which raises unfair discrimination issues. Also, some types of interviews, such as stress tolerance interviews, may be seen as intrusive, and may alienate certain candidates (Fisher, Schoenfeldt & Shaw 2006). This may be particular so for females, who do not necessarily enjoy situations of equal status (Konrad, Ritchie, Lieb & Corrigall 2000), but who tend to rate communal factors as more important in the workplace than men do (Frame, Roberto, Schwab & Harris 2010).

Returning to the matter of structure, unstructured interviews are seen as a potential risk and can be perceived as an unfair selection tool (Cascio & Agiunis 2011; Swanepoel et al 2008). Unstructured interviews can discriminate against candidates as questions are not used consistently and therefore present low reliability and validity (Fisher et al 2006). According to Bradley and Healy (2008), the content of the interview is the critical aspect that determines its validity. They warn against questions that may create the impression that individuals of certain groups will be discriminated against, or that the interview may reflect a preference for members of another group.

Even benevolent sexism has a negative effect on interview outcomes for women (Good & Rudman 2009). Interesting to note is that male decision-makers often prefer female partners to men, as they believe that women are more trustworthy than men (Slonim 2004). Grobler et al (2011) highlight this dilemma and state that the total evaluation process is at risk where interviewers hire whoever they

are comfortable with. According to Swanepoel et al (2008), the interview is not necessarily the best predictor as females are often rated lower than men in interviews for jobs that depict traditional male sex roles. They suggest that gender prejudices and stereotyping cannot be corrected due to the innateness of their nature, which tends to blur all information. This is in contrast to Yukl (2010), who believes that the use of trained assessors for selection and promotion decisions limits the biases caused by racial and gender stereotypes.

2.2.6 Decision-making

The decisions that follow interviews may also result in gender-based discrimination. Many jobs are perceived as gendered, that is, men and women are perceived as likely to perform differently in a given job. Consequently, hiring decisions are partially based on whether the job in question is considered more suitable for men or for women, thereby leading to gender-based discrimination in hiring decisions (Burke & Vinnicombe 2005). In order to make the hiring process more effective, Ocon (2006) purports that employers should follow a stepwise process embedded in policy for accepting and reviewing applications. The entire hiring process should focus on recording and preserving evidence of non-discrimination. Decisions that follow after due process are less discriminatory than where due process was not followed (Slonim 2004). The use of a combination of selection tools can improve the chances of making the right selection (Karsten 2006). Cascio and Agiunis (2011) urge decision-makers to follow a mechanical or statistical route when they combine data from different sources, as judgment often fails in producing valid and reliable outcomes.

2.2.7 Remuneration

Employees expect to be treated fairly and equitably. This implies that equilibrium should be found in the contribution an individual makes to a job and the results the individual receives from it (Fisher et al 2006). It is, however, not a requirement to apply the equal pay concept for a job if disparities are brought about by seniority or performance (Fisher et al 2006). The matter is not that simple, though, and some less conscious processes play a role here. Gender, for example, is a chronically salient category in all societies, and attributes associated with males and females will

shape the way the individual's skills and attributes are perceived. Men are thought to poses agentic traits, such as being decisive and task-oriented (see Barry, Child & Bacon 1959; Pratto 1996; Schwartz & Rubel 2005), while women are thought to poses communal attributes, such as nurturance and being more relationship-oriented (see Rossi & Rossi 1990; Tamres, Janicki & Helgenson 2002; Taylor 2002). When the gender stereotypes of the individual fit with the gender type of the job, the perception might be that the individual possesses the attributes to perform well in that job. This process works against women and in favour of men in employment settings that potentially have the most rewards to offer (Mathis & Jackson 2003), as most high-paying jobs traditionally favour masculine traits. This situation is aggravated by what Naidu (1997) refers to as "structural" or "institutional" discrimination. This stems from the organisational norms, rules and procedures used to determine the allocation of positions and benefits. These elements have generally been designed, whether deliberately or unreflectively, around the behaviour patterns and attributes of the historically dominant group. This group traditionally referred to males, and as such may lead to discrimination against females.

Nel et al (2008) argue that where differentiation in remuneration exists, this should be permissible only in as far as it pertains to the level, status and content of the job, or the level of performance of the incumbent (as evaluated by generally acceptable means), and not by gender. This, however, does not seem to be the norm, as Metcalf and Rolfe (2009) argue that gender and pay discrimination are prevalent throughout all pay structures, including basic pay, performance assessment and total earnings, and they state that employment policies and practices are contributory factors to these pay discrepancies. Nel et al (2008) argue for the use of formal processes with clear guidelines that advocate the principle of equal pay for work of an equal nature. Nel et al (2008) also contend that the methods of evaluating jobs and job grading should accord with accepted standards and that these systems should be published and available for inspection by all employees. The same authors also recommend that employers should consider including a code on equal remuneration in their conditions of employment as an assurance of fair remuneration practice.

To conclude, Gandhi (2010) reports that research across the decades has shown that women are at a disadvantage compared to men in all aspects of employment, from hiring and promotion to pay aspects. Metcalf and Rolfe (2009)

affirm this and state that recruitment and selection processes contribute to sorting women through discriminatory practices into categories, which impede promotion, training and career advancement.

3 Method

In this section the way the research was conducted is discussed.

3.1 Respondents

The respondents in this study were managers who had a direct influence on the appointment, promotion and remuneration of employees. Only managers from relatively large organisations were involved. In order to qualify for inclusion in the study, the organisations had to have a diverse workforce of at least 30 male and 30 female employees, and they needed to be willing to participate in the study. The organisations that were approached were those to which students, enrolled for the Masters of Business Leadership programme at the Unisa Graduate School of Business Leadership, had access, primarily via their own employment in the said organisations. It was therefore a convenient sample (Rosnow & Rosenthal 2008). The students conducted interviews with the most senior human resource managers as well as four other managers who were directly involved in the appointment and promotion of employees in the organisation. In total, managers from 15 organisations were interviewed. Data was therefore collected from 75 managers. The managers were from the mining environment (25 managers), services industry (20 from financial services and 5 from tourism), government (10 national, 5 provincial, and 5 local government), as well as from the small manufacturing segment (10 managers).

3.2 Approach and procedure

Structured interviews were used to collect the data at a specific point in time. The study used a cross-sectional design, which was suitable for describing the population (Shaughnessy, Zechmeister & Zechmeister 2009). The content of the responses to the interview questions were analysed, which make the approach qualitative. However, the frequency of the responses was also counted, introducing quantitative data analysis (Terre Blanche, Durrheim & Painter 2009). Managers were asked

questions on discriminatory practices during appointments, promotions and remuneration, as well as on policies in this regard.

Managers were then asked the following four questions regarding appointments:

- “Do you believe that there is discrimination, in favour of or against women, in terms of the appointment of women at this organisation?” If they indicated that discrimination in favour or against women existed, they were asked to explain in which way it happened. This was captured verbatim.
- Managers were then requested to look at a chart depicting a generic appointment process (capturing the steps of the appointment process as described in the literature review), and asked the following question: “Does discrimination against women occur at any of these steps?” This question was posed only to those managers who responded affirmatively to the first question. Managers needed to indicate at which step discrimination occurred.
- Managers were then asked: “Are there, in this organisation, any formal policies that suggest that women should be given preferential treatment with regard to appointments in the organisation?”
- Lastly a question on informal policies was directed at the managers: “Are there, in this organisation, any unwritten instructions that suggest that women should be given preferential treatment with regard to appointments in this organisation?”

This concluded the questioning with regard to appointments.

Exactly the same line of questioning, using the same format as described above, was followed with regard to promotions and with reference to remuneration aspects.

Those managers who worked in large organisations were reminded to focus their comments on the section of the organisation of which they had direct knowledge, and not to focus on the organisation as a whole, of which they might only have had limited knowledge.

All the responses of the managers were recorded verbatim.

3.3 Data analysis

Content analysis (Terre Blanche et al 2009) was used to analyse the responses of the managers. The procedure used was to firstly read the full corpus of the narrative and then to categorise the narrative according to the coding guide. The coding was thus done deductively, starting with predefined themes (as described in the literature review above) and matching the collected data with the themes (Terre Blanche et al 2009). To test the effectiveness of the coding scheme it was first tried out on a copy of the collected material. This was followed by defining the categories in greater detail (see Shaughnessy et al 2009) to ensure that the categories were mutually exclusive and exhaustive. To ensure that the findings were reliable, an independent observer was trained to use the coding system. During the training, feedback discrepancies were provided (Shaughnessy et al 2009). This sharing of ideas between the observer and the trainer contributed to the trustworthiness of the findings (Glesne 2011). Inter-observer reliability was calculated as the ratio of the number of times the observers agreed about an allocation over the number of opportunities the observers could have agreed (Shaughnessy et al 2009). “Although there is no hard-and-fast percentage of agreement that defines low inter-observer reliability, researchers generally report estimates of reliability that exceed 85%” (Shaughnessy et al 2009:122). This was set as the absolute lowest level of acceptance in this research.

In reporting the findings, the frequency and the relative frequency were reported. The relative frequency is the ratio of the observations per category over the total number of observations (Shaughnessy et al 2009). The reported findings include some direct quotes from the interviews. Such quantification and verbatim reports contribute to the trustworthiness of the findings (Frost 2011).

3.4 Ethical considerations

Several ethical considerations were applicable to this study. The first issue was the possible exploitation of students as fieldworkers. Students, however, benefitted from collecting the data as they used the data in writing their own research reports. A possible second ethical concern was that students accessed respondents in the organisations where they worked, thus having undue influence over the respondents. This matter was partially addressed by the requirement that the chief executive

officer or director general of the organisation concerned had to give permission to conduct the study (suggesting that the student did not have ultimate authority in the setting). Consent was also obtained from the respondents. In fact, most of the respondents were on a higher organisational level than the students, which provided them with an easy opportunity to withdraw from the study. The informed consent form also outlined that participation in the survey was voluntary and all respondents provided written consent before entering into the study.

4 Findings

In total, 75 interviews from managers in 15 organisations were captured. The findings are presented separately in terms of appointments, promotions and remuneration.

4.1 Appointments

The findings indicated that 24 (32%) of the 75 managers interviewed answered affirmatively to the question: “Do you believe that there is discrimination, in favour or against women, in terms of the appointment of women in this organisation?” In total, 28 statements, explaining discrimination at appointment level, were made. The contents of these explanations were analysed by the author as well as by the trained independent observer and the findings thereof are captured in Table 1, in the column marked “volunteered responses”. It was possible to categorise only 20 of the statements according to the pre-set grid. The balance of the statements (8) focused on an element not listed and related to human resource planning and strategy. Examples of these statements were:

– “The general environment in this company favours women” and, even more descriptive,
– “We have a focus … in mining which gives women an edge … in line with the mining regulations and mining charter and it is suggested that women should be given preferential treatment [sic]”.

This theme is important as almost 29% of all volunteered responses related to it. It was possible to categorise the rest of the items according to the pre-set grid, and the inter-observer reliability for the statements that were categorised was .80.

Table 1

Areas of discrimination against women in the appointment process

	Volunteered responses		Endorsed themes	
Themes	**Count[#]**	**Relative frequency**	**Count**	**Relative frequency**
Job analysis/post description	.5;1;1;1;1;.5;1;1;1;.5	.42	9	.12
Advertising of post			6	.08
Screening of applicants	.5;1;1	.12	14	.18
Interviews with applicants	1	.05	11	.14
Decisions further to interviews	.5;.5;1;1	.15	21	.28
Salary offers			3	.04
Induction of employees			1	.01
Placement of employees	.5;1;1;1;1;.5	.25	10	.13
Total	20	1	74	1

[#] A score of .5 indicates that one observer selected the theme while the other person favoured a different theme. A score of 1 indicates that the observers were in agreement with the allocation of the themes.

The most frequently volunteered theme was discrimination during the job description (42% of all volunteered responses) and how managers described it as:

- "Most work is manual. Women are considered not physically fit for the job or work" and
- "The administrative side of the business is where females are preferred. The production side is where males are more suitable because of the manual labour involved."

This result may be a function of the sample, but this matter will be addressed in the discussion part of the article. The second most frequently volunteered theme was placement of employees, with 25% of the statements relating to this aspect, for example:

- "During the placement step, careful consideration is given to pregnant women; for safety and health reasons they cannot be placed underground" and
- "There is discrimination against women in the allocation of jobs."

Both themes represent gender-based job segregation, and gender-based discrimination against females.

Following the open-ended question, managers were given a chart depicting a generic appointment process, and asked, “Does discrimination against women occur at any of these steps?” This is also reported in Table 1, in the column marked “endorsed themes”. From Table 1 it can be observed that the decisions that follow interviews were the most frequently pointed out as the place where discrimination occurs in the appointment process, with 28% of the total endorsements. The second most important area was the screening of applicants, with 18%. It can be noted that when managers were confronted with specific human resource themes, different themes emerged. A reason for this may be the fact that a large percentage of the respondents were operational managers, who are not au fait with human resource processes and the jargon of the discipline.

As stated in the methodology section, managers were also asked, “Are there, in this organisation, any formal policies that suggest that women should be given preferential treatment with regard to appointments in this organisation?” In total 17 respondents (23% of all managers) indicated that this does indeed occur. On the last question pertaining to appointments, managers were asked, “Are there, in this organisation, any unwritten instructions that suggest that women should be given preferential treatment with regard to appointments in this organisation?” Twenty-one managers (28% of all managers) indicated that preferential treatment occurs.

4.2 Promotions

The findings indicate that 29 (38%) of the 75 managers interviewed answered affirmatively to the question about gender-based discrimination during promotions. From the 29 statements explaining the nature of the discrimination, 18 corresponded with the preset themes. The balance of the statements (11) focused on broad organisational and national cultural aspects. Examples of these statements were:

- “There is talk to bring ladies into senior positions” and
- “This is done in order to address the past discriminatory practices whereby women were not appointed in senior positions and underground.”

The rest of the statements were categorised according to the set categories and the inter-observer reliability was .88. The findings are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Areas of discrimination against women in the promotion process

	Volunteered responses		Endorsed themes	
	Count[#]	**Relative frequency**	**Count**	**Relative frequency**
Job analysis/post description	.5;1;1.5	.23	4	.08
Access development and training	1;1	.11	9	.19
Performance appraisals	1	.05	4	.08
Advertising of post	1	.05	7	.14
Screening of applicants	1;1;1;.5;1	.26	16	.34
Interviews with applicants	1;.5	.08	6	.12
Decisions following interview	1;1;1;1;1	.29	11	.23
Salary offers			5	.10
Induction of employees			1	.02
Total	17	1	47	1

[#] A score of .5 indicates that one observer selected the theme while the other person favoured a different theme. A score of 1 indicates that the observers were in agreement with the allocation of the themes.

The most frequently volunteered theme was discrimination during the decisions that follow interviews (29% of all responses). The following are examples of how managers described it:

– “At times, even when a man outperformed a woman, the panel … can recommend for the appointment of an appointable women” and
– “If two candidates have equal capabilities, the female candidate will be given preferential consideration.”

The second most frequently volunteered theme was the screening of the applicants (26% of all responses). Examples are:

– “The set criteria during shortlisting favour women, as they score more marks than men” and
– “Women will be scored 10 points above men, just for being women. This is the implementation of the equity plan of …”

Following this, managers were given a chart depicting a generic promotion process and asked to point out where discrimination against women was most likely to occur. The screening of the applicants was most frequently (34% of all responses) pointed out as the place where discrimination occurs during the promotion process. The second most important area was decisions that follow the interview (23% of all responses). These two themes were also the top two themes volunteered.

With regard to formal policies which propose that women should be given preferential treatment with regard to promotions, 13 managers (17% of all managers) indicated that this was the case. With regard to informal or unwritten instructions, 9 managers (12% of all managers) professed that this was the case in their respective organisations.

4.3 Remuneration

In total, 12 (16%) of the 75 managers interviewed answered affirmatively to a question related to gender-based discrimination with regard to remuneration. It was possible to categorise 12 of the 13 statements explaining discrimination at remuneration level. The statement not analysed was: “Promotion is usually considered at the lower level”, and this did not seem relevant. It was possible to categorise the rest of the items, and the inter-observer reliability for the statements that were categorised was 1.0.

Table 3

Managers endorsing discrimination against women during remuneration

	Volunteered responses		**Endorsed themes**	
	Count	**Relative frequency**	**Count**	**Relative frequency**
Job analysis			2	.12
Job evaluation				
Pay structuring	1;1;1;1;1;1;1	.58	3	.18
Performance appraisals	1;1;1	.25	5	.29
Decision-making practices	1;1	.16	7	.41
Total	12	1	17	1

The most frequently volunteered theme, identified in more than 50% of the responses, was discrimination during the pay-structuring process, and managers described it as:

– “Males do earn more than females at the same level of management within the organisation” and
– “On basic salaries, women earn less.”

The second most frequently volunteered theme was discrimination during performance appraisals, with examples such as:

– “There are too many women in decision-making positions who favour their kith and kin [sic]” and
– “The trend in (the) performance management process indicates men are usually rated higher than women, which allows them to receive higher salary increases than women.”

Following the open-ended question, managers were given a chart depicting a generic remuneration process, and asked, “Does discrimination against women occur at any of these steps?” This is reported in Table 3, in the column marked “endorsed themes”. From Table 3, it can be observed that decision-making practices were most frequently pointed out as the place where discrimination occurs in the remuneration process. The second most important area was performance appraisals. From the type of responses received, it seems as though discrimination against females occurs during the remuneration process.

Not one respondent indicated that formal policies in their places of work argued that women should be given preferential treatment with regard to remuneration and only two managers (3% of all managers) indicated that it occurs informally or outside of formal instructions.

5 Discussion and conclusions

In this research, information was gathered from managers who reported on relatively large groups of employees (at least 30 males and 30 female staff members). The absolute size of these groups commented on made it very unlikely to include top managers or middle managers. Those reported on were most likely to be supervisors and general employees at operational level. This reasoning was supported by

statements made during the interviews that implied that the work was at a low organisational level and might require physical strength or basic administrative skills. Focusing on lower-level employees contributes to the body of knowledge as many previous reports on gender discrimination focused primarily on senior employees (e.g. April et al 2007; Booysen 2007; Johnson & Mathur-Helm 2011; Msweli-Mbanga, Fitzgerald & Mkhize 2005; Zulu 2003).

It is also important to note that data was collected from 75 managers. Although this was a convenient sample of managers from mining (33%), the services industry (27%), government (25%), and small manufacturing (13%), it represented a comparatively large number of respondents and a broad selection of managers, unlike several other studies that focused on specific industries (e.g. Boshoff 2005; Kahn 2008; Kane-Berman & Hickman 2003; Lloyd & Mey, 2007; Montesh 2010). Apart from the South African study by Thomas (2003), which was conducted across several organisations, this article makes a significant contribution to the knowledge about gender-based discrimination in South Africa as it constitutes the first broad-based study of its nature.

Also important about this study is that managers reported on the discriminatory practices in which they were involved, and not on discrimination experienced by them or committed unto them. Having managers as respondents, reporting on employees, might have provided a clearer picture of the real situation, as they (the managers) could have been less affected by in-group bias than respondents who are directly affected by discrimination due to their group membership (Tajfel 1981).

The quality of the analysis of the responses, as reflected in the inter-observer reliability coefficient, was acceptable on average. The individual values were .80 (N = 20), .88 (N = 18) and 1 (N = 12). The average was .88 (N = 50), which is higher than the minimum value suggested by Shaughnessy et al (2009).

From the findings it is clear that gender-based discrimination occurs mostly at promotional level (38% of managers reported this), less at appointment level (32% of managers reported this), and least at the stage of determination of remuneration (16% managers reported this). With regard to promotions, it seemed that discrimination in favour of women occurs most frequently. It is during the screening phase and when decisions are made after interviews where this preferential treatment occurs. This was evident from the volunteered, as well as from the

endorsed themes. In addition to what was expected from the literature, discrimination seems to be driven by a culture that proposes that women should be promoted, as well as by legislation and charters in this regard.

When considering gender-based discrimination at appointment level, it seems as though discrimination often occurs in favour of men. When volunteered responses of the managers were analysed, it became evident that this occurred at the job analysis/job description stage and during the placement of employees. This should be seen within the context that many of the managers reported on jobs that required physical labour (mining/manufacturing), and that some job segregation traditionally occurs along gender lines (Munroe & Munroe 1975) in such positions. When managers were confronted with a list of human resource practices that might affect gender discrimination during appointments, the decision-making practices that followed interviews were listed most frequently.

With regard to the determination of remuneration, men seem to be at an advantage. The unstructured responses of the managers were coded as reflective of discrimination in (individual) pay structuring. This could be seen within the context of performance management, where men seem to outscore women. Men may be at an advantage when it comes to performance assessments, as they are generally less involved with family matters (Cascio 2010) and may spend more time at work (Scott & McClellan 1990). Weak evidence advocating that differences in the income of females and males vary in accordance with the gender composition of senior partners (in medical practices) is provided by Gravelle et al. (2011). Hultin and Szulkin (1999) argue along the same lines and submit that earnings are affected by the gender composition of establishments' managerial and supervisory staff. Theoretical arguments focus on managers' propensity to create and maintain or to undermine institutionalised gender bias and on employees' capacity to mobilise resources and establish claims in the wage distribution process, mainly through social networks. Results show that gender-differentiated access to organisational power structures is essential when explaining women's relatively low wages. Women who work in establishments in which relatively many of the managers are men receive lower wages than women with similar qualifications and job demands do in establishments where more women are represented in the power structure (Hultin & Szulkin 1999).

Regarding the structured responses, the managers placed emphasis on decision-making practices that result in remuneration differences. Should the work environment be dominated by men, this would put them at an advantage when decisions are made (Naidu 1997; Stone & Stone-Romero 2006). However, women also hold powerful positions in the workplace, and based on that, they also discriminate against others, including women (Johnson & Marthur-Helm 2011).

The above resonates well with critical theory and Marxist thoughts, and the fact that mangers use their power in decision-making situations to maintain the status quo, which, as reported in this research, allows for distrust in managerial ability to effect a fair society. Cascio and Aguinis (2011) state very clearly that decisions should be made mechanically, using mathematical models, rather than being based on judgement, as managers do not have the cognitive ability to integrate the large amount of information that should be considered when making decisions.

The reports of managers regarding formal and informal policies that advocate gender-based discrimination showed that policies are more often in place at appointment, less often at promotion and even less often at remuneration level. Few managers report formalised discrimination at appointment level (23%) and even fewer report it at promotion level (17%). This is strange as the Employment Equity Act (RSA 1998) prescribes affirmative action during appointments and promotions. This may suggest that legislation is not always formalised in company policies. Refreshing to note was that not a single manager indicated that formal policies guide discrimination at remuneration level. Informal or unwritten policies regarding gender-based discrimination followed the same pattern as was the case with formal policies, being the highest at appointment level and the lowest at remuneration level.

To conclude, most gender-based discrimination occurs during promotions, and this is generally pro-female discrimination. Discrimination, which is pro-male, occurs at appointment level, and this is often due to the inherent requirements of the job and as such may be considered to be fair discrimination. Lastly, some gender-based discrimination occurs at remuneration level, where men seem to be at an advantage, receiving higher salaries than women at the same organisational level. This discrimination occurs during structured (e.g. job descriptions – at appointments) as well as during less structured (e.g. decision-making after interviews – at promotions) stages in the human resource processes. Thus, gender-based

discrimination is not, based on the reports of managers, a one-sided affair and both parties are at the receiving end, depending on the process involved.

The findings of this research should make practitioners aware of where gender-based discrimination occurs, as well as of the fact that it is not only directed at a particular group. Practitioners should also take note that discrimination occurs in the structured as well as in the less structured processes. As such practitioners need to design and implement human resource management tools that would allow the structured processes to be gender-blind as well as to ensure that the users of the processes, referring to the less structured processes, are well equipped to use the tools. Furthermore, managers do not always seem to be aware of the formal policies that should guide decision-making, and training in this regard may be necessary.

The study had some limitations. Some testing effects may have been possible (Kerlinger & Lee 2000), as can be seen from general question 1 to general question 2. It could be argued that once managers became aware of some of the human resource terminologies, they started using it. Controlling for this effect could be done by alternating the sequence of the questions posed, and this may be a recommendation for future research of this nature. Another limitation could be that the gender of the managers was not asked for or recorded. This is a limitation as in-group bias plays an important role when evaluations about other groups are made (Tajfel 1981). This element was, however, not introduced in the study as small groups of managers were interviewed per organisation, and it was seen as a way to protect their anonymity. This could be addressed in future studies if more managers per organisation participate. A further limitation was the possible need of the respondents to answer questions in a politically correct manner and to hide the true nature of the discrimination that does exist. It would be naïve to expect that, as is the case with modern racism, blatant sexism would not be presented publicly (Swim, Aikin, Hall & Hunter 1995). This may explain the bottoming effect witnessed in a number of reports on discrimination. This limitation of low report rates could be addressed by using questionnaires, designed and administered in such a way as to ensure anonymity. A further limitation was the use of convenient sampling. This does not allow for broad generalisations (Rosnow & Rosenthal 2008). The problem could be addressed through random sampling.

List of references

April, K, Dreyer, S & Blass, E. 2007. Gender impediments to the South African executive boardroom. *South African Journal of Labour Relations* 31(2):51-67.

Armstrong, M. 2009. *Handbook of human resources practices*. 11th edition. London: Kogan Page.

Baron, RA, Branscombe, NR & Byrne, D. 2009. *Social psychology*. 12th edition. Boston, MA: Pearson/Allyn and Bacon.

Barry, H, Child, I & Bacon, M. 1959. Relation of child training to subsistence economy. *American Anthropologist* 61:51-63.

Basim, HN, Sesen, H & Sesen, E. 2007. Are they equal? Comparison of Turkish and English job announcements in terms of some discrimination factors. *Humanity Social Sciences Journal* 2(1):34-42. Available at http://idosi.org/hssj/hssj2 (1)07/6.pdf (accessed on 3 March 2012).

Bezuidenhout, MC, Garbers, CJ & Potgieter, S. 2007. *Managing for healthy labour relations: A practical guide for health services in Southern Africa*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Bohlander, GW & Snell, SA. 2013. *Principals in human resources management*. 16th edition. New York, NY: South-Western Cengage Learning.

Booysen, L. 2007. Barriers to employment equity implementation in and retention of blacks in management in South Africa. *South African Journal of Labour Relations* 31(1):47-51.

Boshoff, N. 2005. The representation of women academics in higher education in South Africa: Progress in the pipeline? *South African Journal of Higher Education* 19(2):359-377.

Bradley, H & Healy, G. 2008. *Ethnicity and gender at work: Inequalities, careers and employment relations*. London: Palgrave.

Burke, RJ & Vinnicombe, S. 2005. Advancing women's careers. *Career Development International* 10:165-7.

Cascio, WF & Aguinis, H. 2011. *Applied psychology in human resource management.* 7th edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Cascio, WF. 2010. *Managing human resources: Productivity, quality of work life, profits*. 8th edition. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Channer, ZA, Abbassi, Z & Ujan IA. 2011. Gender discrimination in workforce and its impact on the employees. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences* 5(1):177-191.

Dessler, G. 2011. *Human resource management*. 12th edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Fisher, CD, Schoenfeldt, LF & Shaw, JB. 2006. *Human resource management.* 6th edition. Boston, MA: Houghton Miffin.

Floro, MS & Komatsu, H. 2011. Gender and work in South Africa: What can time-use data reveal? *Feminist Economics* 17(4):33-66.

Frame, MC, Roberto, KJ, Schwab, AE & Harris, CT. 2010. What is important on the job? Differences across gender, perspective and job level. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 40(1):36-56.

Frost, N. 2011. *Qualitative research methods in psychology: Combining core approaches*. Birkshire: Open University Press.

Gandhi, P. 2010. *Gender discrimination in the workplace.* Available at http://www.scribd.com/doc/22571816/Gender-Discrimination-in-Work-Place (accessed on 25 June 2013).

Glesne, C. 2011. *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction.* 4th edition. Boston, MA: Pearson.

Gómez-Mejía, LR, Balkin, DB & Cardy, RL. 2007. *Managing human resources*. 5th edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Good, JJ & Rudman, A. 2009. When female applicants meet sexist interviewers: The costs of being a target of benevolent sexism. *Sex Roles* 62:41-493.

Grobler, P, Wärnick, S, Carrell, MR, Elbert, NF & Hatfield, RD. 2011. *Human resource management in South Africa.* 4th edition. London: Thomson Learning.

Grogan, J. 2007. *Dismissal, discrimination and unfair labour practices*. 2nd edition. Cape Town: Juta.

Grun, C. 2004. Direct and indirect gender discrimination in the South African labourmarket. *International Journal of Manpower* 25(3):321- 342.

Hareli, S, Klang, M & Hess, U. 2008. The role of career history in gender based biases in job selection decisions. *Career Development International* 13(3):252-269.

Hinks, T. 2002. Gender wage differentials and discrimination in the New South Africa. *Applied Economics* 34(16):2043-2052.

Hultin, M & Szulkin, R. 1999. Wages and Unequal Access to Organizational Power: An Empirical Test of Gender Discrimination. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 44(3):453-472.

Ivancevich, J.M. 2010. *Human resource management.* 11th edition. New York, NY: McGraw- Hill.

Johnson, Z & Mathur-Helm, B. 2011. Experiences with queen bees: A South African study exploring the reluctance of women executives to promote other women

in the workplace. *South African Journal of Business Management* 42(4):47-55.

Kahn, SB. 2008. Employment of women in the South African National Defence Force: 1998-2008. *Journal of Public Administration* 44(1):197-208.

Kane-Berman, J & Hickman, R. 2003. Women doctors in medical professional organisations in South Africa: A report by the Women in Medicine Workgroup. *South African Medical Journal* 93(1):69-73.

Karsten, MF. 2006. *Race and ethnicity in the workplace: Issues and challenges for today's organisations*. Westport, CONN: Praeger Publishers.

Kerlinger, FN & Lee, HB. 2000. *Foundations of behavioural research*. 4th edition. Forth Worth, TX: Harcourt College Publishers.

Konrad, AM, Ritchie, JE, Lieb, P & Corrigall, E. 2000. Sex differences and similarities in job attribute preferences: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin* 126:593-641.

Lim, GS, Mathis, RL & Jackson, JH. 2010. *Human resources management.* Singapore: Cengage.

Lloyd, HR & Mey, MR. 2007. Gender differences in perceptions of workplace progression: An automotive industry case study. *Southern African Business Review* 11(3):95-120.

Mathis, RL & Jackson, JH. 2003. *Human resource management*. 10th edition. Mason, OH: South-Western.

Mathur-Helm, B. 2005. Equal opportunity and affirmative action for South African women: A benefit or barrier? *Gender in Management* 20(1/2):56-71.

Mathur-Helm, B. 2006. Woman and the glass ceiling in South African banks: An illusion or a reality. *Women in Management Review* 21(4):311-326.

Meiring, D, van de Vijver, AJR, Rothman, S & Barrick, MR. 2005. Construct, item, and method bias of cognitive and personality measures in South Africa. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology* 31(1):1-8.

Mello, D & Phago, K. 2007. Affirming women in managerial positions in the South African public service. *South African Journal for Political Science and Public Administration* 26(2):145-158.

Metcalf, H & Rolfe, H. 2009. *Employment and earnings in the finance sector: A gender analysis.* Manchester: National Institute of Economic and Social Research. Available at http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/uploaded_files/download_finance_gender_analyis_research.pdf (accessed on 25 June 2013).

Mondy, WR. 2012. *Human resource management*. 12th edition. Essex: Pearson.

Montesh, M. 2010. Transformation in the South African Police Service: The implementation of affirmative action and employment equity in SAPS. *South African Journal of Criminal Justice* 23(1):55-77.

Msweli-Mbanga, P, Fitzgerald, P & Mkhize, A. 2005. Representation of women directors in JSE securities exchange listed companies: Institutional theory perspective. *South African Journal of Labour Relations* 29(1):98-110.

Munroe, RL & Munroe, RH. 1975. *Cross-cultural human development*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Naidu, KM. 1997. *Indirect discrimination against women in the workplace*. Masters thesis. University of Natal.

Ncayiyana, DJ. 2011. Feminisation of the South African medical profession: Not yet nirvana for gender equity. *South African Medical Journal* 101(1):5.

Nel, PS, Van Dyk, PS, Haasbroek, GD, Schultz, HB, Sono, T & Werner, A. 2008. *Human resources management*. 6th edition. Cape Town: Oxford.

