

**A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE  
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE  
AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICY AT THE  
UNIVERSITY OF NAMIBIA**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT  
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF  
MASTER OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION**

**OF**

**THE UNIVERSITY OF NAMIBIA**

**Faculty of Economics and Management Sciences, Department of  
Political and Administrative Studies**

**By**

**Tekla Tjipura**

**SUPERVISOR: Dr. H. Riruako**

**EXAMINER: Prof. C. J.J Mphaisha**

**FEBRUARY 2006**

## **ABSTRACT**

Affirmative Action is a concept that started in the USA, where intentional policies and measures were taken to correct historical socio- economic imbalances between Whites and Blacks. Since then, Affirmative Action has been widely employed in many countries to address such imbalances, with varying degrees of success. This study attempts to critically analyse the implementation of Affirmative Action at the University of Namibia against the backdrop of experiences in other countries. The study identifies bottlenecks either due to ignorance, attitudes and fear; and compares these with experiences drawn from other countries. From this analysis a list of norms considered imperative for success, thereby providing the way forward in the implementation of the Affirmative Action Policy at the University has been identified.

Using a combination of methods involving literature survey, questionnaire distribution and analysis, and interviewing, the study found out that although the country has made notable and smooth progress in the implementation of Affirmative Action, the same cannot be said for the University of Namibia. The greatest problem noted was lack of information sharing and publicity on the implementation process, as well as deep rooted mistrust among different social groups within the University. This does not mean, however, that the University has not made any progress, but the study highlights impediments to smooth implementation of Affirmative Action Policy. The University needs to develop methods of information sharing and work to create harmony within different social groups. A clear action plan with a time frame for deliverables should be designed and made public, and progress reports against this plan should be compiled regularly and widely shared with the university staff. This will improve the current sombre state and avoid pitfalls that other implementation processes suffered.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i><b>ABSTRACT</b></i> .....	<i><b>i</b></i>
<i><b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b></i> .....	<i><b>ii</b></i>
<i><b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT</b></i> .....	<i><b>iv</b></i>
<i><b>DEDICATION</b></i> .....	<i><b>v</b></i>
<i><b>DECLARATIONS</b></i> .....	<i><b>vi</b></i>
<i><b>ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS</b></i> .....	<i><b>vii</b></i>
<i><b>CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND</b></i> .....	<i><b>1</b></i>
<b>1.1 General Introduction to the Study</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>1.2 Background to the Study</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>1.3 Statement of the Problem</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>1.4 Research Question</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>1.5 Purpose of the Study</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>1.6 Importance of the Study</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>1.7 Limitations of the Study</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>1.8 Approach and Organisation</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>1.9 Definitions of Terms</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<i><b>CHAPTER 2: AFFIRMATIVE ACTION: A CONCEPTUAL EXPOSÉ AND CROSS NATIONAL REVIEWS</b></i> .....	<i><b>12</b></i>
<b>2.1 Introduction</b> .....	<b>12</b>
<b>2.2 “Affirmative Action” as a Concept</b> .....	<b>13</b>
<b>2.3 Negative Aspects of the Affirmative Action Policy</b> .....	<b>15</b>
<b>2.4 Conclusion</b> .....	<b>28</b>
<i><b>CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY</b></i> .....	<i><b>31</b></i>
<b>3.1 Introduction</b> .....	<b>31</b>
<b>3.2 The Research Instruments</b> .....	<b>32</b>
3.2.1 Questionnaires .....	32
3.2.1.1 Research design: Population and Sampling .....	33
3.2.1.2 Distribution and Collection of Questionnaires .....	37
3.2.1.3 Data analysis .....	38
3.2.2 Interviews .....	38
3.2.2.1 Preparing for the Interview .....	40
3.2.2.2 Conducting the Interview .....	42

<b>CHAPTER 4: THE HISTORICAL REVIEW OF THE UNIVERSITY'S AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICY IMPLEMENTATION</b> .....	<b>44</b>
<b>4.1 Introduction</b> .....	<b>44</b>
<b>4.2 Academic, Administrative Staff and Senior Managers</b> .....	<b>49</b>
<b>4.3 Implementation of Affirmative Action Policy</b> .....	<b>49</b>
<b>4.4 Conclusion</b> .....	<b>53</b>
<b>CHAPTER 5: DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS</b> .....	<b>55</b>
<b>5.1 Introduction</b> .....	<b>55</b>
<b>5.2 Questionnaires</b> .....	<b>55</b>
5.2.1 Awareness of the Affirmative Action Policy .....	56
5.2.2 Methods of Conveying Information Within UNAM .....	57
5.2.3 Implementation of the Affirmative Action Policy .....	59
5.2.4 Implementation Stages of the Affirmative Action Policy .....	61
5.2.5 The Way Forward.....	64
<b>5.3 Interviews</b> .....	<b>65</b>
5.3.1 Implementation of the Affirmative Action Policy .....	65
5.3.2 Extent of Implementation .....	66
5.3.3 Mechanisms to Sensitise Staff.....	67
5.3.5 Employment Equity Commission Support .....	68
5.3.6 Progress on Equal Opportunities at the University.....	68
5.3.7 Problems of Implementing Affirmative Action.....	69
5.3.8 Suggestions for Successful Implementation.....	70
<b>5.4 Summary of Findings</b> .....	<b>70</b>
5.4.