Niemann, R. 2002. Redress and empowerment for gender equity in South African education. *Acta Academica* 3(1):167-195.

Noe, RA, Hollenbeck, JR, Gergart, B & Wright, PM. 2008. *Human resource management: Gaining a competitive advantage*. 6th edition. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill Irwin.

Ocon, R. 2006. *Gender and diversity in management.* New York, NY: University Press of America.

Pfeffer, J. 1994. *Competitive advantage through people*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Pfeffer, J. 1995. Producing sustainable competitive advantage through effective management of people. *Academy of Management Executive* 9:55-69.

Pfeffer, J. 1998. The human equation: Building profits by putting people first. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Pratto, F. 1996. Sexual politics: The gender gap in the bedroom, the cupboard and the cabinet. In D.M. Buss & N.M. Malamuth (Eds.), *Sex, power, conflict: Evolutionary and feminist perspectives*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Pretorius, E, De Villiers Human, S, Niemann, R, Klinck, E & Alt, H. 2002. Fighting from within: Gender equity at the University of the Free State. *Acta Academica* 3(1):1-38.

Rosnow, RL & Rosenthal, R. 2008. *Beginning behavioural research: A conceptual primer*. 6th edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Prentice Hall.

Rossi, AS & Rossi, HP. 1990. *Of human bonding: Parent-child relations across the life course*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.

RSA (Republic of South Africa). 1995. *Labour Relations Act, Act No. 66 of 1995.* Available athttp://www.info.gov.za/acts/1995/a66-95.pdf (accessed on 7 March 2012).

RSA (Republic of South Africa). 1996. *Constitution of South Africa, Act No.108 of 1996.* Available athttp://www.info.gov.za/documents/constitution/1996/a108-96.pdf (accessed on 7 March 2012).

RSA (Republic of South Africa). 1998. *Employment Equity Act, Act No. 55 of 1998.* Available at https://www.labour.gov.za/downloads/legislation/acts/employment-equity/Act%20-%20Employment%20Equity.pdf (accessed on 7 March 2012).

RSA (Republic of South Africa). 2000. *Promotion of Equality and Prevention of Unfair Discrimination Act, Act No. 4 of 2000*. Available at http://www.justice.gov.za/legislation/acts/2000-004.pdf (accessed on 7 March 2012).

Schwartz, SH & Rubel, T. 2005. Sex differences in value priorities: Cross-cultural and multimethod studies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 89:1010-1028.

Scott, KD & McClellan, EL. 1990. Gender differences in absenteeism. *Public Personnel Management* 19(2):229-253.

Serumaga-Zake, PAE & Naudé, WA. 2003. Labour market discrimination in the North West province of South Africa. *Development Southern Africa* 18(5):671-682.

Shaughnessy, JJ, Zechmeister, EB & Zechmeister, JS. 2009. *Research methods in psychology*. 8th edition. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Slonim, R. 2004*. Gender selection discrimination: Evidence from a Trust Game*. Cleveland, OH: Case Western Reserve University. Available at https://aeaweb.org/assa/2005/0108_0800_1302.pdf (accessed on 24 June 2013).

Stone, D & Stone-Romero, E. 2006. Unbiased hiring systems. In J Greenhaus & G Callanan (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of career development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Stone, K & Coetzee, M. 2005. Levelling the playing field: Reducing barriers to mentoring for women protégés in the South African organisational context*. SA Journal of Human Resource Management* 3(3):33-39.

Stredwick, J. 2005. *An introduction to human resources management.* 2nd edition. Burlington, MA: Elsevier.

Swanepoel, BJ, Erasmus, BJ & Schenk, HJ. 2008. *South African human resource management theory and practice*. 4th edition. Juta: Cape Town.

Swim, JK, Aikin, KJ, Hall, WS & Hunter, BA. 1995. Sexism and racism: Old-fashioned and modern prejudices. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 68:199-214.

Tajfel, H. 1981. *Human groups and social categories: Studies in social psychology*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Tamres, LK, Janicki, D & Helgenson, VS. 2002. Sex differences in coping behavior: A meta-analytical review and an examination of relative coping. *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 6:2-30.

Taylor, SE. 2002. *The tending instinct: How nurturing is essential to who we are and how we live.* New York, NY: Times Books/Henry Holt.

Terre Blanche, M, Durrheim, K & Painter, D. 2009. *Research in practice*. 2nd edition. Cape Town: UCT Press.

Thomas, A. 2003. Employment equity practices at selected companies in South Africa. *South African Journal of Labour Relations* 27(3 & 4):6-40.

Walters, IS & Le Roux, NJ. 2008. Monitoring gender remuneration inequalities in academia using biplots. *ORION* 24(1):49-73.

Welle, B & Heilman, ME. 2005. *Formal and informal discrimination against women at work.* West Point, NY: Information Age Publishers.

Yukl, G. 2010. *Leadership in organisations.* 7th edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Zulu, C. 2003. Gender representation patterns in higher education management in South Africa: Perspectives on higher education. *South African Journal of Higher Education* 17(1):98-104.

CHAPTER 3
ARTICLE 2

In this chapter, the second of four articles is presented. This particular article is aimed at examining the second objective of the study, namely *to describe perceived gender-based discrimination in South Africa as experienced by employees.* The title of the article, as presented to the *Journal of Psychology in Africa*, was “General employee perceptions of gender-based discrimination in a selection of South African organisations”. The format of the article is in line with the guidelines for authors published by the journal.

General employee perceptions of gender-based discrimination in a selection of South African organisations

Abstract:

Introduction: *Gender-based discrimination is prohibited in many countries, including South Africa. Despite this prohibition, employees continue to report discrimination and this affects individuals negatively.* ***Objectives:*** *To gauge the levels of perceived gender-based discrimination and to comment on gender differences in this respect.* ***Method:*** *Information was gathered from 1 740 employees working for 29 organisations, using the Fair Treatment at Work Survey and the Gender-Based Discrimination Questionnaire.* ***Results:*** *Percentagewise more women reported incidents of discrimination at work, with gender being the primary reason for discrimination. Men also reported discrimination, but this occurred less often. Males and females reported similar workplace effects of discrimination. Some women reported pro-male discrimination and other women pro-female discrimination. The same pattern was found with men.* ***Conclusions:*** *Both males and females experience gender-based discrimination in the workplace, but females report on it more frequently. The effects of discrimination are very similar for both groups, but the phenomenon primarily affects their remuneration. The perceptions of discrimination are gender-specific, with each group perceiving similar levels of discrimination both in their favour and against them, supporting social identity theory and conceptions about group-serving bias. Both male and female employees experience the negative effects of perceived discrimination, so interventions should be directed at both groups to curb the negative effects associated with perceived discrimination.*

Keywords: Gender; Discrimination; Appointment; Promotion; Remuneration; South Africa.

Introduction

Discrimination can be defined as actions whereby some individuals are afforded benefits and others are denied access to them (Grogan, 2007). Discrimination could be either individual or group-based. Cascio (2010), for example, states that discrimination involves a group of individuals being given preferential treatment over others. This is typical of gender-based discrimination. Channar, Abbassi and Ujan (2011) concur, stating that gender-based discrimination constitutes giving the members of one gender either an unfair advantage or disadvantaging them in comparison with the members of the other group. Parziale (2007) emphasises that gender discrimination can be directed at an individual or a group, maintaining that

gender discrimination is the prejudicial treatment of an individual or group on the grounds of gender.

Gender-based discrimination is unlawful in South African. The highest law of the country, the Constitution, makes it clear that "the state may not unfairly discriminate directly or indirectly against anyone on one or more grounds, including race, *gender*, sex, pregnancy, marital status, ethnic or social origin, colour, sexual orientation, age, disability, religion, conscience, belief, culture, language and birth" (RSA,1996: 3). The Constitution states more specifically the aim of creating a society reflective of non-racialism and *non-sexism* (RSA, 1996). So important is this issue to the South African government that the Constitution also makes provision for a Commission for Gender Equality, which "has the power, as regulated by national legislation, necessary to perform its functions, including the power to monitor, investigate, research, educate, lobby, advise and report on issues concerning *gender equality*" (RSA, 1996: 63). This prohibition of gender-based discrimination as set out in the Constitution is mirrored in South African labour legislation. The Labour Relations Act, for example, states specifically that "unfair discrimination is prohibited, either directly or indirectly, against an employee on any arbitrary ground, including, but not limited to race, gender, sex, ethnic or social origin, colour, sexual orientation, age, disability, religion, conscience, belief, political opinion, culture, language, marital status or family responsibility" (RSA, 1995:141).

The government may have many reasons for promoting the rights of women, which could include both a preference for the moral high ground and party political gains. However, there are important business reasons why gender-based discrimination should be addressed at the organisational level. The first of these is employee health.

Perceptions of being discriminated against may have a negative impact on the general well-being of those who harbor perceptions of being victims of discrimination[3] (Foley, Ngo & Loi, 2006; Krieger, 1990; Pascoe & Richman, 2009; Pavalko, Mossakowski & Hamilton, 2003). This specifically affects female employees (Corning & Krengal, 2002), possibly because some working mothers are placed in a position where their employers see them as "bad mothers" for investing time and resources in their careers and at the same time as "bad workers" for devoting time

[3] The perception of discriminatory treatment may be as important as actual inequality (Banerjee, 2006).

and attention to their families (Iberiyenari, 2012; Jamieson, 1995). Chabaya, Rembe and Wadesango (2009) elaborate on this, maintaining that women's positions are made problematic by wide-spread perceptions that their role in the family overrides all other roles.

The effects of perceived discrimination on well-being include psychological outcomes such as higher stress levels (Channar et al., 2011; Huynh, Devos & Dunbar, 2012; Sanchez & Brock, 1996; Schmitt, Maes & Widaman, 2010), anxiety (Corning & Krengal, 2002; Huynh et al., 2012), and depression (Corning & Krengal, 2002; Huynh et al., 2012; Noh & Kaspar, 2003), as well as medical conditions, such as hypertension (Krieger, 1990) and the effects of substance abuse (Ro & Choi, 2010). Ro and Choi (2010: 211) state that "…gender discrimination was certainly linked with both lifetime and recent solid drug usage". Williams, Neighbors and Jackson (2003) report consistent findings that perceptions of discrimination tend to be associated with poorer health across a broad range of mental health outcomes, and this occurs across socially disadvantaged groups in different societies. Kim and Williams (2012) echo this and report mounting evidence that discriminatory experiences can harm health and are associated with poor self-rated health. Theories on relative deprivation, and particularly fraternal relative deprivation, could explain the effects of perceived discrimination on well-being (Schmitt et al., 2010). The effects of perceived discrimination are, however, not limited to general well-being but they also have a direct effect on the workplace.

Job-specific outcomes associated with perceived discrimination include increased absenteeism and lower productivity (Abbas, Athar & Herani, 2010; Abbas, Hameed & Waheed, 2011; Russell, Quinn, King-O'Riain & McGinnity, 2008). Discrimination also has a negative effect on job satisfaction (Channar et al., 2011; Ensher, Grant-Vallone & Donaldson, 2001; Goldman, Slaughter, Schmit, Wiley & Brooks, 2008; Ozër & Günlück, 2010; Sanchez & Brock, 1996), organisational commitment (Channar et al., 2011; Ensher et al., 2001; Goldman et al., 2008; Sanchez & Brock, 1996), organisational citizenship behaviour (Ensher et al., 2001), and turnover intentions (Abbas et al., 2010; Bose, 2011; Goldman et al., 2008; Ozër & Günlück, 2010). All of these may have serious consequences for the survival of the organisation. However, clear policies could dispel the effects of perceived discrimination. Abbas et al. (2010) emphasise the importance of providing gender discrimination policy guidelines, which they believe will enhance employee

performance and increase their work motivation and satisfaction. Harris, Lievens and Van Hoye (2004) maintain that, if an organisation is reputed to have “healthy” diversity policies, the perception of being discriminated against is less pronounced than it would be if such policies did not exist. Furthermore, according to Loden and Rosener (1991), companies that manage diversity reap a number of positive benefits, such as increased productivity, a higher rate of retention and a greater ability to recruit high-potential candidates. Along the same lines, but focusing on the negative, Bose (2011) submits that, if an organisation’s image projects unfair discriminatory policies, its relationship with present and potential clients may also be hampered.

These comments indicate that perceived discrimination may affect employees negatively. The aim of this research was to gauge the levels of perceived discrimination in a selection of South African companies.

Perceived discrimination and group membership

Social identity theory (Tajfel, 1981; Turner & Reynolds, 2004) and group-serving bias (Pettigrew, 1997) are theories that may explain the prevalence of perceived discrimination, even among groups that are similar in many ways, such as male and female employees. Social identity theory states, inter alia, that individuals contrast their own group (in-group) with others (out-group) and develop a favorable bias towards their own (Myers, 2008). The concept of group-serving bias goes a step further. Here, in-group members explain away, or negate, the *positive* behaviours of out-group members (attributing them to situational circumstances) and ascribe *negative* behaviours disproportionally to out-group members’ dispositions (personality and values), rather than more appropriately to situational circumstances (Myers, 2008). It may thus be the mere fact of membership of a specific group that creates prejudice against another group, as was found in the seminal Robber’s Cave Experiment by Sherif, Harvey, White, Hood and Sherif (1961). It may be this “natural” prejudice between groups that drives perceived discrimination.

The use of social identity theory is encouraged in the South African context of gender research (Finchilescu, 2006). Research by Steyn (2012) on racial discrimination demonstrates the value of such an approach. In this research, it was found that black South Africans scored higher on a measure of modern racism (designed to measure discrimination against black individuals) than did white South

Africans (mean 23.4 versus 19.2), and that whites scored higher than blacks on a measure of modern racism (with an instrument that measures discrimination against whites; mean 22.5 versus 16.3). The group-serving bias is corroborated by several research reports, including the report by Hunter, Stringer and Watson (1991) on violence in Ireland. The authors reported how Catholics attributed violent acts committed by their own group more to contextual causes (78.1%), and less to internal causes (dispositions; 17.9%). Protestants, however, commented on the same acts by saying that these actions were initiated by disposition (79.2%) rather than by situational circumstances (20.8%). Hunter et al. (1991) reported the same pattern for violence committed by Protestants. Protestants attributed the actions of their own group to contextual causes (71.5%) rather than to internal causes (28.5%), while Catholics reported a completely contrary picture (28.5% blamed on external causes and 71.5% attributed to contextual causes). These results suggest support for both theories when considering two groups that are comparable in many ways. In such cases both groups experience prejudice against the other at a similar level.

It may therefore be concluded that similar levels of prejudice between groups exist, based on the human condition rather than on objective realities.

Method

Respondents

The respondents in this research were employees of relatively large organisations, as the sample frame required at least 30 male and 30 female voluntary employees per company. The organisations approached were those to which students enrolled for the Master of Business Leadership programme at the Unisa Graduate School of Business Leadership had access, primarily on account of their own employment in these organisations. It was therefore a convenient sample (Rosnow & Rosenthal, 2008).

Procedure and approach

Data on discrimination was collected by means of the Fair Treatment at Work Survey and the Gender-Based Discrimination Questionnaire. Respondents were asked to rank items (using the Fair Treatment at Work Survey) and to select options (in the Gender-Based Discrimination Questionnaire). The method of data collection makes this a quantitative study. As the data was collected at a particular point in time, it is a

cross-sectional design. This design is suitable for describing the population and relationships between variables (Shaughnessy, Zechmeister & Zechmeister, 2009). Before the employees were asked to complete the questionnaires, they were given informed consent forms. After consenting, they were requested to answer all the questions that applied to them. Their answers were not to be based on their perceptions of the workplace in general.

Measurements

Employees were asked three questions on their work situation. The first two were from the Fair Treatment at Work Survey (Grainger & Fitzner, 2007). The first question read as follows: “In the past two years with this organisation, have you been treated unfairly because of any of the following?” The respondents could select any one (or more) of 19 possible reasons for having been treated unfairly. This list included age, gender, nationality, religion, race or ethnic group, and 14 other possible reasons. The second question, also from the Fair Treatment at Work Survey, related to unfair treatment, specifically the consequences of such treatment. It read as follows: “To what did the unfair treatment you have personally experienced relate?” The respondents could select any one (or more) of 18 possible consequences of being treated unfairly. These included salary, pension, other benefits, perks and bonuses besides pay, and 13 other possibilities. The data generated was ranked in order of the frequency of endorsements.

Question 3 related to access to the organisational resources and was comprised of four similar sub-questions. In answer to the first sub-question, the respondents had to select one of three options: (1) It is easier for a woman to get appointed to this organisation than it is for a man; (2) It is equally difficult for a man or a woman to get appointed to this organisation; and (3) It is easier for a man to get appointed to this organisation than it is for a woman. The next three sub-questions were identical in structure to the first, except that the content related to promotion, access to training and development, and equal work for equal pay, instead of to appointments. This measure was called the Gender-Based Discrimination Questionnaire, which was developed specifically for this research. Answers were treated as categorical data.

Data analysis

The data was presented as frequencies, and per gender, as gender differences in scores, based on social identity theory (Tajfel, 1981; Turner & Reynolds, 2004), were expected. In the case of the Fair Treatment at Work Survey the statistical difference in ranking between the gender groups was calculated using the Spearman rank-order correlation formula. The differences between the scores for males and females on the Gender-Based Discrimination Questionnaire were calculated using the Pearson chi-square test. In all cases a significant level of less than .01 was seen as significant.

Ethical considerations

Several ethical considerations are applicable. The first is the use of students as fieldworkers. The students benefitted from collecting the data, which they used when writing their Master of Business Leadership research reports. A possible second ethical concern could be that students accessed respondents in the organisations where they were working, which allowed them undue influence over the respondents. This matter was partially addressed by the requirement that the chief executive officer or director general first had to grant permission to conduct the research (suggesting that the student did not have ultimate authority in the setting). The students also had to obtain consent from the respondents. The informed consent form clearly stated that participation in the survey was voluntary and all the respondents provided consent before entering into the research.

Results

In total, data from 1 740 questionnaires from employees working at 29 companies was captured. The employees were primarily from financial service providers (seven organisations), the government (seven organisations), and the mining sector (four organisations). Other sectors included the hospitality industry, the manufacturing industry and agriculture.

The results in answer to Question 1, on the type of discrimination to which employees are exposed, are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Sources of Unfair Treatment at Work

Question 1 In the last two years with "this organisation" have you been treated unfairly because of any of the following?	Number of endorsements, percentage, and rankings: Males (N=871)			Number of endorsements, percentage, and rankings: Females (N=868)		
	Count	%	Rank	Count	%	Rank
My age	91	10.4	2	71	8.2	4
My gender	90	10.3	3	120	13.8	1
My nationality	36	4.1	11	50	5.8	7.5
My religion	27	3.1	14	29	3.3	15
My race or ethnic group	95	10.9	1	93	10.7	2
My sexual orientation	18	2.1	16.5	21	2.4	18
My disability	8	.9	18	19	2.2	19
My long-term illness	18	2.1	16.5	22	2.5	17
My marital status	35	4.0	12	45	5.2	12
My political beliefs	26	3.1	15	26	3.0	16
My skin colour	89	10.2	4	82	9.4	3
My physical appearance	30	3.4	13	46	5.3	10.5
The way I dress	41	4.7	7.5	70	8.1	5
Being pregnant	9	1.0	19	39	4.5	14
Union membership	38	4.4	10	50	5.8	7.5
Accent or the way I speak	47	5.4	5	47	5.4	9
Address or where I live	39	4.5	9	41	4.7	13
My social class	43	4.9	6	46	5.3	10.4
My family responsibilities	41	4.7	7.5	61	7.0	6
Total	821			978		

The type of discrimination most frequently reported by females was gender-based, which had been experienced by 13.8% of all the female respondents. This was higher than the gender-based discrimination reported by males, who numbered 10.3%. The reason for discrimination most often cited by males was racial bias (10.9%). Race was the second most frequently-cited reason for discrimination in the case of females. The Spearman rank-order correlation of .890 was significant at the .001 level. The rankings were therefore similar, indicating that males and females both experience these types of discrimination in the workplace.

As the main focus of this research is on gender-based discrimination, the significance of this difference in gender-based discrimination should be considered in greater detail. Table 2 provides information on the count data in a two-by-two table reflecting gender (male / female) and reported discrimination (yes / no).

Table 2

Perceived Discrimination during Appointments by Gender

Question	Gender	
	Female	Male
No: No gender discrimination	749 (86.2%)	780 (89.7%)
Yes: Gender discrimination	120 (13.8%)	90 (10.3%)
Total	869 (100.0%)	870 (100.0%)

In Table 2, as in Table 1, it can be observed that 13.8% females reported gender discrimination, while 10.3% of males did so. The Pearson chi-square value was 4.914 (degrees of freedom = 1) and the asymptotic significance (2-sided) was equal to .027, and more than .01, which indicates that the rows and columns of the contingency are not dependent. Males and females therefore did not differ in the degree to which they reported on gender-based discrimination.

When it comes to the perceived consequences of discrimination, three elements stand out. In Table 3, it can be seen that for both male and female respondents the most frequently-reported discrimination concerned remuneration. It is of interest that, percentagewise, more males reported this negative effect.

Table 3

Consequences of Unfair Treatment

Question 2 To what did the unfair treatment you have personally experienced relate too?	Number of endorsements, percentage, and rankings: Males (N=871)			Number of endorsements, percentage, and rankings: Females (N=869)		
	Count	%	Rank	Count	%	Rank
The pay you receive	205	23.5	1	183	21.1	1
Your pension	55	6.3	12.5	48	5.5	15
Other benefits, perks and bonuses, besides pay	176	20.2	2	167	19.2	2
Your working hours	94	10.8	8	106	12.2	8
Taking holidays	90	10.3	9	104	12.0	9
Applying for a job (horizontal movement)	113	13.0	6	109	12.5	7
Being promoted (vertical movement)	169	19.4	3	162	18.6	3
Receiving training	122	14.0	5	116	13.3	5
Disciplinary action	55	6.3	12.5	39	4.5	16
Redundancy	22	2.5	17	33	3.8	17
Early retirement	14	1.6	18	13	1.5	18
Being allowed to work flexibly (changing hours of work)	50	5.7	14.5	81	9.3	10
Being ignored	125	14.4	4	134	15.4	4
Being excluded from social activities	50	5.7	14.5	73	8.4	12
Not being part of social group	38	4.4	16	54	6.2	14
Type of work given	75	8.6	10	114	13.1	6
Bullying/ harassment	60	6.9	11	75	8.6	11
Falsely accused of something	96	7.9	7	72	8.3	13
Total	1 609			1 983		

Both males and females reported that discrimination affected their perks and benefits, while the third most frequently-mentioned effect of discrimination was that of promotion. The Spearman rank-order correlation of .894 was significant at the .001 level. The rankings were therefore similar, suggesting that the workplace consequences of discrimination experienced by males and females are comparable.

The results pertaining to data gathered by means of the Gender-Based Discrimination Questionnaire are presented in the following tables. The question on the fairness of the appointment process was answered by 1 733 respondents (seven missing values). Most respondents (61.3%) selected the middle option, indicating that no discrimination occurred during this process.

Table 4

Perceived Discrimination during Appointments by Gender

Question	Gender	
	Female	Male
It is easier for a woman to get appointed at … than it is for a man.	133 (15.4%)	253 (29.1%)
It is equally difficult for a man or a woman to get appointed at ...	539 (62.3%)	523 (60.3%)
It is easier for a man to get appointed at … than it is for a woman.	193 (22.3%)	92 (10.6%)
Total	865 (100%)	868 (100%)

Differences in scores between male and female perceptions were calculated, with the Pearson chi-square value of 73.335 (degrees of freedom = 2). The asymptotic significance (2-sided) was smaller than .001, and less than .01, indicating that the rows and columns of the contingency are dependent. It can be seen in Table 4 that males reported pro-female discrimination (29.1%), while females reported pro-male discrimination (22.3%). Both groups thus negated the achievements of the other, providing support for the group-serving bias (Pettigrew, 1997). The difference between perceived pro-female and perceived pro-male discrimination was 6.8%.

Regarding the promotion process, 1 732 cases were examined (eight missing values). As with appointments, a large percentage of employees (62.0%) selecting the middle option reported no difference in the way males and females were treated.

Table 5

Perceived Discrimination with regard to Promotions by Gender

Question	Gender	
	Female	Male
It is easier for a woman to get promoted at ... than it is for a man.	117 (13.5%)	242 (27.9%)
It is equally difficult for a man or a woman to get promoted at ...	533 (61.6%)	541 (62.4%)
It is easier for a man to get promoted at ... than it is for a woman.	215 (24.9%)	84 (9.7%)
Total	865 (100%)	867 (100%)

Differences between male and female perceptions were calculated, with the Pearson chi-square value being 100.97 (degrees of freedom = 2) and the asymptotic significance (2-sided) smaller than .001, and less than .01. This indicates that the rows and columns of the contingency are dependent. It can be seen in Table 5 that

males reported pro-female discrimination (27.9%), while females reported pro-male discrimination (24.9%). The difference between perceived pro-female and perceived pro-male discrimination was 3.0%.

Regarding access to training and development, 1 729 cases in total were examined (11 missing values). In the case of the previous reports, most employees (75.8%) reported that males and females were treated equally.

Table 6

Perceived Discrimination with regard to Access to Training and Development by Gender

Question	Gender	
	Female	Male
It is easier for a woman to get access to training and development at ... than it is for a man.	81 (9.4%)	146 (16.8%)
It is equally difficult for a man or a woman to get access to training and development at ...	648 (75.3%)	662 (76.3%)
It is easier for a man to get access to training and development at ... than it is for a woman	132 (15.3%)	60 (6.9%)
Total	861 (100%)	868 (100%)

Differences between male and female perceptions were calculated, with the Pearson chi-square value being 45.734 (degrees of freedom = 2) and the asymptotic significance (2-sided) smaller than .001, and less than .01. This indicates that the rows and columns of the contingency are dependent. It can be seen in Table 6 that males reported pro-female discrimination (16.8%), while females reported pro-male discrimination (15.3%). The difference between perceived pro-female and perceived pro-male discrimination was 1.5%.

When it came to equal work for equal pay 1 727 cases were examined (13 missing values). As with the previous reports, most employees (76.5%) reported that males and females were treated equally.

Table 7

Perceived Discrimination with regard to Equal Work for Equal Pay by Gender

Question	Gender	
	Female	Male
Generally women get paid more than what would equate to their inputs, compared to men	33 (3.8%)	100 (11.6%)
The rule of equal work for equal pay is enforced at ...	632 (73.3%)	689 (79.7%)
Generally men get paid more than what would equate to their inputs, compared to women	197 (22.9%)	76 (8.8%)
Total	862 (100%)	865 (100%)

The differences between male and female perceptions were calculated, with the Pearson chi-square value being 89.836 (degrees of freedom = 2) and the asymptotic significance (2-sided) smaller than .001, and less than .01. This indicates that the rows and columns of the contingency are dependent. It can be read in Table 7 that males reported pro-female discrimination (11.6%), while females reported pro-male discrimination (22.9%). The difference between perceived pro-female and perceived pro-male discrimination was 11.3%.

For the Gender-Based Discrimination Questionnaire, most employees reported the absence of discrimination in the workplace (average across items = 68.6%). Some women reported a pro-male bias (average across items = 21.35%) and others a pro-female bias (average across items = 10.52%). The same pattern applies to men, reporting pro-female (average across items = 21.35%) and pro-male (average across items = 9.00%) discrimination.

Discussion

During this research, information was gathered from general employees in relatively large organisations. The absolute size of these groups (at least 30 male and 30 female staff members) made the inclusion of top or senior managers highly unlikely, as very few companies have in the region of 60 top or senior managers. The respondents were thus most likely to be supervisors and general employees at lower levels of the organisation. The nature of the groups sampled should contribute to the body of knowledge, as many previous reports on gender discrimination focused

mainly on senior employees (eg. April, Dreyer & Blass, 2007; Booysen, 2007; Johnson & Mathur-Helm, 2011; Msweli-Mbanga, Fitzgerald & Mkhize, 2005; Zulu, 2003). This research fills a lacuna by considering the perceptions of employees at lower organisational levels. This implies that the results may be generalisable to a larger portion of the working population, as lower-level employees by far outnumber senior and top managers.

It is also important to note that data was collected from 1 740 employees at 29 companies. Although this was a convenient sample of companies, it represents a large number of randomly-selected respondents from a broad selection of companies, unlike several other studies with limited sample sizes and focused just on specific industries (e.g. Boshoff, 2005; Kahn, 2009; Kane-Berman & Hickman, 2003; Lloyd & Mey, 2007; Montesh, 2010). Apart from the South African study by Thomas (2002), which was conducted across several organisations, this article makes a contribution in constituting the first broad-based research of this nature in South Africa.

Regarding the Fair Treatment at Work Survey, most employees seemed to agree that gender discrimination did not affect them directly. In total, 87.9% reported that they had not been exposed personally to gender-based discrimination during the past two years. When asked about gender-based discrimination in workplace processes, the average scores using the Gender-Based Discrimination Questionnaire were substantially lower at 68.9% (The scores were 61.3% for the appointment processes, 62.0% at the promotional level, 75.8% for training and development, and 76.5% in the case of equal pay for equal work.) It can thus be noted that more than 60% of all employees perceive the workplace to be free of gender-based discrimination.

When interpreting these results, it is important to note that the Fair Treatment at Work Survey solicits information on personally-experienced gender discrimination, whereas the Gender-Based Discrimination Questionnaire solicits information on discrimination in processes affecting both the respondents and other employees. This difference in reported scores on the two measures could be explained with the person/group discrimination discrepancy, coined by Taylor, Wright, Moghaddam and Lalonde (1990). They argue that disadvantaged individuals often rate the discrimination suffered by their group (as measured by the Gender-Based Discrimination Questionnaire) as more severe than the discrimination they suffer

personally (as measured with the Fair Treatment at Work Survey). Dixon, Durrheim, Tredoux, Tropp, Clack and Eaton (2010) also demonstrated this effect in a South African population sample while investigating perceptions of racial discrimination.

Remaining with the matter of no discrimination, using the Gender-Based Discrimination Questionnaire, more females than males (62.3% females; 60.3% males) perceived the appointment process to be free of discrimination. With regard to promotional processes (61.6% females; 62.4% males), access to the training and development level (75.3% females; 76.3% males), and equal pay for equal work (73.3% female; 79.7% males), males more often view the processes as being free of discrimination. From the above, it is clear that most discrimination is perceived to occur at the appointment and promotional levels (the lowest report on no discrimination), with less discrimination when it comes to access to training and development and equal pay for equal work (high reports of no discrimination).

Females seem to experience discrimination, including gender discrimination, more frequently than males do. In total, 13.8% females reported gender-based discrimination in comparison with the 10.3% of males who reported it. However, this difference was not statistically significant (χ^2= 4.914; p = .027). Two important matters relate to this. Firstly, females do not experience more gender-based discrimination than males do, and, secondly, males experience a substantial amount of gender-based discrimination (1 in 10 males reported gender-based discrimination). It is important to note that the types of discrimination experienced by male and female employees are very similar (ρ = 890; p < .001), being based on race, gender and age. Males and females therefor do not experience different forms of discrimination, and the type and extent of discrimination are similar.

When it came to discrimination in the workplace, males and females listed similar outcomes (ρ = 894; p < .001). Both groups proposed that pay, perks and bonuses, as well as promotion, were negatively affected by discriminatory practices. These *workplace* results may[4] appear to contradict the work done by Schmitt, Branscombe, Kobrynowics and Owen (2002), who found that discrimination had different implications for the *psychological well-being* of both men and women.

In the matter of perceived gender-based discrimination, males reported pro-female discrimination (29.1%) at the appointment level more often than females

[4] Emphasis is on “may”, as these results have a bearing on workplace consequences and not on general well-being.

reported about pro-male discrimination (22.3%). As far as promotions were concerned, males reported pro-female discrimination (27.9%) more frequently than females reported pro-male discrimination (24.9%). Males and females reported similarly on discrimination at the access to training and development level. Males reported slightly more pro-female discrimination (16.8%) than females, who also reported pro-male discrimination (15.3%). As far as enforcing the principle of equal pay for equal work went, males reported less pro-female discrimination (11.6%) than females reported pro-male discrimination (22.9%). This all indicates that both males and females report discrimination and that the levels of reported discrimination are similar. This is also evident from the average across items reported earlier. These results suggest that both gender groups display similar - in some cases almost equal - prejudice against the out-group. This pattern could be explained well by social identity theory, but could be interpreted even better as group-serving bias. The results from male and female responses, which mirror each other almost identically, are very similar to those found by Steyn (2012) pertaining to racial differences, as well as to the findings of Hunter et al. (1991), for religious differences.

Conclusion

This research focused on the experiences of discrimination against female and male employees in a comparable manner. There is a general tendency to focus on women's experiences of discrimination (Chabaya et al., 2009; Corning & Krengal, 2002; Pavalko et al., 2003; Ro & Choi, 2010), which is not the case with the groups studied in this article. Males were also sampled here, and they too experience gender-based discrimination. While the 13.8% of females reporting gender-based discrimination is unacceptable, the 10.3% reported by males is equally noteworthy. Gender-based discrimination is thus experienced by females, but males also develop perceptions that they are the victims of discriminatory practices. It is possible that males develop such perceptions because the implementation of affirmative action (RSA, 1999) often places female employees in a position of advantage. Irrespective of the reasons for these perceptions, the fact that males feel aggrieved requires redress just as female perceptions must be considered.

The workplace impact of perceived discrimination is very similar for male and female employees, listing exactly the same effects.

This particular research tells the reader little about the actual levels of gender discrimination and additional research which could objectively determine such levels would be important, as unprejudiced information often alters negative perceptions (Bendoly & Swink, 2007; Zalesny & Ford, 1990; Zhu, Xie & Gan, 2011). A change in negative perceptions is important as they influence employees at many levels. With reference to the concept of perceived as opposed to actual discrimination, it is interesting to note from this research that males and females are critical of each other, following group-serving bias and social identity theory. This is important to note, as these theories propose prejudice based purely on group membership, irrespective of actual damage or advantage. This provides even more motivation for investigating the real levels of discrimination.

Managers, particularly human resource managers, should note that perceived gender-based discrimination occurs mostly at the appointment level (61.3%, indicating that there is no difference between males and females). The situation is very similar at the promotional level (62.0%), but when it came to access to training and development (75.8%) and equal pay for equal work (76.5%), more respondents felt that the playing fields were even. Managers should therefore focus their attention on altering negative perceptions of what can be seen as unfairness in appointments and promotions, as this is where employees feel the most dissatisfied.

Managers should, however, note that although the male and female groups harbour similarly negative perceptions of each other, the difference is noticeable when it comes to pro-male bias regarding pay. As mentioned earlier, 22.9% of females reported pro-male bias in the case of equal pay for equal work, while the number was 8.8% for males. This submits that more females than men perceive this pro-male bias in remuneration, so management could attempt to remedy this.

The research had some limitations. One concern was that it reflects perceptions and may therefore reveal little of actual discrimination. This could be addressed by looking at hard data, which is certainly recommended. It was stated earlier that hard data could counter the development of perceptions of prejudice. A further limitation is that the respondents were asked about the effects of discrimination in the workplace. The question thus did not direct their attention specifically to gender-based discrimination, but to discrimination in general. The results reported may thus be ambiguous. However, bearing in mind the general nature of the question, it should be noted that gender-based discrimination was most

often mentioned by females, and constituted an important issue for males. Future researchers are cautioned against making the same mistake and should rather enquire directly about gender discrimination.

In conclusion, this research represents the views of general employees, not only senior managers. They represent a wide variety of organisations, including those in the government sector. Males and females all perceive themselves to be victims of gender-based discrimination, indicating that this is not an exclusively female experience. The workplace impact of perceived discrimination is very similar for males and females. Discrimination is perceived most at the appointment and promotion levels, and least at the training and development and equal pay for equal work levels. However, disagreement between males and females is the most significant when it comes to pro-male bias in equal pay for equal work.

List of references

Abbas, S.M.N., Athar, S.A. & Herani, G. (2010). Gender based wage discrimination and its impact on performance of blue collar workers: Evidence from Pakistan. *KASBIT Business Journal*, 3(1), 45-63.

Abbas, Q., Hameed, A. & Waheed, A. (2011). Gender discrimination and effect on employment performance/productivity. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 1(15), 170.

April, K., Dreyer, S. & Blass, E. (2007). Gender impediments to the South African executive boardroom. *South African Journal of Labour Relations*, 31(2), 51-67.

Banerjee, R. (2006). *An examination of factors affecting perception of workplace discrimination.* Toronto: Centre for Industrial Relations and Human Resources, University of Toronto.

Bendoly, E. & Swink, M. (2007). Moderating effects of information access on project management behavior, performance and perceptions. *Journal of Operations Management*, 25, 604-622.

Booysen, L. (2007). Barriers to employment equity implementation in and retention of blacks in management in South Africa. *South African Journal of Labour Relations*, 31(1), 47-51.

Bose, D. (2011). *Gender discrimination in the workplace*. Retrieved from http://www.buzzle.com/articles/gender-discrimination-in-the-workplace.html [Accessed 25 January 2013].

Boshoff, N. (2005). The representation of women academics in higher education in South Africa: Progress in the pipeline? *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 19(2), 359-377.

Cascio, W.F. (2010). *Managing human resources: Productivity, quality of life, profits* (8th ed.). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill Irwin.

Chabaya, O., Rembe, S. & Wadesango, N. (2009). The persistence of gender inequality in Zimbabwe: Factors that impede the advancement of women into leadership positions in primary schools. *South African Journal of Education*, 29(2), 235-251.

Channar, Z.A., Abbassi, Z. & Ujan, I.A. (2011). Gender discrimination in the workforce and its impact on the employees. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce & Social Sciences*, 5(1), 177-191.

Corning, A.F. & Krengal, M. (2002). Self-esteem as a moderator between perceived discrimination and psychological distress among women. *Journal of Counselling Psychology*, 40(1), 117-124.

Dixon, J., Durrheim, K., Tredoux, C., Tropp, L., Clack, B. & Eaton, L. (2010). A paradox of integration? Interracial contact, prejudice reduction, and perceptions of racial discrimination. *Journal of Social Issues*, 66(2), 401-416.

Ensher, E.A., Grant-Vallone, E.J. & Donaldson, S.I. (2001). Effects of perceived discrimination on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, and grievances. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 12(1), 53-72.

Finchilescu, G. (2006). Women as a minority group. In T. Sheffer, F. Boonzaier & P. Kiguwa (eds.), The gender of psychology (pp. 85-99), Cape Town: UCT Press.

Foley, S., Ngo, H. & Loi, R. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of perceived personal gender discrimination: A study of solicitors in Hong Kong. *Business Media Journal*, 55(1), 197-208.

Goldman, B.M., Slaughter, J.E., Schmit, M.J., Wiley, J.W. & Brooks, S.M. (2008). Perceptions of discrimination: A multiple needs model perspective. *Journal of Management*, 34(5), 952-977.

Grainger, H. & Fitzner, G. (2007). *The First Fair Treatment at Work Survey: Executive summary - updated*. Retrieved from www.bis.gov.uk/files/file38386.pdf [Accessed 25 January 2012].

Grogan, J. (2007). *Dismissal, discrimination and unfair labour practices* (2nd ed.). Cape Town: Juta.

Harris, M.M., Lievens, F. & Van Hoye, G. (2004). “I think they discriminated against me”: Using prototype theory and organisational justice theory for understanding perceived discrimination in selection and promotion situations. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 12(1), 54-65.

Hunter, J.A., Stringer, M. & Watson, R.P. (1991). Intergroup violence and intergroup attributions. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 30, 261-266.

Huynh, Q.L., Devos, T. & Dunbar, C.M. (2012). The psychological costs of painless but recurring experiences of racial discrimination. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Diversity Psychology*, 18, 26-34.

Iberiyenari, L. (2012). *Gender discrimination in the workplace: Are women sufficiently protected? The Lawyers Chronicle*. Retrieved from http://thelawyerschronicle.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=134:gender-discrimination-in-the-workplace-are-women-sufficiently-protected&catid=41:gender-issue&Itemid=54 [Accessed 15 January 2013].

Jamieson, K.H. (1995). *Beyond the double-bind: Women in leadership*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Johnson, Z. & Mathur-Helm, B. (2011). Experiences with queen bees: A South African study exploring the reluctance of women executives to promote other women in the workplace. *South African Journal of Business Management*, 42(4), 47-55.

Kahn, S. B. (2009). Employment of women in the South African National Defense Force: 1998-2008. *Journal of Public Administration*, 44(1), 196-208.

Kane-Berman, J. & Hickman, R. (2003). Women doctors in medical professional organisations in South Africa: A report by the Women in Medicine Workgroup. *South African Medical Journal,* 93(1), 69-73.

Kim, S-S. & Williams, D.R. (2012). Perceived discrimination and self-rated health in South Korea: A nationally representative survey. *PLoS ONE*, 7(1): e30501. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0030501.

Krieger, N. (1990). Racial and gender discrimination: Risk factors for high blood pressure. *Social Science & Medicine*, 30(12), 1273-1281.

Lloyd, H.R. & Mey, M.R. (2007). Gender differences in perceptions of workplace progression: An automotive industry case study. *Southern African Business Review*, 11(3), 95-120.

Loden, M. & Rosener, J.B. (1991). *Workforce America! Managing employee diversity as a vital resource*. Burr Ridge, IL: Irwin.

Montesh, M. (2010). Transformation in the South African Police Service: The implementation of affirmative action and employment equity in SAPS. *South African Journal of Criminal Justice*, 23(1), 55-77.

Msweli-Mbanga, P., Fitzgerald, P. & Mkhize, A. (2005). Representation of women directors in JSE securities exchange listed companies: Institutional theory perspective. *South African Journal of Labour Relations*, 29(1), 98-110.

Myers, D.G. (2008). *Social psychology* (9th ed.). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

Noh, S. & Kaspar, V. (2003). Perceived discrimination and depression: Moderating effects of coping acculturation and ethnic support. *American Journal of Public Health*, 93(2), 232-238.

Parziale, A. (2007). *Gender inequality and discrimination: Encyclopedia of business ethics and society*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Pascoe, E.A. & Richman, L.S. (2009). Perceived discrimination and health: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 135(4), 531-554.

Pavalko, E.K., Mossakowski, K.N. & Hamilton, V.J. (2003). Does perceived discrimination affect health? Longitudinal relationships between work discrimination and women's physical and emotional health. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 43, 18-33.

Pettigrew, T.F. (1997). Generalized intergroup contact effects on prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23, 173-185.

Ro, A. & Choi K.H. (2010). Effects of gender discrimination and reported stress on drug use among racially/ethnically diverse women in Northern California. *Women's Health Issues*, 20(3), 211-218.

Rosnow, R.L. & Rosenthal, R. (2008). *Beginning behavioural research: A conceptual primer* (6th ed.) Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Prentice Hall.

RSA (Republic of South Africa). (1995). *Labour Relations Act, Act No. 66 of 1995*. Retrieved from http://www.info.gov.za/acts/1995/a66-95.pdf [Accessed 12 June 2013].

RSA (Republic of South Africa). (1996). *Constitution of South Africa, Act No. 108 of 1996*. Retrieved from http://www.info.gov.za/documents/constitution/1996/a108-96.pdf [Accessed 12 June 2013].

RSA (Republic of South Africa). (1999). Employment Equity Act, 55 of 1998. Retrieved from http://www.agsa.co.za/Portals/1/ACTS/EEA.pdf [Accessed 12 June 2013].

Russell, H., Quinn, E., King-O'Riain, R. & McGinnity, F. (2008). *Experience of discrimination in Ireland: Analysis of the QNHS Equality Module*. Retrieved from

www.equality.ie/.../Pregnancy%20at%20Work%20A%20Literature%20Review.pdf [Accessed 26 June 2013].

Sanchez, J.I. & Brock, P. (1996). Outcomes of perceived discrimination among Hispanic employees: Is diversity management a luxury or a necessity? *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(3), 704-719.

Shaughnessy, J.J., Zechmeister, E.B. & Zechmeister, J.S. (2009). *Research methods in psychology* (8th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Schmitt, M., Maes, J. & Widaman, K. (2010). Longitudinal effects of egoistic and fraternal relative deprivation on well-being and protest. *International Journal of Psychology*, 45(2), 122-130.

Schmitt, M.T., Branscombe, N.R., Kobrynowicz, D. & Owen, S. (2002). Perceiving discrimination against one's own gender group has different implications for the well-being in women and men. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28, 484-492.

Sherif, M., Harvey, D.J., White, B.J., Hood, W.R. & Sherif, C.W. (1961). *Robber's cave experiment.* Norman, OK: Institute of Group Relations. Retrieved from http://psychclassics.yorku.ca/Sherif/ [Accessed 15 January 2013].

Steyn, R. (2012). Adaptation of the Modern Racism Scale for use in South Africa. *International Journal on Diversity in Organizations, Communities and Nations*, 11(5), 175-188.

Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories: Studies in social psychology*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Taylor, D.M., Wright, S.C., Moghaddam, F.M. & Lalonde, R.N. (1990). The personal/group discrimination discrepancy: Perceiving my group but not myself to be a target for discrimination. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 16, 256-262.

Thomas, A. (2002). Employment equity in South Africa: Lessons from the global school. *International Journal of Manpower*, 23(3), 237-255.

Turner, J.C. & Reynolds, K.J. (2004). *The social identity perspective in intergroup relations: Theories, themes and controversies*. In M.B. Brewer & M. Hewstone (eds.), Self and social identity (pp. 259-277), Oxford: Blackwell.

Williams, D.R, Neighbors, H.W. & Jackson, J.S. (2003). Racial/ethnic discrimination and health: Findings from community studies. *American Journal of Public Health*, 93(2), 200-208.

Zalesny, M.D. & Ford, J.K. (1990). Extending the social information processing perspective: New links to attitudes, behaviors, and perceptions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 47(2), 205-246.

Zhu, D., Xie, X. & Gan, Y. (2011). Information source and valence: How information credibility influences earthquake risk perception. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 31, 129-136.

Zulu, C. (2003). Gender representation patterns in higher education management in South Africa: Perspectives on higher education. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 17(1), 98-104.

CHAPTER 4
ARTICLE 3

In this chapter the third of four articles is presented. This particular article is aimed at examining the third objective of the study, namely *to analyse the level of fairness in the remuneration of women in South Africa.* The title of the article, as presented to the *South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences*, was “Gender-based discrimination in South Africa: A quantitative analysis of fairness of remuneration”. The format of the article is in line with the guidelines for authors published by the journal.

Gender-based discrimination in South Africa: A quantitative analysis of fairness of remuneration

Abstract

Introduction: *Equity is important to most individuals and a perceived lack of it may impact negatively on individual and organisational performance. Equity presupposes fair treatment, while discrimination assumes unfair treatment. Perceptions of discrimination or being treated unfairly may result from psycho-social processes, or from data that justifies discrimination and is quantifiable.* ***Objectives****: To assess whether differences in post grading and remuneration of males and females are based on gender, rather than on quantifiable variables that could justify these differences.* ***Method****: Biographical information was gathered from 1 740 employees representing 29 organisations. Data collected included self-reported post grading (dependent variable) and 14 independent variables which may predict the employees' post gradings. The independent variables related primarily to education, tenure and family responsibility.* ***Results****: Males reported higher post gradings and higher salaries than those of females, but the difference was not statistically significant and the practical significance of this difference was slight. Qualification types, job-specific training, and membership of professional bodies did not affect post grading along gender lines. The ways in which work experience was measured had no influence on post grading or salary for either males or females. Furthermore, family responsibility, union membership and the type of work employees performed did not influence the employees' post grading. The only difference found concerned the unfair treatment of males, particularly well-qualified males.* ***Conclusions****: Objective evidence of unfair gender-based discrimination affecting post grading and salary is scarce, and the few differences that do occur have little statistical and practical significance. Perceptions of being discriminated against may therefore more often be seen as the result of psycho-social processes and are not necessarily the result of justifiable differences in education, tenure and family responsibility.*

Keywords: gender; discrimination; fairness; remuneration; South Africa

JEL: J3

1 Introduction

Unfair gender-based discrimination is unlawful in South Africa. This is set out in the South African Employment Equity Act (EEA), which states that no person may unfairly discriminate, directly or indirectly, against an employee in any employment policy or practice, on one or more grounds, including race, *gender*, pregnancy, marital status, family responsibility, ethnic or social origin, colour, sexual orientation, age, disability, religion, HIV-status, conscience, belief, political opinion, culture, language or birth (RSA, 1998). The EEA states, with specific reference to gender discrimination, that this type of discrimination may refer to any distinction, exclusion or restriction made on the basis of sex, including pregnancy, marital status, domestic or family responsibilities, which is aimed at or has the effect of impairing or nullifying the recognition, enjoyment or exercise for women or men. The authors of the act then continue to state that this definition of recognition, enjoyment or exercise specifically includes employment opportunities.

Discrimination within the South African context can also be fair, stated as "not unfair discrimination" in the EEA (RSA, 1998: 8). Discrimination is fair when it is the result of affirmative action measures or when measures "distinguish, exclude or prefer a person on the inherent requirement of a job or a situation" (RSA, 1999: 8). Affirmative action and specific job requirements therefore constitute legally valid reasons for discrimination.

The fact that discrimination is legal, or based on legal grounds or job-specific requirements, does not negate the fact that some individuals perceive discrimination to occur in the workplace. Adams' (1963) equity theory is relevant in this respect. The theory, with roots in cognitive dissonance theory, exchange theory (see Luthans, 2011) and social comparison theory (see Moorhead & Griffin 2014), states that inequality occurs when "a person perceives that the ratio of his or her outcomes to inputs and the ratio of a relevant others' outcomes and inputs are unequal" (Luthans, 2011: 170). "The person's assessment of inputs and outputs for both self and others is based partly on objective data (for example, the person's own salary) and partially on perceptions (such as the comparison-other's level of recognition)" (Moorhead & Griffin, 2014: 102). In the workplace, certain inputs and outputs are likely to be considered relevant by most individuals in that setting (Hollyforde & Whiddett, 2002). Experience, skills and seniority are listed as examples of workplace inputs, whereas pay, benefits and job satisfaction are seen as examples of outputs by Hollyforde and

Whiddett (2002). It is worth noting that Luthans (2011) includes gender (which he refers to as sex) as an input variable, along with age, education, social status, organisational position, qualifications and how hard the person works. Furthermore, Luthans (2011) states that outcome variables consist primarily of rewards like pay, status, promotion and intrinsic interest in the job. Moorhead and Griffin (2014) refer to very similar input and outcome variables. They cite education, experience, effort and loyalty as input variables and pay, recognition, social relationships and intrinsic rewards as outcomes. There seems to be reasonable consensus as to what constitutes inputs and outcomes in the context of equity theory. In many ways, the equity theory complements the just-world theory (Lerner, 1980), which, in its simplest form, states that people expect to obtain what they deserve, and expect others to deserve what they (the others) get (Myers, 2008), in light of the fact that the world is just. Social comparison and the input-outcome ratio also seem to be at play in the just-world theory.

The aim of this research was to gather information and report on the workplace inputs and outputs that may be used when males and females compare themselves with each other and that may contribute to dissonance (disequilibrium) and feelings of discrimination in the workplace. Operationalised, the aim was to assess whether differences in post grading and remuneration of males and females are based on gender, rather than on quantifiable variables, which could justifiably account for these differences. Should differences in post grading and salary be based on gender, rather than on just and quantifiable variables, perceptions of gender-based discrimination would be valid.

2 Literature

When it comes to gender-based discrimination in wages, salaries and earnings, these are often discussed under the heading of the gender wage gap. Some researchers argue that no significant gender-based wage discrimination occurs (Deininger, Jin & Nagarajan, 2013). Others find that salary differences exist, but there is no evidence (Gravelle, Hole & Santos, 2011; Nadeau, Walsh & Wetton, 1993) or weak evidence of gender discrimination (Gravelle et al., 2011). Some researchers (see Stanley & Jarrell, 1998) maintain that there is considerable agreement on the existence of gender wage discrimination, but say that estimates of its magnitude vary widely. In general, the male gender has been associated with higher salaries (Shainbrook, Roberts & Triscari, 2011).

Regarding extent, the gender wage gap is estimated to be approximately 30 per cent (Kara, 2006). An American demographic study shows that women working full-time with two or fewer years of experience earn 72 per cent of what men with the same experience might earn (Isaacs, 1995). The difference in income and wages is worth noting. The income of female family doctors in the United Kingdom is 70 per cent of that of their male counterparts and their wages (hourly income) constitute 89 per cent of male doctors' wages (Gravelle et al., 2011). Meta-regression analysis reveals that the estimated gender gap has been steadily declining (Stanley & Jarrell, 1998). However, women consistently earn less money than men in almost every industry (Isaacs, 1995). Louis, Alexandros and Konstantinos (2013) reported on the gender wage gap in 26 European countries, taking into account annual earnings and hourly wages. In all these countries, women earned less than men, and in only two countries did women report higher wages than those of men. South African research (Haroon & Sumayya, 2013) reported that in 2007 the ratio of average female to male wages for those in the sample stood at 82.2%.

Calculating the wage rate is crucial when estimating the wage gap (Stanley & Jarrell, 1998). Many factors other than gender may contribute to this. Kara (2006) states that it is important to control for education, experience, occupation, region and selection effects when considering discriminatory wage data. Pudney and Shields (2000) state that models developed should include estimates of the influence of gender, ethnicity, training and career interruptions. Shainbrook et al. (2011) showed that years of experience, the educational level, certification and gender elements all relate to salary.

The influence of most of these factors will be discussed shortly. However, Isaacs (1995) states that the salary gap is found even in studies that equate years of experience, the level of education and industry (Isaacs, 1995). The extent of this adjusted wage gap varied between 12 and 15 per cent of the average male wage up to 1989, after which the size of the gap increased to approximately 14-18 per cent (Johansson, Katz & Nyman, 2005). Some estimates are a little lower, in the region of 11.5 per cent (Solberg, 1999).

Factors linked to the above, the EEA and authors discussing equity theory (Adams, 1963) provide some guidelines on variables which may be used as input and outcome variables when situations are evaluated in terms of the equity theory. The EEA refers to matters like gender, pregnancy, marital status and domestic and

family responsibility (possible inputs), which may impair or nullify the recognition, enjoyment or exercise of women or men. These include employment opportunities (possible outcomes). The EEA also cites the inherent requirements of a job or a situation (RSA, 1998) which can be regarded as an input variable. Luthans (2011), discussing equity theory, includes as input variables gender, age, education, social status, organisational position, qualifications and how hard the person works, while Hollyforde and Whiddett (2002) list experience, skills and seniority as examples of workplace inputs. Outcome variables in the workplace consist primarily of pay, status, promotion and intrinsic interest in the job (Luthans, 2011), as well as benefits and job satisfaction (Hollyforde & Whiddett, 2002). Similar inputs and outcomes are mentioned by Moorhead and Griffin (2014).

Given aforementioned similarities in the literature and the parallels found between the given literature and the legislation, an emphasis was placed in the following discussion on the role of education, work experience and family responsibility (as input variables) on the position of women, particularly on post level and salary (as outcome variables).

2.1 Gender, education and workplace outcomes

Several authors report on how education differentially influences workplace outcomes along gender lines. The earning trajectory is a function of education (Ornstein, 2011), and the level of education of business owners relates positively to their ability to increase business growth (Brijlal, Naicker & Peters, 2013).

Differences in the educational requirements for jobs, and the education traditionally afforded to women, have contributed considerably to gender earning inequality (Johansson et al., 2005; Solberg, 2004). Policy-makers should promote women's education, as education reduces inequalities between genders. This is demonstrated by the decreasing gap in wage differentials for higher levels of education (Kara, 2006).

Education is important, but does not suffice in creating gender equality. Yamauchi and Tiongco (2013) report evidence supporting the notion that females, particularly young women, are advantaged by education. However, when employed, they tend to suffer disadvantage in the labour markets, as was observed in the Philippines. Furthermore, not all education is equally beneficial to women. Gender inequality in annual earnings is less extreme among the well-educated than among those with less education (England, Gornick & Shafer, 2012). Addabbo and Favaro

(2011) also show the extent of difference in the gender wage gap in cases of diverse educational levels. In the case of less-educated workers, lower levels of education or less experience are deemed responsible for the wage gap. On the contrary, highly-educated females have better opportunities than highly-educated men, with high differences in returns, in particular at the extremes of the distribution.

The gender wage gap decreases with education (Kara, 2006), and Shainbrook et al. (2011) showed that higher degrees, but not first degrees, are positively associated with higher salaries. These gender differences are robust when various estimation procedures are used and are particularly pronounced when it comes to more educated workers (Munasinghe, Reif & Henriques, 2008). Although education is important, differences between women and men in job selection and qualifications can account for only between two-fifths and three-fifths of the gender wage gap (Johansson et al., 2005).

2.2 Gender, age, tenure, work experience and workplace outcomes

Several authors demonstrate how age can differentially influence workplace outcomes along gender lines. Ornstein (2011) showed that age was not an important factor in women's earnings before 1970. Between 1970 and 1980 women's earnings increased dramatically, the current age-income trajectory resembles that of men. Petit (2007) found significant hiring discrimination against young women (aged 25), applying for highly-skilled administrative jobs. According to Petit, young men are preferred to young women when it comes to employers offering long-term contracts. This discrimination may be on account of perceived future family constraints. The bias may be unjustified, as Petit (2007) found no further significant gender-based hiring discrimination practices among older single and childless applicants (aged 37). There was also no gender-based discrimination when male and female applicants, who were single and childless or married with three children, were compared. Shainbrook et al. (2011) showed that years of experience and gender relate to salary, and greater bias is likely when researchers omit experience or fail to correct for selection bias (Stanley & Jarrell, 1998). The median tenure in the United States of America from 1983 to 2002 was higher for men than for women (Anon, 2002). When considering all the female life stages, except for the 65 years+ bracket, women have a lower median tenure than men (Anon, 2006). Shainbrook et al. (2011) found that five or more years' experience (but not two to five years' work experience) at a particular organisation are positively associated with higher salaries. Ioakimidis

(2012: 31) found “that the wage gap and tenure were found positively correlated for approximately the first five years of within-firm employment, after which the correlation was near zero”.

Sloane and Theodossiou (1993) examined the effect of gender and job tenure on earnings in Great Britain. The basic hypothesis is that earnings correlate positively with tenure. The results were consistent with the differential lifetime labour force behaviour of men and women. Similarly Munasinghe et al. (2008) present empirical evidence on gender disparities in wage returns relating to job tenure and experience. They found that the overall wage return on an extra year of labour market experience is lower for women than for men. A decomposition analysis shows that the wage return for job tenure is substantially lower for women than for men, and that the wage returns for experience are higher for women than for men. Ioakimidis (2012) similarly found that the returns for tenure were greater for men than for women, with a statistically significant breakpoint at the seven-year mark for men.

There are at least two explanations for the importance of tenure of experience to salary. The first is provided by Sloane and Theodossiou (1993), who argue that “the positive relationship between earnings and tenure is the result of either unobserved individual or job/firm match heterogeneity arising from the fact that higher earnings could reflect the quality of the employee-job or employee-firm match, which in turn induces longer tenure” (1993: 421).Thus, while earnings depend on tenure, tenure depends on earnings, individual characteristics and job/firm characteristics. Secondly, Munasinghe et al. (2008) hypothesise that these observed gender disparities in wage returns are driven by the fact that women are less attached to their jobs than men are. The authors present some supportive evidence for their hypothesis, namely that women are more likely to quit their jobs, or receive substantially fewer hours of company-provided training. A much higher fraction of women expects not to be working at age 35 for family-related reasons.

2.3 Gender, family responsibility and workplace outcomes

Several authors report how family responsibility impacts differentially on workplace outcomes along gender lines. Ioakimidis (2012) attributes the gender wage gap to the life and work cycles of women. Bornstein, Williams and Painter (2012) state that mothers and fathers who have caregiver responsibilities experience the strongest forms of discrimination in the workplace. They cite motherhood penalty, the maternal

well-being and the caregiver bias as manifestations of family responsibilities discrimination. Bagraim and Harrison (2013a) found that mothers spend ten more hours of multitasking a week than fathers do, and that these additional hours are related mainly to time spent on housework and childcare. For mothers, multitasking activities are associated with an increase in negative emotions, stress, psychological distress and work-family conflict. By contrast, fathers' home multitasking is not a negative experience. However, it is not only actual work-family conflict that impacts on workplace outcomes for women. Anticipated work-family conflict is the belief that future demands from work and family are going to be incompatible. Moderate differences in anticipated work-family conflict were reported across gender, with females displaying more anticipated conflict (Bagraim & Harrison, 2013b). Among married or cohabiting mothers, the better educated are more likely to be employed (England et al., 2012).

3 Method

In this section, the respondents, the procedure, the measuring instruments, the data analysis and the ethical considerations are discussed.

3.1 Respondents

The respondents in this study were groups of employees who shared a common working domain. Only employees who were part of a relatively large organisational domain were involved. In order to qualify for inclusion in the study the organisational domain had to have a diverse workforce of at least 30 male and 30 female employees. Furthermore, at least 30 respondents from each gender had to be willing to participate in the study. This requirement excluded senior executives or top managers, as in most cases these groups would not meet the domain size requirement decided upon, unless entire, very large organisations were targeted. The organisations approached were those to which students, enrolled for the Masters of Business Leadership programme at the Unisa Graduate School of Business Leadership, had access because they were employed in the organisations. These present a convenient sample (Rosnow & Rosenthal, 2008) of South African companies. Employees from 29 companies were approached. The financial service providers (7 organisations), the government (7 organisations) and the mining sector (4 organisations) were the best represented. Other sectors included the hospitality industry, the manufacturing industry and the agricultural sector.

3.2 Procedure

Individual employees in the organisations were recruited to participate in the study using random selection from a personnel list. Informed consent forms were given to the potential participants and only those who gave consent and who were willing to participate were enrolled. This continued until data from 30 males and 30 females per organisation had been collected. This was always done randomly and with cognisance of the threat to anonymity. After giving consent, the employees were requested to answer a number of questions, including those applicable to this research. Biographical information for this research was solicited, as well as information on post grading, which is a proxy for salary. After completing the questionnaires, employees were thanked for their participation and were assured that the data would be treated according to what they had consented to.

3.3 Measuring instruments

Data was gathered by means of a biographical questionnaire. The questions related to general matters like gender and race, but specific questions on education (five questions), work experience (three questions) and family responsibility (two questions) were also posed. The rationale for focusing on these variables was explained in the literature section above. The items are considered to have face and content validity based on their grounding in variables used in previous research. The following is an example of the questions included in the questionnaire: “What is your gender?” (1) Male; (2) Female; “Are you registered with a professional body related to your present job?” (1) Yes; No (0). Respondents were asked to report their post grading (salary) according to the system with which they were acquainted in their company.

3.4 Data analysis

First, the collected post grading data was converted. Data on post grading in the different companies was, as previously reported, collected on company-specific systems familiar to the employees in that company. All collected data was converted to a common system, the Equate System, as most data could be easily converted to that format. This was done by using available conversion tables (Bussin, 2011). However, the 16 post gradings and the seven bands of the Equate System would not be very useful in cross tabulations, as minimum requirements for calculating the Pearson chi-square have an expected count of at least 5 in each cell (Field, 2009; Pallant, 2010). For this reason, four post grading bins were created: Below level 6;

Level 6 to 9; Level 10; and 11, as well as Level 12+. In each case, the term level refers to the Equate System levels, while binning was done with due consideration of the Equate System bands and the frequency of observed cases. Presenting salary as a continuous variable was also useful. This was done by using the middle salary value in each of the post gradings to represent the salary of all the respondents on that level (Anon, 2013). In this way, the categorical variable was converted into a continuous variable.

First, descriptive data was presented; continuous data as averages and standard deviation, and categorical data as frequencies. Of particular interest were the descriptive statistics for post grading and salary per gender. Means, standard deviations, kurtosis and skewness were calculated. The statistical mean is a measure of central tendency and the arithmetic average of the data, the standard deviation is a measure of the spread or variability of the data dispersion, the kurtosis is a measure of the peakedness or flatness of the distribution, and the skewness is seen as a measure of the distribution deviation from symmetry (Blumberg, Cooper & Schindler, 2011). Regarding kurtosis, for a sample of 200, heavier tails (platykurtic shape) are below a value of -.47 and a sharper peak (leptokurtic shape) is higher than .62 (Doane & Seward, 2009). In the case of a sample of 200 the lower limit for skewness (skewed to the left) is -.281 with the upper limit (skewed to the right) standing at .281. These cut-off scores will be used in the comments on kurtosis and skewness.

T-tests were used to calculate differences in means. When differences were statistically significant ($p<.01$), effect sizes were calculated. The formula for the Cohen d-value is $X_1–X_2/ s_p$, where X_1 is the mean of the first group (say, males), X_2 the mean of the second group (say, females), and s_p the pooled standard deviation of both groups (Pallant, 2010). When d is >.8, the difference is practically significant. d-Values between .8 and .5 indicate a moderate effect size, while a d statistic <.5 but >.2 indicates a small effect (Cohen, 1988; Steyn, 2000).

The Pearson chi-square (χ^2) test was used to test whether the rows (say male and female) and columns (high and low pay) of the contingency were dependent. A significant χ^2–value ($p<.01$) indicates that the rows and columns are dependent, implying gender effects. If they are not significant, the rows and columns are independent. Effect size is reported as Cramer's V (Field, 2009; Pallant, 2010), as this value always varies between 0 and 1, unlike other measures such as Phi and

the contingency coefficient (Field, 2009). When Cramer's V values are larger than .5 the effect is large. When larger than .3 it is considered to be medium, and between .1 and .29, the effect is seen as small (Rosnow & Rosenthal, 2008).

In some cases it was necessary to test whether the association between variables was the same for males and females. As a first step, the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was calculated. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient is a measure of the covariance, or association, between two variables. For the purposes of this research all statistically significant correlations will be reported ($p<.01$) and correlations where the shared variance is greater than 20% will be interpreted as practically meaningful (Cohen, 1988). For example, when a correlation of $r=.13$ ($p<.01$) is reported, the coefficient of determination is $R^2=.02$ (.13x.13=.02), stating that the shared variance between the two constructs is only 2%, and not practically significant compared to the 20% margin set by Cohen (1988). To calculate whether the associations (correlations) differ along gender lines, a strategy suggested by Field (2009) and Pallant (2010) was used. In this case, z-values, corresponding to the correlations, were looked up in a table (see Steyn, Smit, du Toit & Strasheim, 2013: 695) and inserted into the following formula:

$$z_{(observed)} = \frac{z_1 - z_2}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{N_1 - 3} + \frac{1}{N_2 - 3}}}$$

with z_1 the z-value for the male correlation, z_2 the value for the female group, N_1 the size of the male group, and N_2 the size of the female group. For the difference in correlation, $z_{(observed)}$ values larger than 1.96, or smaller than -1.96, were considered to be indicative of significant differences (Pallant, 2010).

Regression analysis was also performed. The R^2–adjusted (multiply by 100) was interpreted as the percentage of the variance in the dependent variable explained by the model (Pallant, 2010). For example, if R^2–adjusted is .108, almost 11% of the variance in the dependent variable is explained by the model. The significance of the standardised beta was also interpreted. If the beta value of any of the independent variables was significant ($p<.01$), it was interpreted as indicating that the specific variable contributed uniquely and significantly to the variance declared in the dependent variable (Pallant, 2010). When the significance of the

standardised beta for any independent variable was larger than .01, it was interpreted as indicating that the specific variable did not contribute uniquely and significantly to the variance declared in the dependent variable.

3.5 Ethical considerations

Several ethical considerations apply in this study. The first is the use of students as fieldworkers. The students benefited from collecting the data, as they could use it when writing their own research report for the Master of Business Leadership degree. A possible second ethical concern could be that students could access respondents in the organisation where they work, implying that they had undue influence over the respondents. This is partially addressed by the requirement that the chief executive officer or director general would initially have to grant permission to conduct the study (suggesting that the student had no ultimate authority in the setting). Further, the respondents consented to taking part. The informed consent form explains clearly that participation in the survey was voluntary and that all respondents had given their consent before entering into the study.

4 Results

Descriptions of the respondents are presented first, followed by data on gender differences in post grading and salary. Issues pertaining to gender and tenure, gender and education and gender and family responsibility will be discussed later.

4.1 Respondents

In total, data was captured from 1 740 questionnaires returned by employees from 29 companies. The following are the descriptive statistics for the respondents (missing data is not reported):

- Gender: Female=869 (46.1%); Male=871 (46.2%);
- Age: Mean=37.2; SD=9.2; Youngest=19 years; Oldest 64 years;
- Race: Asian=117 (6.2%); Black=1227 (67.7%); Coloured=99 (5.3%); White=299 (12.1%);
- Define the type of work you do. Support/Admin=556 (29.5%): Management of Support/Admin=340 (18.0%); Core Business/Operations=647 (34.3%); Management of Core Business/Operations=179 (9.5%);
- Number of companies you have worked for since the age of 18: Mean=2.9; SD=1.6; Most=10 companies; Least=1 company;

- Number of years in full-time employment since the age of 18: Mean=13.1; SD=9.1; Longest=45 years; Shortest=1 year (this was a measure of experience);
- Number of years with present employer: Mean=8.1; SD=7.3; Longest=40 years; Shortest=1 year (this was a measure of tenure);
- Years of formal schooling: Less than 12 years=129 (6.8%); 12 years (matric) =30 (22.8%); 1st Degree/Diploma=787 (41.8%); Higher degree/Diploma=383 (20.3%);
- Highest job-specific qualification: 1st Degree/Diploma=954 (50.1); Higher Degree/Diploma=359 (19.0%);
- Area of qualification: BA=217 (11.5%); B.Com=360 (19.1%); BSc=202 (10.7%);
- Did you receive any specialised certified training at this organisation? Yes=864 (45.8%); No=872 (46.3%);
- Are you registered with a professional body related to your present job? Yes=634 (46.3%); No=1100 (58.4%);
- Do you belong to an acknowledged trade union? Yes=861 (45.75%); No=872 (46.3%);
- Marital status: Single=613 (32.5%); Married=948 (50.3%); Divorced=125 (6.6%);
- How many times have you been on maternity leave? (Only females): Mean=.77; SD=.97; Most=5 times; Least=0 times;
- How many children younger than 21 years stay with you in your house? Mean=1.5; SD=1.3; Most=8 children; Least=0 children;
- What is your post grading level? Level 1=16 (.8%); Level 2=40 (2.1%); Level 3=42 (2.2%);Level 4=98 (5.21%); Level 5=82 (4.4%); Level 6=186 (8.9%); Level 7=199 (10.6%); Level 8=215 (11.4%); Level 9=202 (10.7%); Level 10=120 (6.4%); Level 11=121 (6.42%); Level 12=126 (6.6%); Level 13=155 (8.2%); Level 14=110 (5.8%); Level 15=39 (2.1%).

It is clear that a wide variety of respondents, and almost an equal number of males and females, completed the questionnaire.

4.2 Post grading and salary differences per gender

Gender differences in the post gradings and salaries were of particular interest. Descriptive statistics per gender on post gradings and salary are presented in Table1.

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics for Salary

		Post Grading					
Gender	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis
Female	864	1.00	15.00	8.559	3.274	-.001	-.730
Male	867	1.00	15.00	8.912	3.347	-.104	-.706
Total	1731	1.00	15.00	8.736	3.315	-.051	-.724
		Salary					
Gender	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis
Female	864	R72 018.00	R1 225 027.00	R346 211.85	R301 272.41	1.392	.688
Male	867	R72 018.00	R1 225 027.00	R381 359.83	R325 077.40	1.212	.098
Total	1731	R72 018.00	R1 225 027.00	R363 816.30	R313 823.78	1.300	.373

The average post grading, expressed on the Equate System, was 8.736 (SD=3.315). Regarding skewness, all three distributions met the requirements for normality (Doane & Seward, 2009), but when it came to kurtosis, heavier tails (platykurtic shape) were found, as the statistics were lower than the set value of -.47 (Doane & Seward, 2009). Fortunately, these values were very similar for all three distributions. The means of males and females were thus comparable. The difference between the post gradings of males and females was .353, but this difference was not statistically significant (t(1 729)=-2.219, p=.027). Its practical significance was small (d=.10). A similar pattern was found when it came to matters of salary.

The average salary, expressed in South African Rand, was R363 816.30 (SD=R313 823.78). This amount is almost equal to the average salary for White South Africans (R365 134.00) reported in the 2011 census (Statistics South Africa, 2012a). Regarding skewness, all three distributions were skewed to the right and did not meet the requirements for normality (Doane & Seward, 2009). Fortunately these values were very similar for all three distributions. For kurtosis, a sharper peak (leptokurtic shape), with a statistic higher than .62 (Doane & Seward, 2009), was found for females. Both the male group and the total group met the requirements of normality in terms of kurtosis. The mean difference was reported despite the limitations mentioned, and the difference between the salaries for males and females

amounted to R35 147.98. The difference was not statistically significant (t(1 729)=-2.333, p=.020). The practical significance of this difference was small (d=.11).

4.3 Gender, post grading and education

The respondents were asked five questions relating to education, all of which produced categorical data. The first question, which related to education, was specifically about formal schooling. The results are presented in Table 2.

Table 2
Gender and Post Grading according to Formal Schooling: Cross Tabulation (Count Data)

	Formal Schooling							
	Less than 12*		12 years		1st degree		2nd degree	
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male
Below level 6	34	47	97	76	91	60	21	17
	64.2%	61.8%	44.1%	36.2%	22.4%	16.0%	11.7%	8.4%
Level 6 to 9	6	20	76	78	167	172	53	41
	11.3%	26.3%	34.5%	37.1%	41.1%	45.7%	29.6%	20.2%
Level 10 and 11	5	6	20	22	59	58	33	37
	9.4%	7.9%	9.1%	10.5%	14.5%	15.4%	18.4%	18.2%
Level 12+	8	3	27	34	89	86	72	108
	15.1%	3.9%	12.3%	16.2%	21.9%	22.9%	40.2%	53.2%
Total	53	76	220	210	406	376	179	203
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*2 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.52.

To assess whether gender (columns) and post grading (rows) are dependent, given education (layer), cross tabulations were drawn and the Pearson chi-square test was performed. The Pearson chi-square values were reported, given 3 degrees of freedom, with asymptotic significance (2-sided) being reported. For those with qualifications of fewer than 12 years, the calculate χ^2 value was 8.147 (p=.043). (The results pertaining to qualifications for fewer than 12 years should, however, be treated with caution, as two cells (25.0%) have an expected count of less than 5. The minimum expected count was 4.52.) For 12 years of schooling, the χ^2 was 3.243 (p=.356), for a first degree χ^2 was 5.355 (p=.148), and for a second degree χ^2 was 7.905 (p=.048). It is clear that the rows and columns are not dependent. As such Cramer's V is not reported.

The same procedure was followed for post grading (rows) and gender (columns) by job-specific qualifications. These results are reported in Table 3.

Table 3
Gender and Post Grading by Job-specific Qualifications: Cross Tabulation (Count Data)

	Job-specific Qualifications			
	1st Degree		2nd Degree	
	Female	Male	Female	Male
Below level 6	120	75	19	21
	24.7%	16.6%	11.5%	10.9%
Level 6 to 9	184	197	48	36
	37.9%	43.5%	29.1%	18.7%
Level 10 and 11	72	82	31	24
	14.8%	18.1%	18.8%	12.4%
Level 12+	110	99	67	112
	22.6%	21.9%	40.6%	58.0%
Total	486	453	165	193
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

The Pearson chi-square value was calculated for each qualification level. In all cases, the degrees of freedom were 3, and asymptotic significance (2-sided) was reported. For respondents with a first degree, job-specific qualification χ^2 was 10.910 (p=.012) and for a second degree χ^2 was 11.901 (p=.008; Cramer's V=.182). In the case of a second degree, gender had a slight effect on post grading. A close look at Table 4 reveals that more males in the Level 12+ group had second degrees, indicating that males in this grouping were more highly qualified than females holding the same positions.

The same procedure was followed for gender (columns), post grading (rows) and types of qualifications (layer). The cross tabulation is not presented here, as all chi-squares calculated using that data were not significant. The same occurred with gender (column) and post grading (rows) when specialized job-specific training (layer) and professional registration (layer) were used. In none of these cases were the rows and columns of the contingency dependent, suggesting the absence of gender effects. In summary: Only having a job-specific qualification, specifically a second degree, influenced post grading, and in such a way that females in the upper post grading groups were less qualified than their male counterparts.

4.4 Gender, post grading and salary per age, tenure and experience

Three questions were asked about tenure and experience. These related to the number of companies the respondent had worked for since the age of 18, the number of years in full-time employment since the age of 18 (experience), and the

number of years with the present employer (tenure). All these variables were treated as continued variables. The results in Table 4 reflect the correlation of these variables (and age) with post grading and salary (presented in brackets) per gender.

Table 4
Correlation Between Age, Tenure, Experience, Post Grading and Salary[1] per Gender

Question		Gender		
		Female	Male	Observed z
Age	Pearson correlation	.132**(.147**)	.226**(.219**)	1.924(1.473)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	>.000(>.000)	>.000(>.000)	
	Coefficient of determination	.017(.021)	.051(.048)	
	N	844(844)	838(838)	
Number of companies the respondent worked for	Pearson correlation	.253**(.197**)	.239**(.233**)	.026(.763)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	>.000(>.000)	>.000(>.000)	
	Coefficient of determination	.064(.039)	.057(.055)	
	N	852(852)	856(856)	
Number of years in full-time employment	Pearson correlation	.206**(.218**)	.274**(.264**)	1.588(.990)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	>.000(>.000)	>.000(>.000)	
	Coefficient of determination	.042(.049)	.075(.072)	
	N	856(856)	853(853)	
Number of years with present employer	Pearson correlation	.039(.076*)	.069*(.061)	.621(.310)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.249(.027)	.044(.075)	
	Coefficient of determination	.001(.005)	>.001(.003)	
	N	861(861)	861(861)	

[1] Results pertaining to salary are reported in brackets

Table 4 shows that age, tenure and experience correlate, in some cases significantly, with post grading and salary. In the case of males, the number of years in full employment has the highest correlation (r=.274) with post grading, which is significant at the .01 level. This is a 7.5% overlap between this variable and post grading, as reflected in the coefficient of determination (.075). Not one of the correlations met the requirement for being practically significant (20% overlap), as set by Cohen (1988). Although none of the correlations met the practically significant criterion, it was still decided to test whether the correlations differed along gender lines, and observed z statistics were calculated. None of the correlations differed significantly from each other along gender lines, as values larger than 1.96 or smaller than -1.96 are considered to be indicative of such differences (Pallant, 2010). The number of years in full employment therefore does not significantly influence post grading or salary along gender lines, and the relationship that exists does not differ along the same lines.

As the four variables mentioned may collectively predict post grading better than when considered individually, a linear regression analysis was performed. The R^2–adjusted was .110, with significant beta scores for three variables, excluding age. The variance in post grading is therefore explained by the tenure and experience variables. Adding the gender variable to the regression improved the model to .111, in other words by .1%. With the latter calculation, the tenure and experience variables had significant betas, but not in the cases of age and gender. This suggests that gender contributes very little to the declared variance. The same procedure was followed with salary. R^2–adjusted was .097, with significant beta scores for all three variables, excluding age. Almost 10% of the variance in salary is thus explained by the tenure and experience variables. Adding the gender variable to the regression improved the model to R^2–being .098. With the latter calculation, the tenure and experience variables had significant betas, in contrast to age and gender.

4.5 Gender and post grading per family responsibility

As previously discussed, writers often point out that marital responsibilities hamper female career development. In Table 5 the results of a cross table with post gradings as rows and gender as columns, with marital status as layers, are presented.

Table 5
Post Grading and Gender by Marital Status: Cross Tabulation (Count Data)

	Marital Status					
	Single		Married		Divorced*	
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male
Below level 6	114	97	99	88	21	7
	34.4%	34.6%	24.1%	16.5%	23.9%	18.9%
Level 6 to 9	121	103	142	191	33	12
	36.6%	36.8%	34.5%	35.8%	37.5%	32.4%
Level 10 and 11	44	36	56	82	10	3
	13.3%	12.9%	13.6%	15.4%	11.4%	8.1%
Level 12+	52	44	114	173	24	15
	15.7%	15.7%	27.7%	32.4%	27.3%	40.5%
Total	331	280	411	534	88	37
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*1 cells (12.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.85.

The Pearson chi-square values were calculated for each marital status grouping. In all cases, the degrees of freedom were 3 and asymptotic significance (2-sided) was reported. For single respondents, rows and columns were not dependent (χ^2=.026; p=.999). The same applied to married respondents (χ^2=9.028;

p=.029) and divorced respondents (χ^2=2.205; p=.531). (The results pertaining to divorced respondents should, however, be treated with caution, as 1 cell (12.5%) has an expected count of less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.85.) The salaries of males and females therefore do not seem to differ along marital status lines.

It is interesting that more males report living in households with children under the age of 21 than females (Mean=1.581; SD=1.371 versus mean=1.336; SD=1.224). The mean difference was .245, and this is statistically significant (t(1705.5)=.919; p<.001). The practical significance of this is, however, small (d=.188). The correlation between the number of children in your care and post grading for males was .065 (p=.058) while for females it was .013 (p=.707). These correlations are small and not significant. When it comes to salary, the number of children in your care correlates significantly with the salary for males (r=.09; p=.008), but not for females (r=.003; p=.930). The correlation is significant for males, but reflects only a .8% overlap between this gender (male) and salary, as reflected in the coefficient of determination of only .0081.

It was previously pointed out that the mean times when females took maternity leave came to .77 occasions (SD=.97), the most times being 5 and the least zero. The results indicate a weak positive and statistically significant correlation between taking maternity leave and post grading (r=.105; p=.003). Add to this that older females are on higher post gradings than younger ones are (r=.132; p<.001), the reported correlation provides even less direction. When it came to salary, the results were very similar (r=.113; p=.001 and r=.147; p<.001). Given the coefficient of determination, taking maternity leave overlaps 1.1% with post grading and 1.2% with salary. This is a very small overlap.

5 Discussion

The literature showed that gender wage differences exist in most countries. It is also apparent from the literature and relevant quoted legislation that factors such as education, age, tenure and work experience, as well as family responsibility, should be considered when wage differences between men and women are discussed and when there are deliberations on fair and unfair gender-based discrimination.

The respondents in this sample represented males and females almost equally, which was to be expected, as the sample was stratified along gender lines. In total 869 females and 871 males reported their gender.

Most respondents were Black (67.7%), with smaller portions of Coloured (5.3%), Asian (6.2%) and White (12.1%) participants. Given the national demographics Whites and Asians were somewhat overrepresented, while Coloureds and Blacks were underrepresented. The 2011 National Census stated that 79.2% of the population is Black, with 8.9% Coloured, 2.5%, Asian and 8.9% White (Statistics South Africa, 2012b). The representation of Whites in this sample is, however, a good reflection of workforce demographics, where the labour force participation rate "among black Africans is lowest while that among the white population group is highest" (Statistics South Africa, 2012b: 51).

The mean age of the respondents was 37.2 years (SD=9.2). This was a relatively mature group of employees. This is echoed in the 13.1 years' (SD=9.1) work experience reported. Here it is important to note that gender-based discrimination is often related to age (Ornstein, 2011) and tenure (Shainbrook et al., 2011) cohorts. This matter is discussed further in the limitations section of the paper.

The respondents were from 29 companies, which included financial service providers, government, the mining sector, the hospitality industry, the manufacturing industry and agriculture. Although they were not representative of all South African organisations, a wide variety of organisations was involved. Those who use this research are nevertheless cautioned to be tentative when making generalisations.

Evidence of gender-based wage differences was found in this selection of South African companies. Males reported higher post gradings (.353 Equate points higher) and salary (R35 147.98 higher) compared with those of females, but the difference was not statistically significant and its practical significance was small. This is a numerical but not a statistical or practical meaningful wage gap.

Qualification types, job-specific training and membership of professional bodies systematically did not affect post grading along gender lines. The only difference found indicated the unfair treatment of males, particularly well-qualified males. These results are contrary to those of previous research, which reported that females with high qualifications were particularly advantaged (Addabbo & Favaro, 2011; England et al., 2012). The absence of discrimination against females, and even discrimination against males, may be a function of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, which specifically states its aim of creating a society that reflects non-sexism. It may also be owing to the Commission for Gender Equality, which, inter alia, performs the function of monitoring, investigating and lobbying to

create gender equality (RSA, 1996). This, coupled with the affirmative action legislation (RSA, 1998; 2000) which advances the position of females, may explain the findings.

None of the three ways in which work experience was measured influenced post grading or salary differently for males and females. The same results were found for age. The results therefore do not reflect gender-based discrimination. Using age and tenure as distinct variables may however be problematic. Age (Ornstein, 2011) and tenure (Shainbrook et al., 2011) affect gender-based wage discrimination per cohort and the linear techniques used in this study, for example, linear regression and Pearson correlations, may be insufficient to describe the relationship. Despite this limitation, it should be emphasised that no gender-based discrimination was found using the techniques employed in this research.

Family responsibility, which included variables like marital status, the number of children, and the number of maternity leaves, did not affect employee outcomes along gender lines. These results are contrary to those from some authors (see Bagraim & Harrison, 2013; Bornstein et al., 2012; Ioakimidis, 2012), who link gender discrimination in the workplace to matters related to family life and responsibilities associated with it. A possible explanation for these results is the role of extended families in caring for children, which is common in South Africa, particularly among Black South Africans (Duflo, 2003). As stated earlier the majority of the respondents were from the Black community.

6 Conclusion

Objective evidence of unfair gender-based discrimination affecting post grading and salary is sparse, and the few differences that do occur have little statistical and only slight practical significance. Perceptions of being discriminated against may thus rather be seen as the effect of psycho-social processes than the result of verifiable differences in education, tenure, experience and family responsibility. The objectively measured ratios of the outcomes of inputs for males and females seem to be equal, and neither males nor females should, based on these results, perceive that others' outcomes and inputs are unequal to their own. The results provide empirical evidence for the justification of perceptions of gender equity. Employees are therefore urged to assess the inputs and outcomes for both self and others on objective data, rather than on stereotypical perceptions of such ratios, or dated research in this regard. Equity persists and the world seems just, as people get what

they deserve, and others deserve what they get. It may thus be important to provide employees with statistics like these to prevent perceptions of discrimination, which may, in fact, not exist. This would eliminate the negative effects of such perceptions (Abbas, Athar & Herani, 2010). Judging by these results, it would also seem that the use of South African legislation may indeed have resulted in a fair and just world for South African males and females. The use of legislation seems effective in redressing gender-related disparities (Nel & Steyn, 2012).

The research has some limitations. Although 29 organisations were selected and 1 740 employees were sampled from those organisations, organisation selection was not done randomly. This limited the generalisability of the results. Future researchers are encouraged to apply randomisation to the full. The use of linear statistical techniques, when analysis of cohorts could be more effective, is not recommended. This limitation could be overcome by using non-linear techniques or cohort analysis, which is recommended for future research. The use of post grading to reflect salaries may be questioned by some and future researchers may prefer to ask for responses directly related to salary. However, this route was not followed as it was believed that respondents would have accurate knowledge relating to post grading, rather than to exact salaries.

References

ABBAS, S.M.N., ATHAR, S.A. & HERANI, G. 2010. Gender based wage discrimination and its impact on performance of blue collar workers: Evidence from Pakistan. *KASBIT Business Journal*, 3(1): 45-63.

ADAMS, J.S. 1963. Towards an understanding of equity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67: 422-436.

ADDABBO, T. & FAVARO, D. 2011. Gender wage differentials by education in Italy. *Applied Economics*, 43(29): 4589-4605.

ANON. 2002. Gender differences in employee tenure. *Compensation and Working Conditions*, Sep: 0.

ANON. 2006. Gender differences in job tenure. *Economic Trends*, Oct: 13.

ANON. 2013. *An Overview: Choosing the Correct Statistical Test*. Available at http://www-users.cs.umn.edu/~ludford/stat_overview.htm [Accessed 2013-10-11].

BAGRAIM, J.J. & HARRISON, E. 2013a. Revisiting the gender gap in time-use patterns: Multitasking and well-being among mothers and fathers in dual-earner families. *American Sociological Review*, 76(6): 809-833.

BAGRAIM, J.J. & HARRISON, E. 2013b. The anticipated work-family conflict of future business managers: Does gender and maternal employment matter? *South African Journal of Business Management*, 44(3): 41-45.

BLUMBERG, B., COOPER, D.R. & SCHINDLER, P.S. 2011. *Business research methods* (3rd ed.). Berkshire: McGraw-Hill Education.

BORNSTEIN, S., WILLIAMS, J.C. & PAINTER, G.R. 2012. Discrimination against mothers is the strongest form of workplace gender discrimination: Lessons from US Caregiver Discrimination Law. *International Journal of Comparative Labour Law and Industrial Relations*, 28(1): 45-62.

BRIJLAL, P., NAICKER, V. & PETERS, R. 2013. Education and SMMe business growth: A gender perspective from South Africa. *International Business and Economics Research Journal*, 12(8): 855-866.

BUSSIN, M. 2011. *The remuneration handbook for Africa. A practical and informative handbook for managing reward and recognition*. Randburg: Knowres Publishing.

COHEN, J.W. 1988. *Statistical power analysis for behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

DEININGER, K., JIN, S. & NAGARAJAN, H. 2013. Wage discrimination in India's informal labor markets: Exploring the impact of caste and gender. *Review of Development Economics*, 17(1): 130-147.

DOANE, D.P. & SEWARD, L.E. 2009. *Applied statistics in business and economics*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

DUFLO, E. 2003. Grandmothers and Granddaughters: Old-age pensions and intrahousehold allocation in South Africa. *World Bank Economic Review*, 17(1): 1-25.

ENGLAND, P., GORNICK, J. & SHAFER, E.F. 2012. Women's employment, education, and the gender gap in 17 countries. *Monthly Labor Review*, 135(4): 3-12.

FIELD, A. 2009. *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

GRAVELLE, H., HOLE, A.R. & SANTOS, R. 2011. Measuring and testing for gender discrimination in physician pay: English family doctors. *Journal of Health Economics,* 30(4): 660-674.

HAROON, B. & SUMAYYA, G. 2013. The gender wage gap in Post-Apartheid South Africa: A re-examination. *Journal of African Economics*. Available at: http://jae.oxfordjournals.org/content/early/2013/05/15/jae.ejt008.full [Accessed 2013-05-15].

HOLLYFORDE, S. & WHIDDETT, S. 2002. *The motivation handbook*. London: Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development.

IOAKIMIDIS, M. 2012. Gender wage gap and earnings: Predicted by tenure in the Czech Republic. *Journal of Developing Areas*, 46(1): 31-43.

ISAACS, E. 1995. Gender discrimination in the workplace: A literature review. *Communications of the ACM*, 38(1): 58-59.

JOHANSSON, M., KATZ, K. & NYMAN, H. 2005. Wage Differentials and gender discrimination: Changes in Sweden 1981-98. *Acta Sociologica*, 48(4): 341-364.

KARA, O. 2006. Occupational gender wage discrimination in Turkey. *Journal of Economic Studies*, 33(2): 130-143.

LERNER, M.J. 1980. The *belief in a just world: A fundamental delusion*. New York: NY: Plenum.

LOUIS, N.C., ALEXANDROS, P. & KONSTANTINOS, V. 2013. Gender wage gaps, 'sticky floors' and 'glass ceilings' in Europe. *Labour Economics*, 21: 86–102.

LUTHANS, F. 2011. *Organizational behavior: An evidence-based approach* (12th ed.). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

MOORHEAD, G. & GRIFFIN, R.W. 2014. *Managing organizational behavior* (11th ed.). Florence, KY: South-Western Cengage Learning.

MUNASINGHE, L., REIF, T. & HENRIQUES, A. 2008. Gender gap in wage returns to job tenure and experience. *Labour Economics*, 15(6): 1296-1316.

MYERS, D.G. 2008. *Social psychology* (9th ed.). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

NADEAU, S., WALSH, W. & WETTON, C. 1993. Gender wage discrimination: Methodological issues and empirical results for a Canadian public sector employer. *Applied Economics*, 25(2): 227-242.

NEL, J. & STEYN, R. 2012. The effects of female parliamentary representation and gender quotas on scholastic empowerment of girls in sub-Saharan Africa: A

test of the effects of in-group bias. *International Journal of Psychology,* 47: 310.

ORNSTEIN, M. 2011. Cohort and period perspectives on gender, education, and earnings in Canada. *Canadian Public Policy*, 37: S95-S113.

PALLANT, J. 2010. *SPSS survival manual* (4th ed.). Berkshire, UK: McGraw-Hill.

PETIT, P. 2007. The effects of age and family constraints on gender hiring discrimination: A field experiment in the French financial sector. *Labour Economics*, 14(3): 371-391.

PUDNEY, S. & SHIELDS, M.A. 2000. Gender and racial discrimination in pay and promotion for NHS nurses. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 62(5): 801-836.

ROSNOW, R.L. & ROSENTHAL, R. 2008. *Beginning behavioural research: A conceptual primer* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Prentice Hall.

RSA (Republic of South Africa). 1996. *Constitution of South Africa, Act No.108 of 1996.* Available at http://www.info.gov.za/documents/constitution/1996/a108-96.pdf [Accessed 2012-03-07].

RSA (Republic of South Africa). 1998. *Employment Equity Act, Act No. 55 of 1998*. Available at https://www.labour.gov.za/downloads/legislation/acts/employment-equity/Act%20-%20Employment%20Equity.pdf [Accessed 2012-03-07].

RSA (Republic of South Africa). 2000. *Promotion of Equality and Prevention of Unfair Discrimination Act, Act No. 4 of 2000*. Available at http://www.justice.gov.za/legislation/acts/2000-004.pdf [Accessed 2012-03-07].

SHAINBROOK, J., ROBERTS, T.J. & TRISCARI, R. 2011. Research administrator salary: Association with education, experience, credentials and gender. *Journal of Research Administration*, 42(2): 87-99.

SLOANE, P.J. & THEODOSSIOU, I. 1993. Gender and job tenure effects on earnings. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 55(4): 421-437.

SOLBERG, E. 1999. Using occupational preference in estimating market wage discrimination: The case of the gender pay gap. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 58(1): 86-113.

SOLBERG, E.J. 2004. Occupational assignment, hiring discrimination, and the gender pay gap. *Atlantic Economic Journal*, 32(1): 11-27.

STANLEY, T.D. & JARRELL, S.B. 1998. Gender wage discrimination bias? A meta-regression analysis. *Journal of Human Resources*, 33(4): 947-973.

STATISTICS SOUTH AFRICA. 2012a. *The South Africa I know, the home I understand.* Available at http://www.statssa.gov.za/Census2011/Products/Census_2011 _Pictorial.pdf [Accessed 2013-08-23]

STATISTICS SOUTH AFRICA. 2012b. *Census 2011: Statistical release (Revised)*. Available at http://www.statssa.gov.za/Publications/P03014/P030142011.pdf [Accessed 2013-08-23]

STEYN, A.G.W., SMIT, C.F., DU TOIT, S.H.C. & STRASHEIM, C. 2013. *Modern statistics in practice* (9th ed.). Pretoria: Van Sckaik.

STEYN, H.S. 2000. Practical significance of the differences in means. *Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 26(3): 1-3.

YAMAUCHI, F. & TIONGCO, M. 2013. Why women are progressive in education? Gender disparities in human capital, labor markets, and family arrangement in the Philippines. *Economics of Education Review*, 32: 196-206.

CHAPTER 5
ARTICLE 4

In this chapter, the third of four articles is presented. This particular article is aimed at examining the third objective of the study, *to analyse differences between managers and employees as far as their perceptions of gender-based discrimination in the workplace are concerned.* The title of the article, as presented to the *South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences*, was “Differences between managers and employees regarding perceptions of gender-based discrimination in a selection of South African organisations”. The format of the article is in line with the guidelines to authors published by the journal.

Differences between managers' and employees' perceptions of gender-based discrimination in a selection of South African organisations

Abstract:

Introduction: *The relationship between employees and employers depends, among other things, on the level of consensus on what is perceived as fair or unfair in the workplace. When these perceptions are similar, a certain harmony results, but when there are appreciable differences, conflict may follow.* ***Objective:*** *To gauge the levels of difference in gender-based discrimination perceived by managers and employees.* ***Method:*** *Information was gathered from 145 managers and 1 740 employees working for 29 organisations, using the Fair Treatment at Work Survey and the Gender-Based Discrimination Questionnaire. This was a cross-sectional quantitative research design.* ***Results:*** *Both managers and employees pointed to gender-based discrimination as the primary source of discrimination in the workplace, more so than race or ethnicity. When presented with a list of the consequences of discrimination, managers and employees provided similar ranking orders. Confronted with the question of whether males or females enjoyed more privileges at the appointment, promotion, training and development levels, or whether remuneration for both gender groups was perceived as fair, managers and employees answered similarly. They agreed that most gender-based discrimination occurs at the appointment and promotion levels, and that less discrimination is experienced at the training, development and fair remuneration levels. They also concurred that discrimination sometimes occurs in favour of males and on certain occasions in favour of females.* ***Conclusions:*** *No real differences were found in the ways in which both managers and employees viewed the levels of discrimination in the workplace. The fact that gender-based discrimination was the most frequently listed type of discrimination suggests that more interventions should be implemented for its elimination*.

Keywords: gender; discrimination; appointment; promotion; remuneration; South Africa.

1 Introduction

This article discusses managers' and employees' perceptions of gender-based discrimination in the workplace. According to Robbins and Judge (2011), managers are concerned with the employee attitudes reflected in shifting perceptions of race, gender and other diversity issues. This concern may be valid, as perceptions often influence behaviour (Myers, 2008). The greater the difference in perceptions on an important issue, the greater is the possibility of conflict (Robbins & Judge, 2011). Moorhead and Griffen (2008: 411), referring to the context of the workplace, state

that “conflict also may arise between people who have different beliefs or perceptions about some aspect of their work or their organization”.

Conflict between managers and employees may be considered to be intergroup conflict. This type of conflict could relate to the fact that managers and employees have different goals (Moorhead & Griffen, 2008) or mutually exclusive aims (Ivancevick, Konopaske & Matteso, 2014). Intergroup conflict may also be the result of status incongruence (Ivancevick et al., 2014). The matter of status incongruence and conflict can be grounded in critical theory (Max Horkheimer), which proposes that the truth is created and uncreated by human beings, mostly by people in positions of authority (Higgs & Smith, 2006). Other theories which may be applicable are the social identity theory (Tajfel, 1981; Turner & Reynolds, 2004) and group-serving bias (Pettigrew, 1997), which explains differences in perceptions based purely on group membership. Social identity theory states, inter alia, that individuals contrast their own group (in-group) with others (out-group) and develop a favourable bias towards their own entity (Myers, 2008). Group-serving bias builds on this and submits that in-group members explain away or negate the *positive* behaviours of out-group members (attributing them to situational circumstances) and ascribe *negative* behaviours disproportionately to out-group members’ dispositions (personality and values), rather than more appropriately to situational circumstances (Myers, 2008). Tension between management and employees therefore seems inevitable.

In the context of South African labour legislation, the tension between employers (who often include managers) and employees is evident. The Basic Conditions of Employment Act (RSA, 1997), for example, describes the duties of employers when dealing with situations involving employees. Empirical studies conducted in South Africa submit that employers are involved in gender-based discrimination (see Ncayiyana, 2011; Pretorius, De Villiers Human, Niemann, Klinck & Alt 2002; Stone & Coetzee 2005). The topic of employers as agents of discrimination who therefore occupy a different and unequal position to that of employees is also evident in human resource management literature. Grogan (2007), for example, defines discrimination as the *action* whereby some are afforded benefits and others are denied access to them. Cascio (2010) adds a group element, stating that discrimination entails a group of individuals being *given* preferential treatment over others. Referring to gender-based discrimination, Channer, Abbassi

and Ujan (2011) maintain that discrimination entails *giving* an unfair advantage or disadvantage to members of a particular gender rather than to members of the other gender. It is therefore through actions or activities that employers and managers discriminate in the workplace.

The aim of this article is to contrast the perceptions by managers and employees regarding gender-based discrimination in the workplace. Should managers and employees differ in the way they perceive discrimination in the workplace, tension may arise, which could lead to disputes. However, knowledge of such differences, and knowing exactly where the greatest number of differences occur, may lead to awareness, which could minimise the likelihood of disputes. Awareness of where differences occur may also give rise to interventions that could create greater congruence between managers and employees.

2 Method

2.1 Respondents

Two groups of respondents participated in this study. The first group was comprised of managers who had a direct influence on the appointment, promotion and remuneration of employees. Five managers per organisation were targeted, namely the most senior human resource manager, the general manager, and three other senior managers, all of whom were directly involved in decision-making relating to personnel. Purposive sampling was used when selecting the managers (Cooper & Schindler, 2011). Only managers from relatively large organisations were involved. In order to qualify for inclusion in the study, the organisations had to have a diverse workforce of at least 30 males and 30 females. The second group involved in the study was comprised of employees of these relatively large organisations where the managers worked. In each organisation, a random sample of 30 males and 30 females was drawn. This amounted to the stratified random sampling (Cooper & Schindler, 2011) of employees. In total, 29 organisations participated in the study. The companies approached were those to which students enrolled for the Master of Business Leadership programme at the Unisa Graduate School of Business Leadership had access, primarily on account of their own employment in these organisations. It was therefore a convenient organisational sample (Cooper & Schindler, 2011).

2.2 Procedure and approach

Data on discrimination was collected by means of the Fair Treatment at Work Survey and the Gender-Based Discrimination Questionnaire. Respondents were asked to rank items (using the Fair Treatment at Work Survey) and to select options (in the Gender-Based Discrimination Questionnaire). The method of data collection represented a quantitative study. As the data was collected at a particular point in time, it can be seen as a cross-sectional design. This particular design is suitable for describing the population and relationships between variables (Shaughnessy, Zechmeister & Zechmeister, 2009). Before the managers and employees were asked to complete the questionnaires, they were given informed consent forms. After consenting, they were requested to answer all the questions that applied to them. They were requested to provide answers based only on perceptions of their workplace, and not workplaces in general.

2.3 Measurements

Managers and employees were asked three questions about their work situation. The first two came from the Fair Treatment at Work Survey (Grainger & Fitzner, 2007). The questions in the Fair Treatment at Work Survey held different emphases for managers and employees. The first question put to managers read as follows: “In the last two years at this organisation, has anyone been treated unfairly because of any of the following?” The equivalent question to the employees was: “In the last two years with this organisation, have you been treated unfairly because of any of the following?” The respondents could select any one (or more) of 19 possible reasons for saying they had been treated unfairly. This list included age, gender, nationality, religion, race or ethnic group, and 14 other possible reasons. The second question, also originating from the Fair Treatment at Work Survey, related to the consequences of the unfair treatment listed. For managers, it read as follows: “To what did the unfair treatment you have personally witnessed relate?” Question 2 for employees read as follows: “To what did the unfair treatment you have personally experienced relate?” The respondents could select any one (or more) of 18 possible consequences of being treated unfairly. These included salary, pension, other benefits, perks and bonuses other than pay, as well as 13 other possibilities. The data generated was ranked in order of the frequency of endorsements.

Question 3 related to access to the organisational resources and was comprised of four similar sub-questions. (Managers and employees were asked exactly the same question). In answer to the first sub-question, the respondents had to select one of three options:

(1) It is easier for a woman to get appointed to this organisation than it is for a man;

(2) It is equally difficult for a man or a woman to get appointed to this organisation; and

(3) It is easier for a man to get appointed to this organisation than it is for a woman.

The next three sub-questions were identical in structure to the first, except that the content related to promotion, access to training and development, and equal pay for equal work, instead of appointments. This measure was called the Gender-Based Discrimination Questionnaire, which was developed specifically for this research. Answers were treated as categorical data.

2.4 Data analysis

The data was presented as frequencies and per organisational position, as differences in scores between managers and employees were expected. In the case of the Fair Treatment at Work Survey, the statistical difference in ranking between the organisational position groups was calculated by using the Spearman rank-order correlation formula. The differences in scores for males and females on the Gender-Based Discrimination Questionnaire were calculated using the Pearson chi-square test. In all cases a significant level of less than .01 was seen as significant.

2.5 Ethical considerations

Several ethical considerations were applicable in this study. The first was the use of students as fieldworkers. The students benefitted from collecting the data, which they used when writing their Master of Business Leadership research reports. A possible second ethical concern could be that students accessed respondents in the organisations where they were working, which could have allowed them to exercise undue influence over the respondents. This matter was addressed partly by the requirement that the chief executive officer or director general first had to grant permission to conduct the research (suggesting that the student did not have

ultimate authority in the setting). The students also had to obtain consent from the respondents. The informed consent form clearly stated that participation in the survey was voluntary and all the respondents gave consent before entering into the research.

3 Results

In total, data from 1 740 employees and 145 managers, working for 29 different companies, was captured. There were 871 male and 869 female employees. No enquiries were made about the gender of the managers as their anonymity would have been compromised, given that only five managers per company were targeted. The respondents were mostly from financial service providers (seven organisations), the government (seven organisations) and the mining sector (four organisations). Other sectors included the hospitality industry, the manufacturing industry and agriculture.

The results pertaining to Question 1, on the type of discrimination to which employees were exposed, and which managers witnessed at their respective companies, are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Sources of unfair treatment at work

Question 1 In the last two years with "this organisation" have you been treated unfairly (employees) / have you witnessed someone being treated unfairly (managers) because of any of the following?	Number of endorsements, percentage, and ranking: Managers (N=145)			Number of endorsements, percentage, and ranking: Employees (N=1 740)		
	Count	%	Rank	Count	%	Rank
My age	12	8.3	8	162	9.3	4
My gender	28	19.3	1	210	12.1	1
My nationality	16	11	4	86	4.9	10
My religion	5	3.4	16.5	56	3.2	14
My race or ethnic group	22	15.2	2.5	188	10.8	2
My sexual orientation	6	4.1	14.5	39	2.2	18
My disability	9	2.6	10	27	1.6	19
My long-term illness	14	9.7	6	40	2.3	17
My marital status	7	4.8	13	80	4.6	11.5
My political beliefs	10	6.9	9	52	3.0	15
My skin colour	22	15.2	2.5	171	9.8	3
My physical appearance	6	4.1	14.5	76	4.4	13
The way I dress	5	3.4	16.5	111	6.4	5
Being pregnant	13	9.0	7	48	2.8	16
Union membership	15	10.3	5	88	5.1	9
Accent or the way I speak	8	5.5	11.5	94	5.4	7
Address or where I live	3	2.1	18.5	80	4.6	11.5
My social class	3	2.1	18.5	89	5.1	8
My family responsibilities	8	5.5	11.5	102	5.9	6

The Spearman rank-order correlation was calculated to determine whether the groups entertained similar thoughts on the sources of unfair treatment in the workplace. The Spearman rank-order correlation value was .339, which was not significant at the .01 level. The rankings were therefore not similar, implying that managers and employees reported differently on their testimony and experience of unfair treatment in the workplace. However, this result should be interpreted with caution, as the type of discrimination most frequently witnessed by managers and experienced by employees was gender-based. For both groups, gender was associated also with race or ethnic group and skin colour. Thus, despite the lists not being statistically similar, a definite overlap occurs at the top. Here, gender, the topic of this paper, is placed first by both groups.

As the main focus of this research is on gender-based discrimination, the significance of the difference in gender-based discrimination was considered in greater detail. Table 2 provides information on the count data in a two-by-two table

reflecting position (management / employee) and reported gender discrimination (yes / no).

Table 2

Perceived unfair treatment based on gender by organisational position

Question	Position	
	Employees	Managers
No: No gender discrimination	1 529 (87.9%)	117 (80.7%)
Yes: Gender discrimination	210 (12.1%)	28 (19.3%)
Total	1 739 (100.0%)	145 (100.0%)

Like Table 1, Table 2 shows that 12.1% of the employees reported falling victim to gender-based discrimination, while 19.3% of managers reported witnessing gender-based discrimination. The Pearson chi-square value was 6.347 (degrees of freedom = 1) and the asymptotic significance (2-sided) was equal to .012, and (just) more than .01, which indicated that the rows and columns of the contingency were not dependent. The Cramer's V value, indicative of effect size, was .058 (p = .012), which indicates a lesser effect. Employees and managers therefore did not differ in the degree to which they reported on gender-based discrimination. This result should also be treated with caution, as the significance level is close to the fixed critical level of .01, which "became entrenched in minds of leading journal editors" (Rosenthal, Rosnow & Rubin, 2009: 5). The value should be used as a guide, rather than as a reason for sanctification (Rosenthal et al., 2009).

In Table 3 the consequences of discrimination per position are presented.

Table 3

Consequences of unfair treatment

Question 2 To what did the unfair treatment you have personally experienced (employees) or witnessed (managers) relate too?	Number of endorsements, percentage, and rankings: Managers (N=145)			Number of endorsements, percentage, and rankings: Employees (N=1740)		
	Count	%	Rank	Count	%	Rank
The pay you receive	18	12.4	7.5	388	22.3	1
Your pension	5	3.4	18	103	5.9	14
Other benefits, perks and bonuses, besides pay	21	14.5	4	343	19.7	2
Your working hours	18	12.4	7.5	200	11.5	7
Taking holidays	8	5.5	15	194	11.1	8
Applying for a job (horizontal movement)	24	16.6	2.5	222	12.8	6
Being promoted (vertical movement)	34	23.4	1	331	19.0	3
Receiving training	24	16.6	2.5	238	13.7	5
Disciplinary action	15	10.3	10	94	5.4	15
Redundancy	7	4.8	17	55	3.2	17
Early retirement	8	5.5	15	27	1.6	18
Being allowed to work flexibly (changing hours of work)	11	7.6	11.5	131	7.5	12
Being ignored	17	11.7	9	259	14.9	4
Being excluded from social activities	9	6.2	13	123	7.1	13
Not being part of social group	8	5.5	15	92	5.3	16
Type of work given	19	13.1	5.5	189	10.9	9
Bullying/ harassment	19	13.1	5.5	135	7.8	11
Falsely accused of something	11	7.6	11.5	141	8.1	10

The Spearman rank-order correlation, calculated to analyse the correlation between the lists, was .753, which was significant at the .001 level. The rankings were therefore similar, suggesting that the workplace consequences of discrimination observed by managers and experienced by employees are comparable. Managers primarily perceived the consequences of discrimination as relating to promotions, job applications and receiving training, while employees viewed the effects of discrimination as relating to pay received, benefits besides pay and promotion.

The results pertaining to data gathered by means of the Gender-Based Discrimination Questionnaire are presented in the following tables. It is important to note that exactly the same questions were posed to the managers and the employees. Regarding the question on the fairness of the appointment process, approximately 61% of the respondents agreed that no gender-based discrimination occurred during this process.

Table 4

Perceived discrimination during appointments by position

Question	Position	
	Employees	Managers
It is easier for a woman to get appointed at … than it is for a man.	386 (22.3%)	25 (17.2%)
It is equally difficult for a man or a woman to get appointed at ...	1 062 (61.3%)	89 (61.4%)
It is easier for a man to get appointed at … than it is for a woman.	285 (16.4%)	31 (21.4%)
Total	1 733 (100%)	145 (100%)

Differences in scores between managers' and employees' perceptions were calculated, with the Pearson chi-square value of 3.484 (degrees of freedom = 2). The asymptotic significance (2-sided) was .175, and more than .01, indicating that the rows and columns of the contingency were not dependent. Table 4 shows that pro-female discrimination was reported more often by employees than by managers (22.3% versus 17.2%) and that pro-male discrimination was reported more often by managers than by employees (21.4% versus 16.4%).

Apropos of the promotion process, approximately 62% of all respondents selecting the middle option reported no difference in the way males and females were treated.

Table 5

Perceived discrimination regarding promotions by position

Question	Position	
	Employees	Managers
It is easier for a woman to get promoted at ... than it is for a man.	359 (20.7%)	26 (17.9%)
It is equally difficult for a man or a woman to get promoted at ...	1 074 (62.0%)	90 (62.1%)
It is easier for a man to get promoted at ... than it is for a woman.	299 (17.3%)	29 (20.0%)
Total	1 732 (100%)	145 (100%)

Differences between perceptions by managers and employees were calculated, with the Pearson chi-square value being 1.084 (degrees of freedom = 2) and the asymptotic significance (2-sided) equal to .582, and more than .01. This indicates that the rows and columns of the contingency were independent. Although the differences are not significant, it is interesting to note that employees reported

more pro-female discrimination (20.7% versus 19.9%) whereas managers reported more incidents of pro-male discrimination (20.0% versus 17.3%).

Regarding access to training and development, most respondents, almost 76%, reported that males and females were treated equally.

Table 6

Perceived discrimination regarding access to training and development by position

Question	Position	
	Employees	Managers
It is easier for a woman to get access to training and development at ... than it is for a man.	227 (13.1%)	17 (11.7%)
It is equally difficult for a man or a woman to get access to training and development at ...	1 310 (75.8%)	110 (75.9%)
It is easier for a man to get access to training and development at ... than it is for a woman.	192 (11.1%)	18 (12.4%)
Total	1 729 (100%)	145 (100%)

Differences between perceptions by managers and employees were calculated, with the Pearson chi-square value being .408 (degrees of freedom = 2) and the asymptotic significance (2-sided) equal to .816, and more than .01. This indicates that the rows and columns of the contingency were independent. As for appointments and promotions, employees reported more pro-female discrimination (13.1% and 11.7%), whereas managers reported more pro-male discrimination (12.4% versus 11.1%).

When it came to equal pay for equal work, fewer employees (76.5%) than managers (81.4%) reported that no discrimination occurred.

Table 7

Perceived discrimination regarding equal-pay for equal work by position

Question	Position	
	Employees	Managers
Generally women get paid more than what would equate to their inputs, compared to men	133 (7.7%)	2 (1.4%)
The rule of equal pay for equal work is enforced at ...	1 321 (76.5%)	118 (81.4%)
Generally men get paid more than what would equate to their inputs, compared to women	273 (15.8%)	25 (17.2%)
Total	1 727 (100%)	145 (100%)

The differences between male and female perceptions were calculated, with the Pearson chi-square value being 8.002 (degrees of freedom = 2) and the asymptotic significance (2-sided) equal to .018, and (just) more than .01. This indicates that the rows and columns of the contingency were independent. The Cramer's V value, which is indicative of effect size, was .068 (p = .018), which indicates a small effect. As in the case of the previous processes, employees reported more pro-female discrimination (7.7% versus 1.4%) and managers more pro-male discrimination (17.2% versus 15.8%).

4 Discussion

In this article the perceptions of gender-based discrimination by managers and employees are contrasted. Should managers and employees differ in the way they perceive discrimination in the workplace, tension may arise that could lead to disputes. However, knowledge of such differences may bring awareness, which could minimise the likelihood of conflict.

The responses reported in this article are those of male and female employees, almost exactly 50 per cent of each. The managers' gender was not asked for, but, given recent reports (see South African Institute of Race Relations, 2012), it may be assumed that the managerial group was dominated by males.

Table 1 shows that both managers and employees perceived gender to be the primary reason for unfair treatment in the workplace. This finding coincides with the reports by Stangor, Lynch, Duan and Glass (1992), who stated that people are more

attuned to gender than to any other characteristic, including race, when considering interpersonal differences.

Employees were asked about their own experiences of discrimination, while managers were asked about witnessing such acts. When comparing the percentage of incidents in which managers had witnessed gender-based discrimination with the percentage of incidents in which employees had experienced discrimination, one may expect the percentage of managers who had witnessed discrimination to be higher than the percentage of employees experiencing the same. One reason for expecting this difference was that employees were limited to reporting on themselves, whilst managers could report on many other details. The difference could also be anticipated, given the person/group discrimination discrepancy (Dixon, Durrheim, Tredoux, Tropp, Clack & Eaton, 2010; Taylor, Wright, Moghaddam & Lalonde, 1990), which suggests that individuals (say male managers) rate the discrimination suffered by their group (e.g. gender-based discrimination) as more severe than that suffered personally (say as male managers). As can be read from Table 2, this difference was not significant and the percentage of managers witnessing gender-based discrimination did not differ significantly from the percentage of employees experiencing discrimination. This result was not expected and it could be argued that managers are not sensitive enough to the discrimination experienced by employees.

The consequences or outcomes of discrimination in the workplace are perceived similarly by managers and employees ($\rho = 753$; $p < .001$). It is interesting to note that Table 3 shows managers referring primarily to human resource processes (namely promotions, job applications and receiving training), while employees refer to more concrete and direct outcomes (pay received, as well as benefits other than pay and promotion) when they report on these consequences. This result indicates that, although managers may present the outcomes of discrimination in a more abstract manner, managers and employees largely concur on the outcomes of discrimination.

When using the Gender-Based Discrimination Questionnaire, managers and employees were shown to have similar perceptions of discrimination, as reflected in the non-significant results found with the chi-square tests performed. Tables 4-7 show that managers and employees agree to a similar extent that gender discrimination is not present in the workplace. With reference to the appointment

process, 61.4% of managers and 61.3% of employees reported no discrimination. For the promotion process, these figures were 62.1% and 62.0%. With regards to access to training and development they were 75.9% and 75.8%. In the case of fairness in remuneration, the difference was greater, with 81.4% of managers reporting no discrimination, compared with 76.5% of employees. Even this greater difference was not statistically significant. Other than this, managers and employees held similar perceptions of non-discrimination in different human resource management processes.

Considering the Gender-Based Discrimination Questionnaire, it is interesting to note that managers reported less pro-female discrimination and more pro-male discrimination (see Tables 4 - 7). With reference to fair remuneration, for example, in Table 4, employees reported pro-female discrimination more often than managers did (22.3% versus 17.2%), whereas pro-male discrimination was reported more often by managers (21.4% versus 16.4%). However, these differences were not significant and may constitute a topic for investigation at a later stage.

A further important point pertaining to the Gender-Based Discrimination Questionnaire is the agreement between managers and employees on the stages at which most incidents of discrimination occur, in other words, where non-discrimination is at the lowest levels. Tables 4 and 5 show that the level of non-discrimination at the appointment level was about 61/62%, and that both managers and employees judged it to be at that level. Approximately the same result was found when it came to promotions. More non-discrimination occurs at access to training and development (around 76 %) and even more at the remuneration level (see Tables 6 and 7). This proposes that most episodes of discrimination occur at the appointment and promotion levels and that the least of these incidents occur at the access to training and development and remuneration stages. Managers and employees agree about this.

5 Conclusion

This research focused on the differences between managers and employees on their experiences of workplace discrimination, specifically gender-based discrimination. The results show that both managers and employees deem gender-based discrimination to be the most important source of discrimination in the workplace. Interventions into the elimination of discrimination should therefore focus on this type

of discrimination rather than on the issue of race, which seems paramount in most initiatives in South Africa. The proliferation of programmes such as Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment (RSA, 2003) echoes the emphasis currently placed on race. No gender-based equivalence of such a programme is available.

Although managers perceived discrimination to be the most pertinent source of discrimination in the workplace, it was expected that they would proportionately witness more discrimination than that experienced by employees. It may thus be hypothesised that managers are not sufficiently alert in detecting discrimination in the workplace. It could be suggested that managers receive sensitivity training to become more aware of the manifestations of discrimination in the workplace. Frame-of-reference training seems effective in this regard (Bernardin & Buckley, 1981), while rater-error-training seems to have some positive short-term effects (Fay & Latham, 1982).

Managers and employees are in consensus that most discrimination occurs at the appointment and promotion levels and that the least discrimination occurs at the access to training and development and remuneration levels. This consensus opens up the opportunity for human resource practitioners to focus on the first two practices when they develop programmes, as this seems to be important to both managers and employees. The level of consensus at the human resource practice level could also be used to leverage co-operation between managers and their employees. Human resource managers or individuals involved in organisational change interventions should take note of this consensus.

The research had some limitations. The first relates to the difference between the questions posed to the managers and employees. Although the response repertoires were identical, Questions 1 and 2 (posed to both managers and employees) differed slightly. This limited the possibility of comparing the responses. A further limitation was that the respondents were asked about the effects of discrimination in general in the workplace. The question therfore did not direct their attention specifically to gender-based discrimination. The results reported may thus be ambiguous, but it should also be noted that gender-based discrimination was mentioned most often by both managers and employees.

References

Bernardin, HJ & MR Buckley 1981. A consideration of strategies in rater training. *Academy of Management Review*, 6: 205-212.

Cascio, WF 2010. *Managing human resources: Productivity, quality of life, profits.* 8th ed. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill Irwin.

Channar, ZA, Z Abbassi & IA Ujan 2011. Gender discrimination in the workforce and its impact on the employees. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce & Social Sciences*, 5(1): 177-191.

Cooper, DR & PS Schindler 2011. *Business research methods.* 11th ed. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Dixon, J, K Durrheim, C Tredoux, L Tropp, B Clack & L Eaton 2010. A paradox of integration? Interracial contact, prejudice reduction, and perceptions of racial discrimination. *Journal of Social Issues*, 66(2): 401-416.

Fay, CH & GP Latham 1982. Effects of training and rating scales on rating errors. *Personnel Psychology*, 35: 105-116.

Grainger, H & G Fitzner 2007. *The First Fair Treatment at Work Survey: Executive summary-updated*. Retrieved from www.bis.gov.uk/files/file38386.pdf [Accessed 25 January 2012].

Grogan, J 2007. *Dismissal, discrimination and unfair labour practices.* 2nd ed. Cape Town: Juta.

Higgs, P & J Smith 2006. *Rethinking truth.* 2nd ed. Cape Town: Juta.

Ivancevick, JM, R Konopaske & MT Matteso 2014. *Organizational behavior and management.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Moorhead, G & RW Griffen 2008. *Managing organizational behaviour*. 10th ed. Florence, KY: South-Western Cengage Learning.

Myers, DG 2008. *Social psychology.* 9th ed. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

Ncayiyana, DJ 2011. Feminisation of the South African medical profession: Not yet nirvana for gender equity. *South African Medical Journal*, 101(1): 5.

Pettigrew, TF 1997. Generalized intergroup contact effects on prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23: 173-185.

Pretorius, E, S De Villiers Human, R Niemann, E Klinck & H Alt 2002. Fighting from within: Gender equity at the University of the Free State. *Acta Academica*, 3(1): 1-38.

Robbins, SP & TA Judge 2011. *Organizational behavior.* 14th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson / Prentice Hall.

Rosenthal, R, RL Rosnow & DB Rubin 2009. *Contrasts and effect size in behavioral research: A correlational approach.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

RSA (Republic of South Africa) 1997. *Basic Conditions of Employment Act, Act 75 of 1997*. Retrieved http://www.info.gov.za/view/DownloadFileAction?id=70820 [Accessed 27 September 2013].

RSA (Republic of South Africa) 2003. *Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment Act, Act No. 53 of 2003*. Retrieved from https://www.environment.gov.za/sites/default/files/legislations/bbbee_act.pdf [Accessed 23 September 2013].

Shaughnessy, JJ, EB Zechmeister & JS Zechmeister 2009. *Research methods in psychology.* 8th ed. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

South African Institute of Race Relations 2012. *The South Africa survey: Employment.* Retrieved from http://www.sairr.org.za/services/publications/south-africa-survey/south-africa-survey-2012/downloads/pp215-284.Employ.05Dec12.pdf [Accessed 23 September 2013].

Stangor, C, L Lynch, C Duan & B Glass 1992. Categorization of individuals on the basis of multiple social features. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62: 207-218.

Stone, K & M Coetzee 2005. Levelling the playing field: Reducing barriers to mentoring for women protégées in the South African organisational context. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 3(3): 33-39.

Tajfel, H 1981. *Human groups and social categories: Studies in social psychology*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Taylor, DM, SC Wright, FM Moghaddam & RN Lalonde 1990. The personal/group discrimination discrepancy: Perceiving my group but not myself to be a target for discrimination. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 16: 256-262.

Turner, JC & KJ Reynolds 2004. *The social identity perspective in intergroup relations: Theories, themes and controversies*. In MB Brewer & M Hewstone (eds.), *Self and social identity* (pp. 259-277), Oxford: Blackwell.

CHAPTER 6
CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this chapter, the conclusions based on the results of the literature review and the empirical investigation are presented. This is followed by a discussion on the limitations of the study. Lastly, recommendations are made, directed first at researchers on this topic, and then at managers and human resource practitioners.

6.1 CONCLUSIONS

Conclusions are made on the literature review and the empirical investigation.

6.1.1 Conclusions concerning the literature review

The literature created the background for the empirical investigation.

In **Article 1,** discrimination and gender-based discrimination were contextualised within the South African legislative framework. The Constitution of South Africa (RSA, 1996), the Labour Relations Act (RSA, 1995), the Employment Equity Act (RSA, 1998) and the Promotion of Equality and Prevention of Unfair Discrimination Act (RSA, 2000) were all applicable. In this article, managers were described as active agents in discrimination, given their roles described in legislation as well as in human resource literature. The bulk of the literature in Article 1 was dedicated to identifying possible points in human resource management processes at which discrimination could occur. Three points were identified: during appointment, at promotion level and at the determination of remuneration. Discrimination during the individual human resource management processes was discussed. The literature proposed that gender-based discrimination often occurs during the compilation of job analyses or post descriptions, as part of recruitment strategies, during screening activities, including when psychometric assessments are applied, as well as during interviews. The literature further proposes that decision-making following administrative processes plays an important role in discrimination. The literature

anchored the questions posed to the managers during the interviews conducted to gather the empirical data for Article 1.

It is important to report that the gathered literature reflecting the views presented in comprehensive human resource management textbooks failed to fully describe the phenomenon of gender-based discrimination in the workplace. The political environment within which human resource planning and strategy occurs was not mentioned. This was revealed during the empirical investigation and therefore seems important within the South African context. It ought to be considered when gender-based discrimination is discussed.

The literature in **Article 2** initially focused on defining discrimination and gender-based discrimination. This was done using textbooks on human resource management. As in the case of Article 1, gender-based discrimination was also contextualised with reference to South African legislation. Further, the Constitution of South Africa (RSA, 1996) and the Labour Relations Act (RSA, 1995) were applicable. Following that, the effect of perceived discrimination on mental health and workplace behaviour was discussed. Mental health symptoms include stress, anxiety and depression, while workplace outcomes include a decrease in job satisfaction, commitment and organisational citizen behaviour. Also discussed in Article 2 was the role played by group membership in the development of perceptions of others and perceptions of being discriminated against. Social identity theory and group-serving bias were discussed.

The literature reviewed and presented in Article 2 provided an appropriate context for the empirical study that followed and gave structure to the interpretation of the empirical results.

In **Article 3,** gender-based discrimination was legislatively contextualised with reference to the Employment Equity Act (RSA, 1998), which defines fair and unfair discrimination in the workplace in the South African context. The principles of equity theory were discussed in the literature, with specific reference to what amounts to inputs and outcomes within the world of work. From the literature it was evident that effort, experience, education and qualifications were common inputs, with pay,

recognition and intrinsic rewards frequently being mentioned as outcomes. Gender differences in the ratio of inputs and outcomes were discussed, and specific attention was given to education, age, tenure, experience and family responsibility (as inputs) and remuneration (as outcome). The wage gap was also discussed, and it is reported that the income of males and females of the same age differs.

The literature presented in Article 3 provided an empirical reference base for the use of education, age, tenure, experience and family responsibility as input variables when calculating fairness in remuneration.

In **Article 4,** managers were contrasted with employees, based on philosophical, theoretical and practical information. Critical theory, social identity theory, group-serving bias and generic human resource management literature were applicable. The literature reviewed and presented in Article 4 substantiated a comparison between those in power (managers) and those possessing less power (employees).

6.1.2 Conclusions concerning the empirical investigation

The empirical investigation succeeded in providing a broad and comprehensive picture of gender-based discrimination in South-Africa.

From **Article 1,** it is evident that most managers agree that gender-based discrimination occurs most frequently at the promotional level, less at the appointment level, and least often at the stage of the determination of remuneration. Managers also report that discrimination is not consistently against a particular gender grouping. In the case of promotions, for example, discrimination seems to be in favour of women, while at the appointment level it seems to be in in favour of men.

Managers also report different levels of the implementation of formal policies to manage discrimination within the workplace, depending on the particular human resource management process used. Policies favoring women are most often enforced at the appointment level and least often at the remuneration level, according to the responses by managers. Managers also seem to be generally

unaware of the legislative framework that governs human resource practices, as they seldom report that their decision-making is guided by policies.

The empirical results in Article 1 sketch gender-based discrimination as a complex issue whereby managers report uneven levels of discrimination at the various stages in the human resource processes, with outcomes which are gender-specific, depending on the process involved. Where affirmative policies are enforced, this also seems to depend on the specific human resource process at hand. Furthermore, it also identifies legal literacy as a developmental area.

The empirical results reported in **Article 2** reflect that women reported more incidents of discrimination at work and that they reported gender-based discrimination more often than men did. However, when males and females were provided with a long list of discriminatory incidents to which they were exposed, males and females reported similar experiences. They reported almost identically on the consequences of discrimination - differences in pay as well as the inequality of perks and bonuses.

Although most employees reported on the absence of discrimination in the workplace, some males and some females reported, in very similar ways, low levels of *positive* discrimination and high levels of *negative* discrimination against their own groups. These results were supportive of the group-serving bias theory.

It can therefore be concluded that both males and females experience gender-based discrimination in the workplace and that the effects of discrimination are very similar for both groups. Also, in keeping with social identity theory and group-serving bias, these perceptions differ, depending on the reporter's group affiliation.

In **Article 3,** the gender wage gap was not confirmed. Although males reported higher post gradings and higher salaries than those of females, this difference was not statistically or practically significant. The input variables (qualification types, job-specific training, membership of professional bodies, work experience, family responsibility, union membership and the type of work performed) did not differentially influence outcomes (post grading and salary) along gender lines, with

one exception. This exception related to the unfair treatment of males, particularly well-qualified males.

From **Article 3**, it can be concluded that, given the data gathered for this study, the gender wage gap has been closed in South Africa and that the gender groups are, given the ratio of concrete and tangible measures of workplace inputs and outcomes, treated fairly in the workplace.

From the empirical results reported in **Article 4,** it is evident that no real divide exists between managers and employees with respect to perceptions of gender-based discrimination in the workplace. Both groups picked gender as the primary source of discrimination in the workplace and, when provided with a long list of the outcomes of such discrimination, they provided similar rankings. Managers and employees concurred that most gender-based discrimination occurs at the appointment and promotion levels, and that less discrimination is experienced at the training, development and remuneration levels. They also concurred that discrimination sometimes occurs in favour of males and occasionally in favour of females.

It may be concluded from the empirical results that the division between those in positions of power (managers) and those with less power (employees) is philosophical or theoretical, at least in the way these respondents perceive gender-based discrimination to be practised in the South African workplace.

6.1.3 Cumulative summary

The research contributed to a better understanding of the nature and level of workplace gender-based discrimination, from the perspective of managers, employees, and objective measures, in South Africa. From the articles presented it became evident that managers can identify during which organisational processes discrimination occurs. They also know against which gender group they discriminate and at which stage of a process a specific group is afforded less opportunities. Female, as well as male employees, report that they are targets and suffer from gender-based discrimination. Some females report discrimination advancing them whilst others report discrimination detrimental to their needs. Males report similarly

on this aspect, with the proportion of males reporting pro-male and pro-female discrimination being almost identical to the way women report on the matter. As a joint group, males and females see discrimination in the workplace much the same as managers do. Results pertaining to the wage gap show a numerical difference in salaries, but this is not statistically significant. The results also indicate that biographical information, such as age, tenure, education and family responsibility, does not differ among those in particular salary groupings. There is thus no gender-based discrimination resulting from biographical status. With regard to the literature review the major contribution made was with respect to emphasizing the role of the political environment within which human resource planning and strategy occurs. This matter was not addressed in the consulted literature.

6.2 LIMITATIONS

The first limitation concerned the participants. The organisations included in the study were those to which students enrolled for the Master of Business Leadership degree at the University of South Africa had access. In other words, this was a convenient sample which therefore limits the possibilities for generalisation. Although this constitutes a limitation, a large number of companies were involved, and but for the students' involvement in the research, it would have been very difficult to enroll such an extensive group of participating organisations.

The questionnaires used posed certain problems. The stem of Question 1 of the Fair Treatment at Work Survey posed to managers differed slightly from the one posed to employees. This made the comparison between managers and employees less than ideal. The response alternatives (the tails of the questions) were, however, identical. Question 2 of the Fair Treatment at Work Survey also presented unexpected difficulties. Respondents were required to report on the outcomes of discrimination in general, whereas this study focuses on gender-based discrimination. As such it may be difficult to state that the reported outcomes are associated with gender-related discrimination. Nevertheless, it can be reported that gender-based discrimination is the number one form of discrimination among women, and among the highest for men, making the inferences valuable.

Some difficulties were encountered in Article 3 when it came to the use of post grading as an outcome variable. When planning the research, there was an argument for using post grading as a proxy for salary, but expressing results in the form of post gradings seemed impractical. Post gradings were therefore converted to salaries, which may not be an adequate expression of salary. Requesting salary information directly from the respondents may have been a more accurate way of collecting the outcome data.

6.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations are made with regard to future research as well as for the benefit of managers and human resource practitioners.

6.3.1 Recommendations for researchers

This research makes a valuable contribution to the body of knowledge regarding gender-based discrimination, and researchers should take note of this. Although the results presented are not necessarily representative of all South African companies, they still represent a large number of companies, more than those found in any similar research. The results of the research can therefore be used as a point of departure in future studies.

As far as could be determined, this is the first time that the Fair Treatment at Work Survey has been used in South Africa. The research thus provides a baseline on the present state of discrimination in South Africa, given this instrument. Furthermore, the introduction of the Gender-Based Discrimination Questionnaire provides researchers with an instrument to be used in this field, along with some baseline data.

One section of the research (Article 2) supports the social identity theory (Tajfel, 1981; Turner & Reynolds, 2004) whilst another part (Article 4) discards the theory, as well as the concept of group-serving bias (Pettigrew, 1997). Further research on what denotes groups, and which groups contrast themselves with others, may be an interesting topic to pursue.

Researchers should also consider including the political environment within which human resource planning and strategy occurs as a variable when investigating the phenomenon of gender-based discrimination in the workplace. It is not considered in textbooks on comprehensive human resource management, but has been identified in this research as an important variable.

The use of an intersectional approach, using a race-by-gender lens, is recommended for future researchers. Intersectionality, recognising that everyone has both race and gender, has become a major paradigm in the study of gender (Acker, 2006; Holvino, 2010), and this approach is also recommended by leading South African authors (Booysen & Nkomo, 2010). This could also be seen as the major limitation of this study.

It is further recommended that researchers consider the limitations of the study (see 5.2) in order to avoid making the same mistakes.

6.3.2 Recommendations for managers and human resource practitioners

The research has several practical implications for managers and human resource practitioners.

In **Article 1,** managers are alerted to the fact that gender-based discrimination still occurs in the workplace. They are also shown where in the human resource management process discrimination is particularly prevalent. Managers should also take note that discrimination sometimes favours males and at other times females, depending on the human resource management process used. It is recommended that managers be vigilant and avoid these discriminatory tendencies. Human resource practitioners should therefore disseminate this information to managers.

From **Article 1** it was also evident that managers did not know about formal policies that may result in pro-female discrimination. Such policies exist in the form of legislation, and human resource practitioners are urged to familiarise themselves with the legislation and to educate managers accordingly.

Managers and human resource practitioners should, given the results in **Article 2**, note that both males and females are victims of gender-based discrimination, and that the levels of discrimination that both groups experience are similar. Managers and human resource practitioners should also be advised that both males and females feel aggrieved because of the gender-based discrimination they experience, and that intervention in workplace discrimination should not only target females, but should address both gender groups.

Perceived gender-based discrimination occurs mostly at the appointment and promotional levels, and less during training and development and at the equal pay for equal work level. It is therefore recommended that managers and practitioners focus their attention on areas where employees report that most discrimination occurs.

Managers should also note that females harbour disproportionally negative perceptions of pro-male bias when it comes to remuneration. More females than males perceive pro-male bias in remuneration, so management should attempt to remedy this.

In **Article 3,** it is reported that males receive higher salaries than those of females, but that this gap is not significant. Importantly, it is reported that, when considering the inputs/output ratios of males and females, both genders receive a fair deal in the workplace. Perceptions of being discriminated against may be seen as the effect of psycho-social processes rather than as the result of verifiable differences in education, tenure, experience and family responsibility. It is recommended that managers, and human resource practitioners, take note of these results and inform employees accordingly. This is important as perceptions of being discriminated against unfairly result in negative outcomes.

In the case of **Article 4,** it was found that managers and employees have similar perceptions regarding the prominence of gender-based discrimination, as well as the places where it most often occurs. This knowledge is valuable for two reasons, firstly because both managers and employees pointed to gender-based discrimination as

the primary source of discrimination in the workplace, more so than race or ethnicity. Interventions aimed at eliminating gender-based discrimination are suggested, unlike the present emphasis on race and ethnicity. Secondly, as managers and employees agree on where in the human resource management processes discrimination is most prevalent, managers and human resource practitioners should use this consensus as a departure point to facilitate organisational change by redesigning these processes.

6.4 SUMMARY

The goal of this study was to provide a comprehensive picture of gender-based discrimination in South Africa. This aim was achieved by meeting the four research objectives. The readers of this thesis should now have a better understanding of how managers perceive gender-based discrimination during human resource processes, of how employees (from different genders) experience gender-based discrimination, of what the level of fairness in the remuneration of women consists of, and also of how managers and employees differ in the way they perceive gender-based discrimination in the workplace.

REFERENCES

Abbas, Q., Hameed, A. & Waheed, A. (2011). Gender discrimination and effect on employment performance/productivity. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 1(15), 170.

Abbas, S.M.N., Athar, S.A. & Herani, G. (2010). Gender based wage discrimination and its impact on performance of blue collar workers: Evidence from Pakistan. *KASBIT Business Journal*, 3(1), 45-63.

Adams, J.S. (1963). Towards an understanding of equity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67, 422-436.

Addabbo, T. & Favaro, D. (2011). Gender wage differentials by education in Italy. *Applied Economics*, 43(29), 4589-4605.

Albertyn, C. (2011). Law, gender and inequality in South Africa. *Oxford Development Studies*, 39(2), 139-162.

Altemeyer, R. (2004). High dominating, high authoritarian personalities. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 144, 421-447.

Amaram, D.I. (2010). The gender pay gap: Review and update. *China-USA Business Review*, 9(6), 51-58.

Anon. (2002). Gender differences in employee tenure. *Compensation and Working Conditions*, Sep: 0.

Anon. (2006). Gender differences in job tenure. *Economic Trends*, Oct: 13.

Anon. (2013). *An Overview: Choosing the Correct Statistical Test*. Retrieved from http://www-users.cs.umn.edu/~ludford/stat_overview.htm [Accessed 11 October 2013].

April, K., Dreyer, S. & Blass, E. (2007). Gender impediments to the South African executive boardroom. *South African Journal of Labour Relations*, 31(2), 51-67.

Arabsheibani, G.R. & Lau, L. (1999). Mind the gap: An analysis of gender wage differences in Russia. *Labour*, 13(4), 761-774.

Archer, J. (2002). Sex differences in physically aggressive acts between heterosexual partners: A meta-analytic review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior,* 7, 313-351.

Archer, J. (2004). Sex differences in aggression in real-world settings: A meta-analytic review. *Review of General Psychology*, 8, 291- 322.

Acker, J. (2006). Inequality regimes: Gender, class and race in organisations. *Gender and Society*, 20(4), 441-464.

Armstrong, M. (2009). *Handbook of human resources practices* (11th edition). London: Kogan Page.

Austin, J.T., Villanova, P., Steed, J., Neil, C. & Snizek, W.E. (1987). Perceived gender discrimination: Relationships with job satisfaction and intent to leave. *Academy of Management Best Papers Proceedings*, 360-363.

Australian Human Rights Commission. (2010). *Sexual orientation and sex and/or gender identity*. Retrieved from http://www.hreoc.gov.au/pdf/human_rights/lgbti/lgbticonsult/SOGIdiscussion_paper.pdf [Accessed 29 December 2011].

Bagraim, J.J. & Harrison, E. (2013a). Revisiting the gender gap in time-use patterns: Multitasking and well-being among mothers and fathers in dual-earner families. *American Sociological Review*, 76(6), 809-833.

Bagraim, J.J. & Harrison, E. (2013b). The anticipated work-family conflict of future business managers: Does gender and maternal employment matter? *South African Journal of Business Management*, 44(3), 41-45.

Baker, B. & Lightle, S.S. (2001). Cracks in the glass ceiling: An analysis of gender equity in the federal government auditing career field. *Journal of Government Financial Management*, 50(3), 18-26.

Banerjee, R. (2006). *An examination of factors affecting perception of workplace discrimination.* Centre for Industrial Relations and Human Resources. Toronto: University of Toronto.

Bang, J.T. & Mitra, A. (2011). Gender bias and the female brain drain. *Applied Economics Letters*, 18(9), 829-833.

Barber, B.M. & Odean, T. (2002). Boys will be boys: Gender, confidence and common stock investment. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 116, 261-292.

Baron, R.A., Branscombe, N.R. & Byrne, D. (2009). *Social psychology* (12th edition). Boston, MA: Pearson/Allyn and Bacon.

Barry, H., Child, I. & Bacon, M. (1959). Relation of child training to subsistence economy. *American Anthropologist*, 61, 51-63.

Basim, H.N., Sesen, H. & Sesen, E. (2007). Are they equal? Comparison of Turkish and English job announcements in terms of some discrimination factors. *Humanity Social Sciences Journal* 2(1):34-42. Retrieved from http://idosi.org/hssj/hssj2 (1)07/6.pdf [Accessed 3 March 2012].

Becker, G. (1957). *The economics of discrimination*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bendoly, E. & Swink, M. (2007). Moderating effects of information access on project management behavior, performance and perceptions. *Journal of Operations Management*, 25, 604-622.

Bennie, C. & Huang, T. (2010). Gender differences in stress management, emotional management and emotional expression within the workplace. *New Voices in Psychology*, 6(2), 23-44.

Bernardin, H.J. & Buckley, M.R. (1981). A consideration of strategies in rater training. *Academy of Management Review*, 6, 205-212.

Bernardin, H.J. (2010). *Human resource management: An experiential approach* (5th edition). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill Irwin.

Berry, J.W., Poortinga, Y.H., Breugelmans, S.M., Chasiotis, A. & Sam, D.L. (2011). *Cross-cultural psychology: Research and applications* (3rd edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Best, D.L. (2010). Gender. In M.H. Bornstein (ed.), *Handbook of cultural developmental science* (pp. 209-222). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.

Bezuidenhout, M.C., Garbers, C.J. & Potgieter, S. (2007). *Managing for healthy labour relations: A practical guide for health services in Southern Africa*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Blau, F.D. & Kahn, L.M. (2007). The gender pay gap: Have women gone as far as they can? *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21(1), 7-23.

Blumberg, B., Cooper, D.R. & Schindler, P.S. (2011). *Business research methods* (3rd edition). Berkshire: McGraw-Hill Education.

Bohlander, G.W. & Snell, S.A. (2013). *Principals in human resources management* (16th edition). New York, NY: South-Western Cengage Learning.

Booysen, A., Fourie, F.C.v.N. & Botes, L.J.S. (2011). The development status of women in South Africa: Patterns and progress in the provinces. *Development Southern Africa*, 28(1), 99-119.

Booysen, L. (2007). Barriers to employment equity implementation in and retention of blacks in management in South Africa. *South African Journal of Labour Relations*, 31(1), 47-51.

Booysen, L.A.E. & Nkomo, S.M. (2010). Gender role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics: The case of South Africa. *Gender in Management*, 25(4), 285-300.

Bornstein, S., Williams, J.C. & Painter, G.R. (2012). Discrimination against mothers is the strongest form of workplace gender discrimination: Lessons from US Caregiver Discrimination Law. *International Journal of Comparative Labour Law and Industrial Relations*, 28(1), 45-62.

Bose, D. (2011). *Gender discrimination in the workplace*. Retrieved from http://www.buzzle.com/articles/gender-discrimination-in-the-workplace.html [Accessed 25 January 2013].

Boshoff, N. (2005). The representation of women academics in higher education in South Africa: Progress in the pipeline? *South African Journal of Higher Education,* 19(2), 359-377.

Bowen, P. & Cattell, K. (2008). Job satisfaction of South African quantity surveyors. *Engineering Construction & Architectural Management*, 15(3), 260-269.

Bradley, H. & Healy, G. (2008). *Ethnicity and gender at work: Inequalities, careers and employment relations*. London: Palgrave.

Braunstein, E. & Heintz, J. (2008). Gender bias and central bank policy: Employment and inflation reduction. *International Review of Applied Economics*, 22(2), 173-186.

Brijlal, P., Naicker, V. & Peters, R. (2013). Education and SMMe business growth: A gender perspective from South Africa. *International Business and Economics Research Journal*, 12(8), 855-866.

Brown, C.D. & Siegal, J.M. (1988). Attributions for negative life events and depression: The role of perceived control. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 54, 316-322.

Brown, R.P., Charnsangavej, T., Keough, K.A., Newman, M.L. & Rentfrow, P.J. (2000). Putting the “affirm” into affirmative action: Preferential selection and academic performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79, 736-747.

Bryman, A. & Bell, E. (2007). *Business research methods* (2nd edition). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Burke, R.J. & Vinnicombe, S. (2005). Advancing women’s careers. *Career Development International,* 10, 165-7.

Bussin, M. (2011). *The remuneration handbook for Africa. A practical and informative handbook for managing reward and recognition*. Randburg: Knowres Publishing.

Byrnes, J.P., Miller, D.C. & Schafer, W.D. (1999). Gender differences in risk taking: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125(3), 367-383.

Carnes, W.J. & Radojevich-Kelley, N. (2011). The effects of the glass ceiling on women in the workforce: Where are they and where are they going? *Review of Management Innovation and Creativity*, 4(10), 70-79.

Cascio, W.F. (2010). *Managing human resources: Productivity, quality of life, profits* (8th edition). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill Irwin.

Cascio, W.F. & Aguinis, H. (2011). *Applied psychology in human resource management* (7th edition). Upper Saddle Road, NJ: Pearson.

Chabaya, O., Rembe, S. & Wadesango, N. (2009). The persistence of gender inequality in Zimbabwe: Factors that impede the advancement of women into leadership positions in primary schools. *South African Journal of Education*, 29(2), 235-251.

Channar, Z.A., Abbassi, Z. & Ujan, I.A. (2011). Gender discrimination in the workforce and its impact on the employees. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce & Social Sciences*, 5(1), 177-191.

Chovwen, C.O. (2003). Experience above the glass ceiling: A study of female executives. *Psychologia: An International Journal*, 11(1), 138-146.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioural sciences* (2nd edition.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cooper, D.R. & Schindler, P.S. (2011). *Business research methods* (11th edition). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Corning, A.F. & Krengal, M. (2002). Self-esteem as a moderator between perceived discrimination and psychological distress among women. *Journal of Counselling Psychology*, 40(1), 117-124.

Cotter, D.A., Hermsen, J.M., Ovadia, S. & Vanneman, R. (2001). The glass ceiling effect. *Social Forces*, 80(2), 655-681.

Crampton, S.M. & Mishra, J.M. (1999). Women in management. *Public Personnel Management*, 28, 87-106.

Daly, M. & Watson, M. (1988). *Homicide*. New York, NY: Aldine.

Daniels, K. & Macdonald, L. (2005). *Equality, diversity and discrimination: A student text.* London: Charted Institute of Personnel and Development.

Davies-Netzley, S.A. (1998). Women above the glass ceiling: Perceptions on corporate mobility and strategies for success. *Gender and Society*, 12(2), 340.

Deininger, K., Jin, S. & Nagarajan, H. (2013). Wage discrimination in India's informal labor markets: Exploring the impact of caste and gender. *Review of Development Economics*, 17(1), 130-147.

Deschenaux, J. (2009). Pay gaps persist throughout Europe. *HRMagazine*, 54(6), 97-104.

Dessler, G. (2011). *Human resource management* (12th edition). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Dieltiens, V., Unterhalter, E., Letsatsi, S. & North, A. (2009). Gender blind, gender-lite: A critique of gender equity approaches in the South African Department of Education. *Perspectives in Education*, 27(4), 365-374.

Dixon, J., Durrheim, K., Tredoux, C., Tropp, L., Clack, B. & Eaton, L. (2010). A paradox of integration? Interracial contact, prejudice reduction, and perceptions of racial discrimination. *Journal of Social Issues*, 66(2), 401-416.

Dlodlo, N. & Khalala, G. (2008). Demystifying the shrinking pipeline of women in ICT education and careers: A South African case study. *Journal for New Generation Sciences*, 6(2), 16-46.

Doane, D.P. & Seward, L.E. (2009). *Applied statistics in business and economics*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

Duflo, E. (2003). Grandmothers and Granddaughters: Old-age pensions and intrahousehold allocation in South Africa. *World Bank Economic Review*, 17(1), 1-25.

Eagly, A.H. & Mladinic, A. (1994). Are people prejudiced against women? Some answers from research on attitudes, gender stereotypes and judgments of competence. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 5, 1-35.

Ebeku, K.S.A. (2006). Considering the protocol on the rights of women in Africa. *Africa Insight*, 36(1), 24-34.

Eccleston, C.P. & Major, B. (2010). An expectancy/value perspective on the demotivating effects of prejudice. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 40(7), 1728-1746.

Elias, M. (2003). Thinking it over and over and over. *USA Today*, February 6, 10D.

Ely, R.J., & Padavic, I. (2007). A feminist analysis of occupational research on sex differences. *Academy of Management Review*, 32, 1121-1143.

England, P., Gornick, J. & Shafer, E.F. (2012). Women's employment, education, and the gender gap in 17 countries. *Monthly Labor Review*, 135(4), 3-12.

English, J., Haupt, T.C. & Smallwood, J.J. (2006). Women, construction and health and safety (H&S): South African and Tanzanian perspectives. *Journal of Engineering, Design and Technology*, 4(1), 18-28.

Ensher, E.A., Grant-Vallone, E.J. & Donaldson, S.I. (2001). Effects of perceived discrimination on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, and grievances. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 12(1), 53-72.

Esterhuizen, W. & Martins, N. (2008). Organisational justice and employee responses to employment equity. *South African Journal of Labour Relations*, 32(2), 66-85.

Fang, H. & Moro, A. (2011). Theories of statistical discrimination and affirmative action: A survey. In J. Benhabib, M.O. Jackson & A. Bisin (eds.), *Handbook of social economics* (pp. 133-200), Burlington, MA: Elsevier.

Fay, C.H. & Latham, G.P. (1982). Effects of training and rating scales on rating errors. *Personnel Psychology*, 35, 105-116.

Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (3rd edition). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Finchilescu, G. (2006). Women as a minority group. In T. Sheffer, F. Boonzaier & P. Kiguwa (eds.), *The gender of psychology* (pp. 85-99), Cape Town: UCT Press.

Fisher, C.D., Schoenfeldt, L.F. & Shaw, J.B. (2006). *Human resource management* (6th edition). Boston, MA: Houghton Miffin.

Floro, M.S. & Komatsu, H. (2011). Gender and work in South Africa: What can time-use data reveal? *Feminist Economics*, 17(4), 33-66.

Foley, S., Ngo, H. & Loi, R. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of perceived personal gender discrimination: A study of solicitors in Hong Kong. *Business Media Journal*, 55(1), 197-208.

Frame, M.C., Roberto, K.J., Schwab, A.E. & Harris, C.T. (2010). What is important on the job? Differences across gender, perspective and job level. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 40(1), 36-56.

Frost, N. (2011). *Qualitative research methods in psychology: Combining core approaches*. Birkshire: Open University Press.

Fubara, E.I., McMillan-Capehart, A. & Richard, O.C. (2008). The role of organizational justice and ethical frameworks on attitudes toward affirmative action: The moderating role of organizational support. *Journal of Diversity Management*, 3(3), 29-40.

Gallinetti, J., Redpath, J. & Sloth-Nielsen, J. (2004). Race, class and restorative justice in South Africa: Achilles heel, glass ceiling or crowning glory? *South African Journal of Criminal Justice*, 17(1), 17-40.

Gandhi, P. (2010). *Gender discrimination in the workplace.* Retrieved from http://www.scribd.com/doc/22571816/Gender-Discrimination-in-Work-Place [Accessed 25 June 2013].

Gibbons, M., Limoges, C., Nowotny, H., Schwartzman, S., Scott, P. & Trow, M. (1994). *The new production of knowledge: The dynamics of science and research in contemporary societies*. London: Sage.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Glesne, C. (2011). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction* (4th edition). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Goldman, B.M., Slaughter, J.E., Schmit, M.J., Wiley, J.W. & Brooks, S.M. (2008). Perceptions of discrimination: A multiple needs model perspective. *Journal of Management*, 34(5), 952-977.

Gómenz-Mejía, L.R., Balkin, D.B. & Cardy, R.L. (2007). *Managing human resources* (5th edition). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Good, J.J. & Rudman, A. (2009). When female applicants meet sexist interviewers: The costs of being a target of benevolent sexism. *Sex Roles,* 62, 41-493.

Grainger, H. & Fitzner, G. (2007). *The First Fair Treatment at Work Survey: Executive summary - updated*. Retrieved from www.bis.gov.uk/files/file 38386.pdf [Accessed 25 January 2012].

Gravelle, H., Hole, A.R. & Santos, R. (2011). Measuring and testing for gender discrimination in physician pay: English family doctors. *Journal of Health Economics,* 30(4), 660-674.

Grobler, P., Wärnick, S., Carrell, M.R., Elbert, N.F. & Hatfield, R.D. (2011). *Human resource management in South Africa* (4th edition). London: Thomson Learning.

Grogan, J. (2007). *Dismissal, discrimination and unfair labour practices* (2nd edition). Cape Town: Juta.

Grossman, M. & Wood, W. (1993). Sex differences in emotional intensity: A social role explanation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65, 1010-1022.

Grun, C. (2004). Direct and indirect gender discrimination in the South African labour market. *International Journal of Manpower*, 25(3/4), 321-342.

Hareli, S., Klang, M. & Hess, U. (2008). The role of career history in gender based biases in job selection decisions. *Career Development International,* 13(3), 252-269.

Haroon, B. & Sumayya, G. (2013). The gender wage gap in Post-Apartheid South Africa: A re-examination. *Journal of African Economics*. Retrieved from http://jae.oxfordjournals.org/content/early/2013/05/15/jae.ejt008.full [Accessed 15 May 2013].

Harris, M.M., Lievens, F. & Van Hoye, G. (2004). "I think they discriminated against me": Using prototype theory and organisational justice theory for understanding perceived discrimination in selection and promotion situations. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 12(1), 54-65.

Hassim, S. (2005). Turning gender rights into entitlements: Women and welfare provision in postapartheid South Africa. *Social Research*, 72(3), 621-646.

Haupt, T. & Madikizela, K. (2009). Why do South African women choose careers in construction? *Acta Structilia*, 16(2), 46-68.

Henderson, D.R. (2008). How free markets break down discrimination. The *Freeman*, 58(3). Retrieved from http://www.thefreemanonline.org/columns/the-pursuit-of-happiness-how-free-markets-break-down-discrimination/ [Accessed 22 December 2011].

Hicks, J. (2010a). *Gender equality in South Africa: Progress and challenges*. Braamfontein: Commission for Gender Equality. Retrieved from http://www.cge.org.za/index.php?option=com_docman&task=cat_view&gid=43&Itemid=0 [Accessed 17 January 2012].

Hicks, J. (2010b). *Opinion piece: Gender transformation in the workplace*. Braamfontein: Commission for Gender Equality. Retrieved from http://www.cge.org.za/index.php?option=com_docman&task=cat_view&gid=43&Itemid=0 [Accessed 17 January 2012].

Hicks, J. (2010b). *The status of women in South Africa in 2010*. Braamfontein: Commission for Gender Equality. Retrieved from http://www.cge.org.za/index.php?option=com_docman&task=cat_view&gid=43&Itemid=0 [Accessed 17 January 2012].

Higgs, P. & Smith, J. (2006). *Rethinking truth* (2nd edition). Cape Town: Juta.

Hinks, T. (2002). Gender wage differentials and discrimination in the New South Africa. *Applied Economics*, 34(16), 2043-2052.

Hlongwane, N. (2007). Commentary on South Africa's position regarding equal pay for work of equal value. *Law, Democracy and Development*, 11(1), 69-84.

Hollyforde, S. & Whiddett, S. (2002). *The motivation handbook*. London: Charted Institute of Personnel and Development.

Holvino, E. (2010). Intersections: The simultaneity of race, gender and class in organisation studies. Gender, *Work and Organisation*, 17(3), 248-277.

Horwitz, F.M., Bowmaker-Falconer, A. & Searll, P. (1996). Human resource development and managing diversity in South Africa. *International Journal of Manpower*, 17(4/5), 134-151.

Hultin, M. & Szulkin, R. (1999). Wages and Unequal Access to Organizational Power: An Empirical Test of Gender Discrimination. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(3), 453-472.

Hunter, J.A., Stringer, M. & Watson, R.P. (1991). Intergroup violence and intergroup attributions. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 30, 261-266.

Huynh, Q.L., Devos, T. & Dunbar, C.M. (2012). The psychological costs of painless but recurring experiences of racial discrimination. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Diversity Psychology*, 18, 26-34.

Iberiyenari, L. (2012). *Gender discrimination in the workplace: Are women sufficiently protected? The Lawyers Chronicle*. Retrieved from http://thelawyerschronicle.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=134:gender-discrimination-in-the-workplace-are-women-sufficiently-protected&catid=41:gender-issue&Itemid=54 [Accessed 15 January 2013].

Ioakimidis, M. (2012). Gender wage gap and earnings: Predicted by tenure in the Czech Republic. *Journal of Developing Areas*, 46(1), 31-43.

Isaacs, E. (1995). Gender discrimination in the workplace: A literature review. *Communications of the ACM*, 38(1), 58-59.

Ivancevich, J.M. (2010). *Human resource management* (11th edition). New York, NY: McGraw- Hill.

Ivancevick, J.M., Konopaske, R. & Matteso, M.T. (2014). *Organizational behavior and management.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

James, N. (1989). Emotional labour: Skill and work in social regulations of feelings. *Sociological Review*, 37, 15-42.

Jamieson, K.H. (1995). *Beyond the double-bind: Women in leadership*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Johansson, M., Katz, K. & Nyman, H. (2005). Wage Differentials and gender discrimination: Changes in Sweden 1981-98. *Acta Sociologica*, 48(4), 341-364.

Johnson, Z. & Mathur-Helm, B. (2011). Experiences with queen bees: A South African study exploring the reluctance of women executives to promote other women in the workplace. *South African Journal of Business Management*, 42(4), 47-55.

Jordan, C.E., Clark, S.J. & Waldron, M.A. (2007). Gender bias and compensation in the executive suite of the Fortune 100. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict*, 11(1), 19-29.

Judge, T.A. & Livingston, B.A. (2008). Is the gap more than gender? A longitudinal analysis of gender, gender role orientation and earnings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(5), 994-1012.

Kahn, S.B. (2009). Employment of women in the South African National Defense Force: 1998-2008. *Journal of Public Administration*, 44(1), 196-208.

Kane-Berman, J. & Hickman, R. (2003). Women doctors in medical professional organisations in South Africa: A report by the Women in Medicine Workgroup. *South African Medical Journal*, 93(1), 69-73.

Kara, O. (2006). Occupational gender wage discrimination in Turkey. *Journal of Economic Studies*, 33(2), 130-143.

Karsten, M.F. (2006). *Race and ethnicity in the workplace: Issues and challenges for today's organisations*. Westport, CONN: Praeger Publishers.

Kerlinger, F.N. & Lee, H.B. (2000). *Foundations of behavioural research* (4th edition). Forth Worth, TX: Harcourt College Publishers.

Kim, S-S. & Williams, D.R. (2012). Perceived discrimination and self-rated health in South Korea: A nationally representative survey. *PLoS ONE*, 7(1): e30501. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0030501.

Kitayama, S., Duffy, S. & Uchida, U. (2007). Self as cultural mode of being. In S. Kitayama & D. Cohen (eds.), *Handbook of cultural psychology* (pp. 136-174), New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Klonoff, E.A., Landrin, H. & Campbell, R. (2000). Sexual discrimination may account for well-known gender differences in psychiatric symptoms. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 24, 93-99.

Koeber, C. & Wright, D.W. (2006).Gender differences in the reemployment status of displaced workers human capital as signals that mitigate effects of bias. *Journal of Socio-Economics*, 35(5), 780-796.

Kok, A. (2008). The promotion of equality and prevention of unfair discrimination Act 4 of 2000: Court-driven or legislature-driven societal transformation? *Stellenbosch Law Review*, 19(1), 122-142.

Konrad, A.M., Ritchie, J.E. Jr., Lieb, P. & Corrigall, E. (2000). Sex differences and similarities in job attribute preferences: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 126, 593-641.

Krieger, N. (1990). Racial and gender discrimination: Risk factors for high blood pressure. *Social Science & Medicine*, 30(12), 1273-1281.

LaFrance, M. & Banaji, M. (1992). Towards a recognition of the gender-emotion relationship. *Review of Personality and Social Psychology*, 14, 178-197.

Lerner, M.J. (1980). *The belief in a just world: A fundamental delusion*. New York: NY: Plenum.

Lewis, D. (1996). *The difference between goals and objectives*. Retrieved from http://edweb.sdsu.edu/courses/edtec540/objectives/Difference.html [Accessed 1 November 2011].

Lim, G.S., Mathis, R.L. & Jackson, J.H. (2010). *Human resources management.* Singapore: Cengage.

Lloyd, H.R. & Mey, M.R. (2007). Gender differences in perceptions of workplace progression: An automotive industry case study. *Southern African Business Review,* 11(3), 95-120.

Loden, M. & Rosener, J.B. (1991). *Workforce America! Managing employee diversity as a vital resource*. Burr Ridge, IL: Irwin.

Loden, M. (1985). *Feminine leadership, or how to succeed in business without being one of the boys*. New York, NY: Times Books.

Louis, N.C., Alexandros, P. & Konstantinos, V. (2013). Gender wage gaps, 'sticky floors' and 'glass ceilings' in Europe. *Labour Economics*, 21, 86–102.

Luthans, F. (2011). *Organizational behavior: An evidence-based approach* (12th edision). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

Luzadis, R., Wesolowski, M. & Snavely, B.K. (2008). Understanding criterion choice in hiring decisions from a prescriptive gender bias perspective. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 20(4), 468-484.

Lyness, K.S. & Thompson, D.E. (1997). Above the glass ceiling? A comparison of matched samples of female and male executives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(3), 359-375.

Mafunisa, M.J. (2006). Enhancing gender equity in the public service: The case of Limpopo Province. *Journal of Public Administration*, 1(41), 258-269.

Mankayi, N. (2006). Male constructions and resistance to women in the military. *Scientia Militaria: South African Journal of Military Studies*, 34(2), 44-64.

Marais, L. (2002). Gender issues in housing delivery in the Free State since 1994. *Acta Academica*, 3(1), 147-166.

Mathis, R.L. & Jackson, J.H. (2003). *Human resource management* (10th edition). Mason, OH: South-Western.

Mathur-Helm, B. (2005). Equal opportunity and affirmative action for South African women: A benefit or barrier? *Gender in Management*, 20(1/2), 56-71.

Mathur-Helm, B. (2006). Woman and the glass ceiling in South African banks: An illusion or a reality. *Women in Management Review,* 21(4), 311-326.

Mavundla, Z. (2010). Women's employment equity in local government: A study of senior managers. *Local Government Bulletin*, 12(3), 20-22.

McDonald, J.A. & Thornton, R.J. (2011). Estimating gender wage gaps. *Journal of Economic Education*, 42(4), 405-413.

Meiring, D., van de Vijver, A.J.R., Rothman, S. & Barrick, M.R. (2005). Construct, item, and method bias of cognitive and personality measures in South Africa. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 31(1), 1-8.

Mello, D. & Phago, K. (2007). Affirming women in managerial positions in the South African public service. *South African Journal for Political Science and Public Administration,* 26(2), 145-158.

Metcalf, H. & Rolfe, H. (2009). *Employment and earnings in the finance sector: A gender analysis.* Manchester: National Institute of Economic and Social Research. Retrieved from http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/uploaded_files/download_finance_gender_analyis_research.pdf [Accessed 25 June 2013].

Milkovich, G.T. & Newman, J.M. (2008). *Compensation*. Burr Ridge, IL: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.

Mondy, W.R. (2012). *Human resource management* (12th edition). Essex: Pearson.

Montesh, M. (2010). Transformation in the South African Police Service: The implementation of affirmative action and employment equity in SAPS. *South African Journal of Criminal Justice*, 23(1), 55-77.

Moorhead, G. & Griffen, R.W. (2008). *Managing organizational behaviour* (10th edition). Florence, KY: South-Western Cengage Learning.

Moorhead, G. & Griffin, R.W. (2014). *Managing organizational behavior* (11th edition). Florence, KY: South-Western Cengage Learning.

Morrison, C.J. & Conradie, H. (2006). Job satisfaction of female police officers in the South African Police Service. *Acta Criminologica*, 19(2), 88-104.

Morrison, C.J. (2005). Gender discrimination versus equality in the police. *Acta Criminologica,* 18(3), 20-28.

Msweli-Mbanga, P., Fitzgerald, P. & Mkhize, A. (2005). Representation of women directors in JSE securities exchange listed companies: Institutional theory perspective. *South African Journal of Labour Relations*, 29(1), 98-110.

Mühlau, P. (2011). Gender inequality and job quality in Europe. *Management Revue*, 22(2), 114-131.

Muli, K. (2004). The broader context: Mainstreaming gender in public institutions of governance and democracy. *Journal of African Elections*, 3(1), 81-93.

Munasinghe, L., Reif, T. & Henriques, A. (2008). Gender gap in wage returns to job tenure and experience. *Labour Economics*, 15(6), 1296-1316.

Munroe, R.L. & Munroe, R.H. (1975). *Cross-cultural human development*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Murphy, R.P. (2010). *The economics of discrimination, library of economics and liberty*. Retrieved from http://www.econlib.org/library/Columns/y2010/Murphydiscrimination.html [Accessed 22 December 2011].

Mwaba, K. & Simbayi, L.C. (1998). Attitudes and beliefs about gender-based affirmative action in the new South Africa. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 138(5), 661-663.

Myers, D.G. (2008). *Social psychology* (9th edition). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

Nachtigall, K., Agthe, M. & Spörrle, M. (2011). The direct and indirect effects of the attractiveness-gender bias on social interaction and hiring intentions in an employee selection scenario: The moderating influence of social comparison orientation. *Neuro Psycho Economics Conference Proceedings*, 45-45.

Nadeau, S., Walsh, W. & Wetton, C. (1993). Gender wage discrimination: Methodological issues and empirical results for a Canadian public sector employer. *Applied Economics*, 25(2), 227-42.

Naidu, K.M. (1997). *Indirect discrimination against women in the workplace*. Masters thesis. University of Natal.

Ncayiyana, D. J. (2011). Feminisation of the South African medical profession: Not yet nirvana for gender equity. *South African Medical Journal*, 101(1), 5.

Nel, J. & Steyn, R. (2012). The effects of female parliamentary representation and gender quotas on scholastic empowerment of girls in sub-Saharan Africa: A test of the effects of in-group bias. *International Journal of Psychology,* 47, 310.

Nel, P.S., Van Dyk, P.S., Haasbroek, G.D., Schultz, H.B., Sono, T. & Werner, A. (2008). *Human resources management* (6th edition). Cape Town: Oxford.

Nentwich, J.C. & Kelan, E.K. (2013). Towards a topology of 'doing gender': An analysis of empirical research and its challenges. *Gender, Work and Organization,* 21(2), 121-134.

Niemann, R. (2002). Redress and empowerment for gender equity in South African education. *Acta Academica*, 3(1), 167-195.

Noe, R.A., Hollenbeck, J.R., Gergart, B. & Wright, P.M. (2008). *Human resource management: Gaining a competitive advantage* (6th edition). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill Irwin.

Noh, S. & Kaspar, V. (2003). Perceived discrimination and depression: Moderating effects of coping acculturation and ethnic support. *American Journal of Public Health*, 93(2), 232-238.

Nolen-Hoeksema, S. & Jackson, S. (2001). Mediators of gender differences in rumination. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 25(1), 37-47.

Ocon, R. (2006). *Gender and diversity in management.* New York, NY: University Press of America.

Ornstein, M. (2011). Cohort and period perspectives on gender, education, and earnings in Canada. *Canadian Public Policy*, 37, S95-S113.

Pallant, J. (2010). *SPSS survival manual* (4th edition). Berkshire, UK: McGraw-Hill.

Palomino, F. & Peyrache, E-A. (2011). Psychological bias and gender wage gap. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 76(3), 563-573.

Parziale, A. (2007). *Gender inequality and discrimination: Encyclopedia of business ethics and society*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Pascoe, E.A. & Richman, L.S. (2009). Perceived discrimination and health: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 135(4), 531-554.

Pavalko, E.K., Mossakowski, K.N. & Hamilton, V.J. (2003). Does perceived discrimination affect health? Longitudinal relationships between work discrimination and women's physical and emotional health. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior,* 43, 18-33.

Petersen, N. & Gravett, S. (2000). The experiences of women academics at a South African university. *South African Journal of Higher Education,* 14(3), 169-176.

Petit, P. (2007). The effects of age and family constraints on gender hiring discrimination: A field experiment in the French financial sector. *Labour Economics*, 14(3), 371-391.

Pettigrew, T.F. (1997). Generalized intergroup contact effects on prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23, 173-185.

Pfeffer, J. (1994). *Competitive advantage through people*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Pfeffer, J. (1995). Producing sustainable competitive advantage through effective management of people. *Academy of Management Executive*, 9, 55-69.

Pfeffer, J. (1998). *The human equation: Building profits by putting people first*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Pfeifer, C. & Sohr, T. (2009). Analysing the gender wage gap (GWG) using personnel records*. LABOUR: Review of Labour Economics and Industrial Relations*, 23(2), 257-282.

Pillay, A.L. & Kramers, A.L. (2003). South African clinical psychology, employment (in)equity and the "brain drain". *South African Journal of Psychology*, 33(1), 52-60.

Pratto, F. (1996). Sexual politics: The gender gap in the bedroom, the cupboard and the cabinet. In D.M. Buss & N.M. Malamuth (eds.), *Sex, power, conflict: Evolutionary and feminist perspectives* (pp. 179-230). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Pratto, F., Stallworth, L.M. & Sidanius, J. (1997). The gender gap: Differences in political attitudes and social dominance orientation. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 36, 49-68.

Prentice, D.A. & Carranza, E. (2002). What women and men should be, shouldn't be, are allowed to be and don't have to be: The contents of prescriptive gender stereotypes. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 26, 269-281.

Pretorius, E., De Villiers Human, S., Niemann, R., Klinck, E. & Alt, H. (2002). Fighting from within: Gender equity at the University of the Free State. *Acta Academica*, 3(1), 1-38.

Pudney, S. & Shields, M.A. (2000). Gender and racial discrimination in pay and promotion for NHS nurses. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 62(5), 801-836.

Rabe, L. (2002). Eve-olution: The status of female voice in South African media. *Ecquid Novi*, 23(1), 152-169.

Ramutloa, L. (2008). *Commission for employment equity*. Retrieved from http://www.labour.gov.za/contacts/statutory-bodies/commission-for-employment-equity [Accessed 17 January 2012].

Republic of South Africa Government Employees Pension Fund. (2011). *Welcome to the Government Employees Pension Fund*. Retrieved from http://www.gepf.gov.za/Pages/Home.aspx [Accessed 22 December 2011].

Republic of South Africa. (1999). *Employment Equity Act, 55 of 1998*. Retrieved from http://www.agsa.co.za/Portals/1/ACTS/EEA.pdf [Accessed 17 January 2012].

Ro, A. & Choi K.H. (2010). Effects of gender discrimination and reported stress on drug use among racially/ethnically diverse women in Northern California. *Women's Health Issues*, 20(3), 211-218.

Robbins, S.P. & Judge, T.A. (2011). *Organizational behaviour* (14th edition). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson / Prentice Hall.

Rosenthal, R., Rosnow, R.L. & Rubin, D.B. (2009). *Contrasts and effect size in behavioral research: A correlational approach.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rosnow, R.L. & Rosenthal, R. (2008). *Beginning behavioural research: A conceptual primer* (6th edition) Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Prentice Hall.

Rossi, A.S. & Rossi, H.P. (1990). *Of human bonding: Parent-child relations across the life course*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.

RSA (Republic of South Africa). (1995). *Labour Relations Act, Act No. 66 of 1995*. Retrieved from http://www.info.gov.za/acts/1995/a66-95.pdf [Accessed 12 June 2013].

RSA (Republic of South Africa). (1996). *Constitution of South Africa, Act No.108 of 1996*. Retrieved from http://www.info.gov.za/documents/constitution/1996/a108-96.pdf [Accessed 12 June 2013].

RSA (Republic of South Africa). (1997). *Basic Conditions of Employment Act, Act 75 of 1997*. Retrieved http://www.info.gov.za/view/DownloadFileAction?id=70820 [Accessed 27 September 2013].

RSA (Republic of South Africa). (1999). *Employment Equity Act, 55 of 1998*. Retrieved from http://www.agsa.co.za/Portals/1/ACTS/EEA.pdf [Accessed 12 June 2013].

RSA (Republic of South Africa). (2000). *Promotion of Equality and Prevention of Unfair Discrimination Act, Act No. 4 of 2000*. Retrieved from http://www.justice.gov.za/legislation/acts/2000-004.pdf [Accessed 7 March 2012].

RSA (Republic of South Africa). (2003). *Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment Act, Act No. 53 of 2003*. Retrieved from https://www.

environment.gov.za/sites/ default/files/legislations/bbbee_act.pdf [Accessed 23 September 2013].

Russell, H., Quinn, E., King-O'Riain, R. & McGinnity, F. (2008). *Experience of discrimination in Ireland: Analysis of the QNHS Equality Module*. Retrieved from www.equality.ie/.../Pregnancy%20at%20Work%20A%20Literature%20Review.pdf [Accessed 26 June 2013].

Sanchez, J.I. & Brock, P. (1996). Outcomes of perceived discrimination among Hispanic employees: Is diversity management a luxury or a necessity? *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(3), 704-719.

Schmitt, D. (2005). Sexuality from Argentina to Zimbabwe: A 48-nation study of sex, culture and strategies of human mating. *Behavioural and Brain Sciences*, 28, 247-311.

Schmitt, M., Maes, J. & Widaman, K. (2010). Longitudinal effects of egoistic and fraternal relative deprivation on well-being and protest. *International Journal of Psychology*, 45(2), 122-130.

Schmitt, M.T., Branscombe, N.R. & Postmes, T. (2003). Women's emotional response to the pervasiveness of gender discrimination. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 33, 297-312.

Schmitt, M.T., Branscombe, N.R., Kobrynowicz, D. & Owen, S. (2002). Perceiving discrimination against one's own gender group has different implications for the well-being in women and men. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28, 484-492.

Schneidhofer, T.M., Schiffinger, M. & Mayrhofer, W. (2010). Mind the (gender) gap: Gender, gender role types and their effects on objective career success over time. *Management Revue*, 21(4), 437-457.

Schwartz, S.H. & Rubel, T. (2005). Sex differences in value priorities: Cross-cultural and multimethod studies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 89, 1010-1028.

Scott, K.A. & Brown, D.J. (2006). Female first, leader second? Gender bias in the encoding of leadership behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 101(2), 230-242.

Scott, K.D. & McClellan, E.L. (1990). Gender differences in absenteeism. *Public Personnel Management*, 19(2), 229-253.

Scozzaro, P.P. & Subich, L.M. (1990). Gender and occupational sex-type differences in job outcome factor perceptions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 36(1), 109-119.

Segall, M.H., Dasen, P.R., Berry, J.W. & Poortinga, Y.H. (1990). *Human behavior in global perspective: An introduction to cross-cultural psychology*. New York, NY: Pergamon.

Serumaga-Zake, P.A.E. & Kotze, D. (2004). Determinants of labour force participation of married women in South Africa. *Studies in Economics and Econometrics*, 28(3), 99-111.

Serumaga-Zake, P.A.E. & Naudé, W.A. (2003 / 2003a). Labour market discrimination in the North West province of South Africa. *Development Southern Africa*, 18(5), 671-682.

Serumaga-Zake, P.A.E. & Naudé, W.A. (2003b). Determinants of labour force participation in the North West province of South Africa. *Development Southern Africa*, 20(4), 505-514.

Shainbrook, J., Roberts, T.J. & Triscari, R. (2011). Research administrator salary: Association with education, experience, credentials and gender. *Journal of Research Administration*, 42(2), 87-99.

Shaughnessy, J.J., Zechmeister, E.B. & Zechmeister, J.S. (2009). *Research methods in psychology* (8th edition). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Shellenbarger, S. (1991). More job seekers put family needs first. *Wall Street Journal,* November 5, B1.

Sherif, M., Harvey, D.J., White, B.J., Hood, W.R. & Sherif, C.W. (1961). *Robber's cave experiment.* Norman, OK: Institute of Group Relations. Retrieved from http://psychclassics.yorku.ca/Sherif/ [Accessed 15 January 2013].

Simister, J. (2009). The importance of being earners: Why women in South Africa need well-paid jobs. *Development Southern Africa*, 26(5), 709-719.

Sloane, P.J. & Theodossiou, I. (1993). Gender and job tenure effects on earnings. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 55(4), 421-437.

Slonim, R. (2004). *Gender selection discrimination: Evidence from a Trust Game*. Cleveland, OH: Case Western Reserve University. Retrieved from https://aeaweb.org/assa/2005/0108_0800_1302.pdf [Accessed 24 June 2013].

Smith, M. (2009). Gender, pay and work satisfaction at a UK university. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 16(5), 621-641.

Solberg, E. (1999). Using occupational preference in estimating market wage discrimination: The case of the gender pay gap. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 58(1), 86-113.

Solberg, E.J. (2004). Occupational assignment, hiring discrimination, and the gender pay gap. *Atlantic Economic Journal*, 32(1), 11-27.

South African Institute of Race Relations. (2012). *The South Africa survey: Employment.* Retrieved from http://www.sairr.org.za/services/publications /south-africa-survey/south-africa-survey-2012/downloads/pp215-284.Employ .05Dec12.pdf [Accessed 23 September 2013].

Stangor, C., Lynch, L., Duan, C. & Glass, B. (1992). Categorization of individuals on the basis of multiple social features. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62, 207-218.

Stanley, T.D. & Jarrell, S.B. (1998). Gender wage discrimination bias? A meta-regression analysis. *Journal of Human Resources*, 33(4), 947-973.

Statistics South Africa. (2012a). *The South Africa I know, the home I understand.* Retrieved from http://www.statssa.gov.za/Census2011/Products/Census _2011 _Pictorial.pdf [Accessed 23 August 2013].

Statistics South Africa. (2012b). *Census 2011: Statistical release (Revised)*. Retrieved from http://www.statssa.gov.za/Publications/P03014 /P030142011 .pdf [Accessed 23 August 2013].

Steyn, A.G.W., Smit, C.F., du Toit, S.H.C. & Strasheim, C. (2013). *Modern statistics in practice* (9th edition). Pretoria: Van Sckaik.

Steyn, H.S. (2000). Practical significance of the differences in means. *Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 26(3), 1-3.

Steyn, R. (2012). Adaptation of the Modern Racism Scale for use in South Africa. *International Journal on Diversity in Organizations, Communities and Nations*, 11(5), 175-188.

Stone, D. & Stone-Romero, E. (2006). Unbiased hiring systems. In J. Greenhaus & G. Callanan (eds.), *Encyclopedia of career development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Stone, K. & Coetzee, M. (2005). Levelling the playing field: Reducing barriers to mentoring for women protégées in the South African organisational context. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 3(3), 33-39.

Strauss, A. (2004). Vroue in die nuwe politieke bedeling in Suid-Afrika. *Journal for Contemporary History*, 29(3), 107-127.

Stredwick, J. (2005). *An introduction to human resources management* (2nd edition). Burlington, MA: Elsevier.

Suh, J. (2009). Decomposition of the change in the gender wage gap. *Research in Business and Economics Journal*, 1, 1-18.

Swanepoel, B.J., Erasmus, B.J. & Schenk, H.W. (2008). *South African human resource management: Theory and practice* (4th edition). Cape Town: Juta.

Swim, J.K., Aikin, K.J., Hall, W.S. & Hunter, B.A. (1995). Sexism and racism: Old-fashioned and modern prejudices. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 68,199-214.

Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories: Studies in social psychology*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Tamres, L.K., Janicki, D. & Helgenson, V.S. (2002). Sex differences in coping behavior: A meta-analytical review and an examination of relative coping. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 6, 2-30.

Tannen, D. (1990). *You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation*. New York, NY: Ballantine Books.

Taylor, D.M., Wright, S.C., Moghaddam, F.M. & Lalonde, R.N. (1990). The personal/group discrimination discrepancy: Perceiving my group but not myself to be a target for discrimination. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 16, 256-262.

Taylor, S.E. (2002). *The tending instinct: How nurturing is essential to who we are and how we live.* New York, NY: Times Books/Henry Holt.

Terre Blanche, M., Durrheim, K. & Painter, D. (2008). *Research in practice: Applied methods for the social sciences*. Cape Town: UCT Press.

Thomas, A. (2002). Employment equity in South Africa: Lessons from the global school. *International Journal of Manpower*, 23(3), 237-255.

Thomas, A. (2003). Employment equity practices at selected companies in South Africa. *South African Journal of Labour Relations*, 27(3 & 4), 6-40.

Tosi, H.L. & Einbender, S.W. (1985). The effects of the type and amount of information in sex discrimination research: A meta-analysis. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 28(3), 712-723.

Tsoka, E.M. & Mathipa, E.R. (2001). Possible barriers to the advancement of women to leadership positions in the education profession. *South African Journal of Education*, 21(4), 324-330.

Turner, J.C. & Reynolds, K.J. (2004). The social identity perspective in intergroup relations: Theories, themes and controversies. In M.B. Brewer & M. Hewstone (eds.), *Self and social identity* (pp. 259-277), Oxford: Blackwell.

Van Antwerpen, S. & Ferreira, E. (2010). Males in predominantly female-dominated positions: A South African perspective. *Journal of Contemporary Management*, 7, 363-379.

Van den Heuvel, A. & Wooden, M. (1995). Do explanations of absenteeism differ for men and women? *Human Relations*, 48, 1309-1329.

Van Wijk, C. (2011). Contemporary sexism in the South African Navy. *Social Indicators Research,* 100(2), 299-311.

Van Zyl, B. & Roodt, G. (2003). Female perceptions on employment equity: Is the glass ceiling cracking? *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 1(2), 13-20.

Vroom, V. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York, NY: Wiley.

Walsh, B.M., Tuller, M.D., Matthews, R.A., Parks, K.M. & McDonald, D.P. (2010). A multilevel model of the effects of equal opportunity climate on job satisfaction in the military. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 15(2), 191-207.

Walster, E., Walster G.W. & Berschield, E. (1987). *Equity: Theory and research*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Walters, I.S. & Le Roux, N.J. (2008). Monitoring gender remuneration inequalities in academia using biplots. *ORION*, 24(1), 49-73.

Welle, B. & Heilman, M.E. (2005). *Formal and informal discrimination against women at work.* West Point, NY: Information Age Publishers.

Williams, D.R, Neighbors, H.W. & Jackson, J.S. (2003). Racial/ethnic discrimination and health: Findings from community studies. *American Journal of Public Health*, 93(2), 200-208.

Yamauchi, F. & Tiongco, M. (2013). Why women are progressive in education? Gender disparities in human capital, labor markets, and family arrangement in the Philippines. *Economics of Education Review*, 32, 196-206.

Yukl, G. (2010). *Leadership in organisations* (7th edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Zalesny, M.D. & Ford, J.K. (1990). Extending the social information processing perspective: New links to attitudes, behaviors, and perceptions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 47(2), 205-246.

Zhu, D., Xie, X. & Gan, Y. (2011). Information source and valence: How information credibility influences earthquake risk perception. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 31, 129-136.

Zulu, C. (2003). Gender representation patterns in higher education management in South Africa: Perspectives on higher education. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 17(1), 98-104.

ANNEXURE A: GUIDELINES FOR AUTHORS

The editorial policy and guidelines for contributors of the articles presented in this thesis are presented here. It should be noted that in some cases the guidelines were not followed to the letter. In these instances, recent articles published in the specific journals were used. The guidelines of the American Psychological Association (APA) are not presented here, as they are too extensive. In this regard see:

American Psychological Association. (2010). *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th edition). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

In **Article 1,** the guidelines of the **South African Journal of Labour Relations** were used. The guidelines are available online at http://www.journals.co.za/ej/images/labour_auth.pdf [Accessed 2013-11-06].

Editorial policy and guidelines for contributors

Editorial mission

It is the purpose of the journal to promote and facilitate the understanding and development of theories and practices concerned with people in relation to employment in its broadest sense, by providing a forum for constructive debate, discussion, analysis, reporting and commentary.

Scope of the journal

Apart from articles of an academic nature, which are research based, the journal will publish commentaries, analyses, overviews, case studies, survey results and reports on aspects related to employment relations (in the broadest sense) in South and southern Africa. Articles on any relevant international issues as they relate to current ideas, theory building and developments in practice will also be considered. While interested authors from any country are invited to submit their work for possible publication, Africa-related themes are especially encouraged in the context of the dire need to develop indigenous theory and understanding of people management in the African context. "Employment relations" is a term which is broadly considered to include the following: work, employment and unemployment; labour and trade unionism; organisational behaviour, change and development; education, training and management development; labour law; collective bargaining, direct and indirect forms of worker participation and industrial democracy at all levels from the shop floor to the national level of tripartism; labour economics and labour market developments; forms of industrial conflict; organisational and cross-cultural communication; national labour policy trends and developments; human resource management topics, including, but not limited to, equal opportunities, affirmative action, discrimination, diversified and multicultural workforces, human resource planning,

job and work design, recruitment and selection, organisation entry, performance management, career and succession management, health, safety and employee well-being, motivation, leadership, remuneration and reward management; broader environmental trends as they relate to employment; and international comparative employment relations and themes related to people management strategies and practices in general. The journal will therefore be of interest to practitioners, researchers, academics, trainers and educators as well as to policy makers in the private, public and semi-public sectors of South Africa and other countries.

Nature of contributions

The journal welcomes the submission of manuscripts by policymakers, practitioners, academics and researchers. Contributions for the Academic section (accredited) are especially welcome. The criteria for acceptance are based on the soundness of the research base and/or the academic rigour of the arguments provided. Contributions for the Forum section (non-accredited) could include comments and/or reports on interesting and relevant developments and/or case studies with significant practical value but without the necessary theoretical or academic underpinning. As far as possible, manuscripts should display a fine balance between well-attested facts and well-informed opinion and argument and a writing style which is intelligible to specialists and non-specialists.

Guidelines for manuscripts

Manuscripts submitted for consideration should comply with the following requirements:

1 They should be submitted in English.

2 Contributions should be submitted in MS Word, 1.5-spaced typescript, using the font Arial (12 point) with wide margins and the UK English language style.

3 Manuscripts for the *Academic section* should be between 5000 and 10 000 words, and those for the *Forum section* between 2000 and 5000 words.

4 Since the South African Journal of Labour Relations follows a policy of blind peer review, the first page of the manuscript should contain the title of the article (preferably no more than fifteen words), but not the name(s) of the author(s).

5 A separate page should contain the title, a brief autobiographical note which includes the name(s) of the author(s), the academic title, the position held, the name of the employer, telephone number(s), postal address(es) and e-mail address(es).

6 The article should be preceded by an abstract of no more than 200 words. The abstract should not form part of the text. A list of relevant key words should also be included for cataloguing purposes.

7 Headings should be numbered 1, 2, etc and subheadings 1.1, 1.2, etc. All headings and subheadings must appear adjacent to the left margin in **bold**.

8 All tables, illustrations and figures should be submitted in black and white. The editor reserves the right to refuse publication of any submission for which the artwork is not of an acceptable standard. Tables, numbered clearly at the top, and graphs/figures numbered clearly at the bottom, should be placed in their final positions (not appended at the end).

9 The Harvard referencing technique should be used (see guidelines below).

10 Footnotes should be avoided; if notes are necessary these should be endnotes.

11 Italics or underlining should be used sparingly for emphasis.

12 Latin words such as *inter alia* appear in italics, but high frequency expressions such as “et al” and “etc” which are no longer regarded as foreign words are not italicised. Note, however, that the use of abbreviations should be avoided as far as possible.

13 The Editor reserves the right to accept other styles, to make minor alterations to the style or to reject any manuscript on the grounds of deficiencies of style or content.

14 It is required that all author(s) have their draft articles reviewed for language proficiency before submitting them to the editors. Sometimes excellent submissions have to drastically amended or even rejected because of linguistic ineptitude. The editors reserve the right to make minor editorial adjustments without consulting the author.

Reference technique

The Harvard system of referencing should be used.

Examples of reference in the text:

1 According to Wissing (2000), …

2 Borjas (1992:149) does, …

3 … to self-actualisation (Cilliers & Coetzee 2003; Cilliers et al 2004) …

4 … through managerial ranks (Fischer & Maritz 1994:22) …

Examples of references in the list of references

1 Anastasi, A. 1990. *Psychological testing*. New York: Macmillan.

2 Antonovsky, A. 1985. The life cycle, mental health and sense of coherence. *Israel Journal of Psychiatry and Related Science* 22(4):273-280.

3 Becker, JS. 2002. Human capital, in *The concise encyclopedia of economics*. Available at: www.econlib.org/library/Enc/HumanCapital.html (accessed on...).

4 Crampton, SM & Mishra, J. 1999. Women in management. *Public Personal Management* 28(1):87-107.

5 Hair, JF, Anderson, RE, Tatham, RL & Black, WC. 1998. *Multivariate data analysis.* 5th edition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

References are listed alphabetically according to the surname of the first author in the “List of references”.

In **Article 2** the guidelines of the **Journal of Psychology in Africa** were used. The journal guidelines is available online at http://www.elliottfitzpatrick.com/downloads/JPAGuidelines.pdf [Accessed 2013-11-06].

Instructions to authors

The **Journal of Psychology in Africa** includes original articles, review articles, book reviews, commentaries, special issues, case analyses, reports, special announcements, etc. Contributions should attempt a synthesis of local and universal methodologies and applications. Specifically, manuscripts should: 1) Combine quantitative and qualitative data, 2) Take a systematic qualitative or

ethnographic approach, 3) Use an original and creative methodological approach, 4) Address an important but overlooked topic, and 5) Present new theoretical or conceptual ideas. Also, all papers must show an awareness of the cultural context of the research questions asked, the measures used, and the results obtained. Finally the papers should be practical, based on local experience, and applicable to crucial development efforts in key areas of psychology.

Editorial policy

Submission of a manuscript implies that the material has not previously been published, nor is it being considered for publication elsewhere. Submission of a manuscript will be taken to imply transfer of copyright of the material to the publishers, Elliott & Fitzpatrick. Contributions are accepted on the understanding that the authors have the authority for publication. Material accepted for publication in this journal may not be reprinted or published, Elliott & Fitzpatrick. The Journal has a policy of anonymous peer review. Papers will be scrutinised and commented on by at least two independent expert referees or consulting editors as well as by an editor. The Editor reserves the right to revise the final draft of the manuscript to conform to editorial requirements.

Manuscripts

Manuscripts should be submitted in English, French, Portuguese or Spanish. They should be typewritten and double-spaced, with wide margins, using one side of the page only. Manuscripts should be submitted to the Editor-in-Chief, Journal of Psychology in Africa, Professor Elias Mpofu, PhD., CRC, Associate Professor, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Sydney, Cumberland Campus, East Street, PO Box 170 Lidcombe NSW 1825, Australia, email: e.mpofu@usyd.edu.au. We encourage authors to submit manuscripts via e-mail, in MS Word, but we also require two hard copies of any e-mail submission. Before submitting a manuscript, authors should peruse and consult a recent issue of the *Journal of Psychology in Africa* for general layout and style. Manuscripts should conform to the publication guidelines of the latest edition of the American Psychological Association (APA) publication manual of instructions for authors.

Manuscript format

All pages must be numbered consecutively, including those containing the references, tables and figures. The typescript of manuscripts should be arranged as follows:

Title: This should be brief, sufficiently informative for retrieval by automatic searching techniques and should contain important key-words (preferably <10 words).

Author(s) and Address(es) of author(s): The corresponding author must be indicated. The author's respective addresses where the work was done must be indicated. An e-mail address, telephone number and fax number for the corresponding author must be provided.

Abstract: Articles and abstracts must be in English. Submission of abstracts translated to French, Portuguese and/or Spanish is encouraged. For data-based contributions, the abstract should be structured as follows: *Objective*—the primary purpose of the paper, *Method* – data source, subjects, design, measurements, data analysis, *Results* – key findings, and *Conclusions* – implications, future directions. For all other contributions (except editorials, letters and book reviews) the abstract must be a concise statement of the content of the paper. Abstracts must not exceed 120 words. It should summarize the information presented in the paper but should not include references.

***Referencing*:** Referencing style should follow APA manual of instructions for authors.

***References in text*:** References in running text should be quoted as follows: (Louw & Mkize, 2004), or (Louw, 2004), or Louw (2000, 2004a, 2004b), or (Louw & Mkize, 2004), or (Mkize, 2003; Louw & Naidoo, 2004). All surnames should be cited the first time the reference occurs, e.g., Louw, Mkize, and Naidoo (2004) or (Louw, Mkize, & Naidoo, 2004). Subsequent citations should use **et al.**, e.g. Louw et al. (2004) or (Louw et al., 2004). 'Unpublished observations' and 'personal communications' may be cited in the text, but not in the reference list. Manuscripts accepted but not yet published can be included as references followed by 'in press'.

Reference list: Full references should be given at the end of the article in alphabetical order, using double spacing. References to journals should include the author's surnames and initials, the full title of the paper, the full name of the journal, the year of publication, the volume number, and inclusive page numbers. Titles of journals must not be abbreviated. References to books should include the authors' surnames and initials, the year of publication, the full title of the book, the place of publication, and the publisher's name. References should be cited as per the examples below:

Appoh, L. (1995). *The effects of parental attitudes, beliefs and values on the nutritional status of their children in two communities*

in Ghana (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Trondheim, Norway.

Peltzer, K. (2001). Factors at follow-up associated with adherence with directly observed therapy (DOT) for tuberculosis patients in South Africa. *Journal of Psychology in Africa, 11,* 165-185.

Sternberg, R. J. (2001, June). *Cultural approaches to intellectual and social competencies*. Paper presented at the Annual

Convention of the American Psychological Society, Toronto, Canada.

Cook, D. A., & Wiley, C. Y. (2000). Psychotherapy with members of the African American churches and spiritual traditions. In P. S. Richards & A. E. Bergin (Ed.), *Handbook of psychotherapy and religiosity diversity* (pp. 369-396). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Tables: Tables should be either included at the end of the manuscript or as a separate file. Indicate the correct placement by indicating the insertion point in brackets, e.g., <Insert Table 1 approximately here>. Tables should be provided as either tab-delimited text or as a MS Word table (One item/cell). Font for tables should be Helvetica text to maintain consistency.

Figures/Graphs/Photos: Figures, graphs and photos should be provided in graphic format (either JPG or TIF) with a separate file for each figure, graph or photo. Indicate the correct placement by indicating the insertion point in brackets, e.g., <Insert Figure 1 approximately here>. Provide the title for the item and any notes that should appear at bottom of item in the manuscript text. Items should be cropped to avoid the appearance of superfluous white space around items. Text on figures and graphs should be Helvetica to maintain consistency. Figures must not repeat data presented in the text or tables. Figures should be planned to appear to a maximum final width of either 80 or 175 mm. (3.5 or 7.0"). Complicated symbols or patterns must be avoided. Graphs and histograms should preferably be two-dimensional and scale marks provided. All lines should be black but not too heavy or thick (including boxes). Color only in photos or color sensitive graphic illustrations. Extra charges will be levied for color printing.

Text: 1. Do not align text using spaces or tabs in references. Use on of the following: (a) use CTRL-T in Word 2007 to generate a hanging indent or (b) MS Word allows author to define a style (e.g., reference) that will create the correct formatting. 2. Per APA guidelines, only one space should follow any punctuation. 3. Do not insert spaces at the beginning or end of paragraphs. 4. Do not use color in text.

In **Article 3** the guidelines of the **South-African Journal for Economic and Management Science** were used. The journal guideline are available online at http://www.journals.co.za/ej/ejour_ecoman.html [Accessed 2013-11-06].

Author Guidelines

Please note that as an ISI-Indexed journal, SAJEMS publishes submissions of a high standard. Manuscripts should therefore as a minimum contain and address the following aspects:

- An introduction and/or basic literature study section(s) clearly indicating the research gap being investigated.
- A research statement and/or question that is considered to be i) of adequate actuality and research-ability to warrant publication in an ISI-indexed journal and ii) falling within the broader scope and focus of SAJEMS.
- An adequate explanation of i) the theoretical framework / research paradigm in which the article is contextualised, and ii) the research methodology in order to gauge the scientific validity of the research findings.
- An adequate and clear discussion of the research findings, any conclusions and recommendations that indicate how (or whether) the research gap has been addressed.
- All submissions must comply with the author guidelines stipulated below, or they will not be considered for publication.

General

All submissions are to be written in acceptable English. Manuscripts not meeting SAJEMS standards in terms hereof, may be returned to authors.

- Please upload your anonymous manuscript with the i) title and abstract, the ii) Journal of Economic Literature (JEL) classification number(s) and iii) keywords. (Refer to http://www.aeaweb.org/jel/guide/jel.php for more information on the JEL classification system).
- The author(s), their institutional affiliations, and the contact details of the corresponding author should be entered when registering on the website. There should be NO reference to any author(s) details on the manuscript itself.
- Please submit on a separate document from the manuscript (or as part of the cover letter), details of at least two potential referees (including the names, employer details and email addresses). Note that the editor retains the sole right to decide whether or not the suggested reviewers are to be used.
- Please use the submission ID of your uploaded manuscript in all your correspondence and payments.

- Submission of a manuscript confirms that the research was conducted by the listed author(s), and that the manuscript is not under consideration at another journal anywhere in the world, nor has it been published anywhere before.
- SAJEMS condones neither plagiarism nor the infringement of copyright.
- All manuscripts are subjected to a double-blind reviewing process managed by the editorial board. The review processing time varies by article, and it can take up to a year (or more) for a paper to be published.

Types of manuscripts

- According to the mission, focus and scope of SAJEMS, the purpose of the journal is to publish economic and management science research, preferably of an interdisciplinary nature from areas such economics, finance, accounting, human capital and related disciplines that breaks down common intellectual silos and prepares a new path for debate on the operation and development of sustainable wealth creating organisations and markets both in the African context and abroad.
- Only the following types of papers will be considered for publication: i) original research, ii) new perspectives on previous research and iii) research notes. Please note that a summary of the literature is not considered as constituting a new perspective on previous research.

Format of manuscript

- Manuscript submissions should not exceed 7000 words including abstract, figures, tables, references, and other necessary items.
- All manuscript submissions should be written in either “Arial” or “Times New Roman” with a 12 point font, using 1.5 line spacing.
- The first page of the manuscript should contain a concise abstract (200 – 400 words), the JEL classification, and up to 10 keywords. The main text of the manuscript should start on the second page of the submission.
- Referencing should follow the Harvard referencing system. For details, please see the formatting example on the SAJEMS website.
- Endnotes are to be used, and not footnotes. These should be numbered sequentially and placed immediately following the text of the manuscript.
- Tables should be self-explanatory, i.e. a reader should be able to understand the table without reading the article. They should be numbered consecutively throughout the manuscript. Notes immediately following the table should explain any symbols or other useful information to the reader. The source of the table and any software used should be listed. Avoid using variable names; but rather short clear descriptions.
- Figures should be self-explanatory and numbered consecutively throughout the manuscript. Notes describing the figure should be included immediately below the figure, and should include the source and software used.
- Equations should be numbered consecutively, with these numbers appearing to the right of the equation. Theorems, lemmas, corollaries and proofs should also be numbered consecutively; however, we prefer that proofs be relegated to the appendix, in order to maintain the flow of the manuscript.
- Once a manuscript has been accepted, it will be text edited by SAJEMS’ language consultants. Text edited papers are returned to the author(s) for approval. We ask authors to submit the accepted

text edited version within three days, following which, it is sent to the layout specialist. Any thanks, acknowledgements or other considerations should be placed in a final section of the paper; the heading of the section should be “Acknowledgements”.

For **Article 4** the writing style of **Alternation** was followed. The journal guidelines are available online at http://alternation.ukzn.ac.za/index.php/submissions [Accessed 2013-11-06].

Guidelines for Contributors

Manuscripts must be submitted in English (UK). If quotations from other languages appear in the manuscript, place the original in a footnote and a dynamic-equivalent translation in the body of the text or both in the text.

Contributors must submit one computer-generated and three, double-spaced printed copies of the manuscript. The computer-generated copy may be sent to the editor or guest editor in Word for Windows. If accepted for publication, 10 original off-print copies of the article will be returned to the author after publication.

Manuscripts should range between 5000-8000 and book reviews between 500-1000 words. However, longer articles may he considered for publication.

Attach a cover page to one manuscript containing the following information: Author's full name, address, e-mail address, position, department, university/ institution, telephone/ fax numbers as well as a list of previous publications.

Maps, diagrams and posters must be presented in print-ready form. Clear black and white or colour digitised photos (postcard size) or diagrams may also be submitted.

Use footnotes sparingly. In order to enhance the value of the interaction between notes and text, we use footnotes and not endnotes.

Authors may use their own numbering systems in the manuscript.

Except for bibliographical references, abbreviations must include fullstops. The abbreviations (e.a.) = 'emphasis added'; (e.i.o.) = 'emphasis in original'; (i.a.) or [...] = 'insertion added' may be used.

The full bibliographical details of sources are provided only once at the end of the manuscript under References. References in the body of the manuscript should follow the following convention: Dlodlo (1994:14) argues .... or at the end of a reference/quotation: ..... (Dlodlo 1994:14).

The full name or initials of authors as it appears in the source must be used in the References section.

Review articles and book reviews must include a title as well as the following information concerning the book reviewed: title, author, place of publication, publisher, date of publication, number of pages and the ISBN number.

The format for the references section is as follows:

Head, Bessie 1974. *A Question of Power*. Oxford: Heinemann Educational Publishers.

Mhlophe, Gcina 1990. Nokulunga's Wedding. In Van Niekerk, Annemarie (ed): *Raising the Blinds. A Century of South African Women's Stories*. Parklands: Ad Donker.

Mngadi, Sikhumbuzo 1994. 'Popular Memory' and Social Change in South African Historical Drama of the Seventies in English: The Case of Credo Mutwa's' *Unosimela*. *Alternation* 1,1:37-41.
Fanon, Frantz 1986. *Black Skin, White Masks*. Markmann, Charles Lam (trans). London: Pluto Press.

ANNEXURE B: INTERVIEW SCEDULE

Manager interview

Official use
A-1-5

Dear Sir / Madam

As per our discussion I would like to request some information from you regarding unfair gender-based discrimination in the workplace. Please allow me to clarify the terminology that will be used in this interview.

Unfair gender-based discrimination implies that a person belonging to a certain group receives work-related benefits, based on that person's gender, and not solely on work-related performance contributions.

The questions posed will relate to entry level appointments, higher level appointments (including promotions), and remuneration. Entry level appointment refers to the entrance of an employee to an entry level at Company X, and higher level appointments refers to vertical movement to a higher position, or entry at senior levels at Company X.

Remuneration refers to the returns employees receive for their work-related activities. This refers to financial rewards such as pay, bonuses and benefits, but also includes non-financial rewards such as paid time of work, training and development opportunities, and even recognition.

In answering the questions that will follow, I do not want you to focus on the organisation as a whole, but only on the employees at Company X.

Given the aforementioned, entry level appointment would be entrance to Company X and higher level appointments (promotions) would be vertical movement within Company X or moving out of Company X to a higher level in the organisation.

Could you please answer the following important questions related to discrimination at Company X?	Official use
1 Do you believe that there is discrimination, in favour or against women, in terms of the **appointment** of women at Company X? >>>>> In favour / against / no discrimination (encircle the appropriate word/s). >>>>> If the respondent answers in favour or against, ask: In what way does it happen? Write this down. …….. …….. >>>>> If no, move to question 2.	B-1/2/3
2 I am obligated to ask you the following question irrespective of your previous answer. Please look at this list of possible steps in the **appointment** process. Now, consider the appointment process at Company X again, and state if discrimination against women or men occurs at any one of these	C-1/2/3/4/5/6/7/8/0 D-2/3/4/5/6/

stages. If it occurs at any of these stages, please indicate what form it takes. >>>>>> Hand the appointment process sheet (Annexure I) to the respondent and ask him / her to consider the points. Allow the respondent to write comments on the annexure to explain him or herself.	7/8/0 E- 3/4/5/6/7/ 8/0
3 Are there, in this organisation, any **formal policies** that suggest that women should be given preferential treatment with regard to **appointments** in Company X? >>>>> If No, move to the next question (encircle No). >>>>> If Yes, ask: Which policies? Write this down. ……..	F-0/1
4 Is there, in this organisation, any **unwritten instructions** that suggest that women should be given preferential treatment with regard to **appointments** in Company X? >>>>> If No, move to the next question (encircle No). >>>>> If Yes, ask: Where does this originate from? Write this down. ……..	G-0/1
5 Do you believe that there is discrimination, in favour or against women, in terms of the **promotion** of women, at Company X? >>>>> In favour / against / no discrimination (encircle the appropriate word/s). >>>>> If in favour or against, ask: In what way does it happen? Write this down. …….. …….. >>>>> If no, move to question 6.	H-1/2/3
6 I am obligated to ask you the following question irrespective of your previous answer. Please look at this list of possible steps in the **promotion** process. Now, consider the promotion process at Company X again, and state if discrimination against women or men occurs at any one of these stages. If it occurs at any of these stages, please indicate what form it takes. Hand the promotion process sheet (Annexure II) to the respondent and ask him / her to consider the points. Allow the respondent to write comments on the Annexure to explain him or herself.	I- 1/2/3/4/5/ 6/7/8/9/0 J- 2/3/4/5/6/ 7/8/9/0 K- 3/4/5/6/7/ 8/9/0
7 Are there, in this organisation, any **formal policies** that suggest that women should be given preferential treatment with regard to **promotions** in Company X? >>>>> If No, move to the next question (encircle No). >>>>> If Yes, ask: Which policies? Write this down. ……..	L-0/1
8 Are there, in this organisation, any **unwritten instructions** that suggest that women should be given preferential treatment with regard to **promotion** in Company X? >>>>> If No, move to the next question (encircle No). >>>>> If Yes, ask: Where does this originate from? Write this down. ……..	M-0/1

9 Do you believe that there is discrimination, in favour or against women, in terms of **the remuneration** of women, at Company X? >>>>> In favour / against / no discrimination (encircle the appropriate word/s). >>>>> If in favour or against, ask: In what way does it happen? Write this down. …….. …….. >>>>> If no, move to question 10.	N-1/2/3
10 I am obligated to ask you the following question irrespective of your previous answer. Please look at this list of possible steps in the **remuneration** process. Now, consider the remuneration process at Company X again, and state if discrimination against women or men occurs at any one of these stages. If it occurs at any of these stages, please indicate what form it takes. Hand the remuneration process sheet (Annexure III) to the respondent and ask him / her to consider the points. Allow the respondent to write comments on the Annexure to explain him or herself.	O-1/2/3/4/5/0 P-2/3/4/5/0 Q-1/2/3/4/5/0
11 Are there, in this organisation, any **formal policies** that suggest that women should be given preferential treatment with regard to **remuneration** in Company X? >>>>> If No, move to the next question (encircle No). >>>>> If Yes, ask: Which policies? Write this down. ……..	R-0/1
12 Are there, in this organisation, any **unwritten instructions** that suggest that women should be given preferential treatment with regard to **remuneration** in Company X? >>>>> If No, move to the next question (encircle No). >>>>> If Yes, ask: Where does this originate from? Write this down. ……..	S-0/1
13 What percentage of the workforce at Company X, without looking at exact numbers, is women? >>>>> (Encircle one): 10% / 20% / 30% / 40% / 50% / 60% / 70% / 80% / 90%.	T-1/2/3/4/5/6/7/8/9
14 What percentage of women, without looking at exact numbers, occupies management positions at Company X? >>>>> (Encircle one): 10% / 20% / 30% / 40% / 50% / 60% / 70% / 80% / 90%.	U-1/2/3/4/5/6/7/8/9
>>>>> What is the gender of the respondent? (Encircle one): Male / Female	V-1/0
>>>>> What is the position of the respondent? (Write down department and position): Department: ……Position: …….	
>>>>> What is the name of this company: Company X	W-1-20

Thank you for your co-operation, thus far. Now for the short questionnaire.
>>>>> Now hand the questionnaire to the respondent.

Annexure I: **Entry Level Appointment Process** – *Does discrimination against women occur at any of these steps? (Pick a maximum of 3 steps)*

Step	**Presence of discrimination against women**	**If yes, comment on the form of discrimination**	Official use
1 Job analysis / Post description	Yes / No		C1/blank (if yes, punch 1, if No, leave the space blank)
2 Advertising of post	Yes / No		C2/blank D2/blank
3 Screening of applicants (e.g. psychometric tests and medical examinations)	Yes / No		C3/blank D3/blank E3/blank
4 Interviews with applicants	Yes / No		C4/blank D4/blank E4/blank
5 Decisions following interview	Yes / No		C5/blank D5/blank E5/blank
6 Salary offers	Yes / No		C6/blank D6/blank E6/blank
7 Induction of employees (orientation)	Yes / No		C7/blank D7/blank D6/blank
8 Placement of employees	Yes / No		C8/blank D8/blank E8/blank
0 Other (Additional)	Yes/No		C0/blank D0/blank E0/blank

Annexure II: **Higher Level Appointment (Promotion) Process** – *Does discrimination against women occur at any of these steps? (Pick a maximum of 3 steps)*

Step	**Presence of discrimination against women**	**If yes, comment on the form of discrimination**	Official use
1 Job analysis / Post description	Yes / No		G1/blank
2 Access to appropriate development and training	Yes / No		G2/blank H2/blank
3 Performance appraisals of employees	Yes / No		G3/blank H3/blank I3/blank
4 Advertising of post	Yes / No		G4/blank H4/blank I4/blank
5 Screening of applicants	Yes / No		G5/blank H5/blankI I5/blank
6 Interviews with applicants	Yes / No		G6/blank H6/blankI I6/blank
7 Decisions following interview	Yes / No		G7/blank H7/blankI I7/blank
8 Salary offers	Yes / No		G8/blank H8/blankI I8/blank
9 Induction of employees	Yes / No		G9/blank H9/blankI I9/blank
0 Other (Additional)	Yes/No		G0/blank H0/blankI I0/blank

Annexure III: **Remuneration Process** – *Does discrimination against women occur at any of these steps? (Pick a maximum of 3 steps)*

Step	**Presence of discrimination against women**	**If yes, comment on the form of discrimination**	Official use
1 Job analysis – Identify and describe characteristics of the job	Yes / No		K1/blank (if yes, punch 1, if No, leave the space blank)
2 Job evaluation – Determining the value the job, compared to others	Yes / No		K2/blank L2/blank
3 Pay structuring – allocating monetary value to jobs based on job evaluation and market rates	Yes / No		K3/blank L3/blank M3/blank
4 Performance appraisals – Effective assessment of individual performance	Yes / No		K4/blank L4/blank M4/blank
5 Decision-making practices – Pay related decisions	Yes / No		K5/blank L5/blank M5/blank
0 Other (Additional)	Yes / No		K0/blank L0/blank M0/blank

ANNEXURE C: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR MANAGERS

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Gender-based discrimination in the workplace

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by several MBL students and Prof Renier Steyn (PhD, DLitt et Phil), from the University of South Africa. This research forms part of my studies towards a master's degree in business leadership.
Please read the following and decide whether you are interested in participating in the study. You will be included in this study only if you are willing to participate voluntarily.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to investigate how gender-based discrimination in the workplace manifests itself. This kind of research is important as it will lead to the identification of the specific practices that may lead to gender-based discrimination, it will measure the levels of perceived discrimination, and will also identify the actual levels of discrimination. This may result in addressing the important issue of unfair discrimination and may result in a better working environment for all employees.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission or as required by legislation (The Mental Health Care Act, Act 17 of 2002).
Confidentiality is not a concern in this research as the tests will be answered anonymously and individual identifiers will not be requested. The data will be kept private on the completion of the study.

PROCEDURES

Should you volunteer to participate in this study, we would like you to answer a single questionnaire. The questionnaire consists of three questions, and contains questions on human resource management practices, discrimination, and where discrimination may occur. The time it will take you to complete the questionnaire is approximately 30 minutes. Your participation will involve the completion of the questionnaires and nothing more. You are free to refuse to answer any questions or to withdraw from the process at any stage.

POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

There are no foreseeable physical or psychological risks to participation. You will be mildly inconvenienced by the time it takes to complete the questionnaire (30 minutes). If you would like to discuss the research and your reactions to the questionnaire, you are welcome to do so after the session.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO SUBJECTS AND/OR TO SOCIETY

You will not directly benefit from your participation in the research. The results of the research will, however, be of scientific and practical value in understanding how people react to discrimination in the workplace and current human resource management practices. The research results may improve the quality or change the emphasis of human resource management practices, and through association improve work attitudes and performance.

PAYMENT FOR PARTICIPATION

You will receive no payment for your participation.

PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

You can choose whether or not you wish to be a participant in this study. Should you volunteer to be a participant in this study, you may withdraw at any time without any repercussions whatsoever.

IDENTIFICATION OF INVESTIGATORS

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact Prof Renier Steyn at 079 227 3984 / steynr@unisa.ac.za

RIGHTS OF RESEARCH SUBJECTS

You may withdraw your consent at any time and cease participating without any penalty. You are not giving up any legal rights because of your participation in this research study. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Health Professionals Council of South Africa, Post Office Box 205, Pretoria, South Africa, (012) 338 9300 or any of the ethics committees of the SBL University of South Africa.

SIGNATURE OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANT

I understand the procedures described above. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I agree to participate in this study. Kindly note that you will not be required to sign this declaration, but that you will indicate your consent by completing the answer sheet. (A signed copy is not required, as this may identify you, and this research is done in such a way that you cannot be identified).

Manager's questionnaire

Please complete the following questionnaire by ticking the appropriate boxes.

Question 1 In the last two years at Company X, has anyone been treated unfairly because of any of the following?		Official use
Their age	Yes / No	X-1/0
Their gender	Yes / No	Y-1/0
Their nationality	Yes / No	Z-1/0
Their religion	Yes / No	AA-1/0
Their race or ethnic group	Yes / No	AB-1/0
Their sexual orientation (e.g. gay, straight, lesbian, bi-sexual etc.)	Yes / No	AC-1/0
Their disability	Yes / No	AD-1/0
Their long-term illness	Yes / No	AE-1/0
Their marital status	Yes / No	AF-1/0
Their political beliefs	Yes / No	AG-1/0
Their colour of skin	Yes / No	AH-1/0
Their physical appearance	Yes / No	AI-1/0
The way they dress	Yes / No	AJ-1/0
Being pregnant	Yes / No	AK-1/0
Union membership	Yes / No	AL-1/0
Their accent or the way they speak	Yes / No	AM-1/0
Their address or where they live	Yes / No	AN-1/0
Their social class	Yes / No	AO-1/0
Their family responsibilities	Yes / No	AP-1/0

Question 2 To what did the unfair treatment you have personally witnessed relate to?		Official use
The pay they receive	Yes / No	AQ-1/0
Their pensions	Yes / No	AR-1/0
Other benefits, perks and bonuses, besides pay	Yes / No	AS-1/0
Their working hours	Yes / No	AT-1/0
Taking holidays	Yes / No	AU-1/0
Applying for a job (horizontal movement)	Yes / No	AV-1/0
Being promoted (vertical movement)	Yes / No	AW-1/0
Getting training	Yes / No	AX-1/0
Disciplinary action	Yes / No	AY-1/0
Redundancy	Yes / No	AZ-1/0
Early retirement	Yes / No	BA-1/0
Being allowed to work flexibly (changing hours of work)	Yes / No	BB-1/0
Being ignored	Yes / No	BC-1/0
Being excluded from social activities	Yes / No	BD-1/0
Not being part of social group	Yes / No	BE-1/0
Type of work given	Yes / No	BF-1/0
Bullying/ harassment	Yes / No	BG-1/0
Falsely accused of something	Yes / No	BH-1/0
Something else (Write this down)		BI

Question 3 Gender differences in accessing resources			
Indicate which statement is true for Company X. Tick the appropriate box.			Official use
1	2	3	BJ-1/2/3
It is easier for a woman to get <u>appointed</u> at Company X than it is for a man.	It is equally difficult for a man or a woman to get <u>appointed</u> at Company X.	*It is easier for a man* to get <u>appointed</u> at Company X than it is for a woman.	

Indicate which statement is true for Company X. Tick the appropriate box.			Official use
1	2	3	BK-1/2/3
It is easier for a woman to get <u>promoted</u> at Company X than it is for a man.	It is equally difficult for a man or a woman to get <u>promoted</u> at Company X.	*It is easier for a man* to get <u>promoted</u> at Company X than it is for a woman.	

Indicate which statement is true for Company X. Tick the appropriate box.			Official use
1	2	3	BL-1/2/3
It is easier for a woman to get <u>access to training and development</u> at Company X than it is for a man.	It is equally difficult for a man or a woman to get <u>access to training and development</u> at Company X.	*It is easier for a man* to get <u>access to training and development</u> at Company X than it is for a woman.	

Indicate which statement is true for Company X. Tick the appropriate box.			Official use
1	2	3	BM-1/2/3
Generally <u>women get paid more</u> than what would equate to their inputs, compared to men.	The rule of equal work for equal pay is enforced at Company X.	Generally <u>men get paid more</u> than what would equate to their inputs, compared to women.	

ANNEXURE D: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR EMPLOYEES

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Gender-based discrimination in the workplace

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by several MBL students and Prof Renier Steyn (PhD, DLitt et Phil), from the University of South Africa. This research forms part of my studies towards a master's degree in business leadership.
Please read the following and decide whether you are interested in participating in the study. You will be included in this study only if you are willing to participate voluntarily.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to investigate how gender-based discrimination in the workplace manifests itself. This kind of research is important as it will lead to the identification of the specific practices that may lead to gender-based discrimination, it will measure the levels of perceived discrimination, and will also identify the actual levels of discrimination. This may result in addressing the important issue of unfair discrimination and may result in a better working environment for all employees.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission or as required by legislation (The Mental Health Care Act, Act 17 of 2002).
Confidentiality is not a concern in this research as the tests will be answered anonymously and individual identifiers will not be requested. The data will be kept private on the completion of the study.

PROCEDURES

Should you volunteer to participate in this study, we would like you to answer a single questionnaire. The questionnaire consists of three questions, and contains questions on human resource management practices, discrimination, and where discrimination may occur. The time it will take you to complete the questionnaire is approximately 30 minutes. Your participation will involve the completion of the questionnaires and nothing more. You are free to refuse to answer any questions or to withdraw from the process at any stage.

POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

There are no foreseeable physical or psychological risks to participation. You will be mildly inconvenienced by the time it takes to complete the questionnaire (30 minutes). If you would like to discuss the research and your reactions to the questionnaire, you are welcome to do so after the session.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO SUBJECTS AND/OR TO SOCIETY

You will not directly benefit from your participation in the research. The results of the research will, however, be of scientific and practical value in understanding how people react to discrimination in the workplace and current human resource management practices. The research results may improve the quality or change the emphasis of human resource management practices, and through association improve work attitudes and performance.

PAYMENT FOR PARTICIPATION

You will receive no payment for your participation.

PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

You can choose whether or not you wish to be a participant in this study. Should you volunteer to be a participant in this study, you may withdraw at any time without any repercussions whatsoever.

IDENTIFICATION OF INVESTIGATORS

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact Prof Renier Steyn at 079 227 3984 / steynr@unisa.ac.za

RIGHTS OF RESEARCH SUBJECTS

You may withdraw your consent at any time and cease participating without any penalty. You are not giving up any legal rights because of your participation in this research study. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Health Professionals Council of South Africa, Post Office Box 205, Pretoria, South Africa, (012) 338 9300 or any of the ethics committees of the SBL University of South Africa.

SIGNATURE OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANT

I understand the procedures described above. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I agree to participate in this study. Kindly note that you will not be required to sign this declaration, but that you will indicate your consent by completing the answer sheet. (A signed copy is not required, as this may identify you, and this research is done in such a way that you cannot be identified).

Employee questionnaire

Official use
A-1-60

Please complete the following questionnaire by ticking the appropriate boxes.

Question 1 In the last two years with Company X have you been treated unfairly because of any of the following?		Official use
My age	Yes / No	B-1/0
My gender	Yes / No	C-1/0
My nationality	Yes / No	D-1/0
My religion	Yes / No	E-1/0
My race or ethnic group	Yes / No	F-1/0
My sexual orientation (e.g. gay, straight, lesbian, bi-sexual etc.)	Yes / No	G-1/0
My disability	Yes / No	H-1/0
My long-term illness	Yes / No	I-1/0
My marital status	Yes / No	J-1/0
My political beliefs	Yes / No	K-1/0
My colour of skin	Yes / No	L-1/0
My physical appearance	Yes / No	M-1/0
The way I dress	Yes / No	N-1/0
Being pregnant	Yes / No	O-1/0
Union membership	Yes / No	P-1/0
Accent or the way I speak	Yes / No	Q-1/0
Address or where I live	Yes / No	R-1/0
My social class	Yes / No	S-1/0
My family responsibilities	Yes / No	T-1/0

Question 2 To what did the unfair treatment you have personally experienced relate to?		Official use
The pay you receive	Yes / No	U-1/0
Your pensions	Yes / No	V-1/0
Other benefits, perks and bonuses, besides pay	Yes / No	W-1/0
Your working hours	Yes / No	X-1/0
Taking holidays	Yes / No	Y-1/0
Applying for a job (horizontal movement)	Yes / No	Z-1/0
Being promoted (vertical movement)	Yes / No	AA-1/0
Getting training	Yes / No	AB-1/0
Disciplinary action	Yes / No	AC-1/0
Redundancy	Yes / No	AD-1/0
Early retirement	Yes / No	AE-1/0
Being allowed to work flexibly (changing hours of work)	Yes / No	AF-1/0
Being ignored	Yes / No	AG-1/0
Being excluded from social activities	Yes / No	AH-1/0
Not being part of social group	Yes / No	AI-1/0
Type of work given	Yes / No	AJ-1/0
Bullying/ harassment	Yes / No	AK-1/0
Falsely accused of something	Yes / No	AL-1/0
Something else (Write this it down)		AM

Question 3 Gender differences in accessing resources			
Indicate which statement is true for Company X. Tick the appropriate box.			Official use
1	2	3	AN-1/2/3
It is easier for a woman to get <u>appointed</u> at Company X than it is for a man.	It is equally difficult for a man or a woman to get <u>appointed</u> at Company X.	*It is easier for a man* to get <u>appointed</u> at Company X than it is for a woman.	

Indicate which statement is true for Company X. Tick the appropriate box.			Official use
1	2	3	AO-1/2/3
It is easier for a woman to get <u>promoted</u> at Company X than it is for a man.	It is equally difficult for a man or a woman to get <u>promoted</u> at Company X.	*It is easier for a man* to get <u>promoted</u> at Company X than it is for a woman.	

Indicate which statement is true for Company X. Tick the appropriate box.			Official use
1	2	3	AP-1/2/3
It is easier for a woman to get <u>access to training and development</u> at Company X than it is for a man.	It is equally difficult for a man or a woman to get <u>access to training and development</u> at Company X.	*It is easier for a man* to get <u>access to training and development</u> at Company X than it is for a woman.	

Indicate which statement is true for Company X. Tick the appropriate box.			Official use
1	2	3	AQ-1/2/3
Generally <u>women get paid more</u> than what would equate to their inputs, compared to men.	The rule of <u>equal work for equal pay</u> is enforced at Company X.	Generally <u>men get paid more</u> than what would equate to their inputs, compared to women.	

Question 4 Demographic information						Official use
Gender		Male	Female			AR-1/0
Race	Asian	Black	Coloured	White	Other	AS-1/2/3/4/5
Status	Single	Married	Divorced	Widow	Other	AT-1/2/3/4/5
Age				_____Years		AU
Number of companies you have worked for since age 18				_____Companies		AV
Number of years in full-time employment since age 18				_____Years		AW
Years of formal schooling		Less than 12 years	12 years (matric)	1st Degree / Diploma	Higher degree / Diploma	AX-1/2/3/4
Highest job-specific qualification			None	1st Degree / Diploma	Higher degree / Diploma	AY-3/4
Area of qualification		Not applicable	BA	BCom	BSc	AZ-0/1/2/3
Did you receive any specialised certified training at Company X?				Yes	No	BA-1/0
Are you registered with a professional body related to your present job?				Yes	No	BB-1/0
Number of years with present employer				_____Years		BC
Do you belong to an acknowledged trade union?				Yes	No	BD-1/0
Did you receive any special recognition or awards in the past 2 years at Company X?				Yes	No	BE-1/0
How many times have you been on maternity leave? (Men should answer 0)				_____Times		BF
How many children, younger than 21 years, stay with you in your house?				_____Children		BG
What is type of work do you do?		Support / Admin	Management of Support / Admin	Core business / Operations	Management of Core business / Operations	BH – 1/2/3/4
What is your salary level?		1	2	3	4	5
		6	7	8	9	10
		11	12	13	14	15
						BI-1-15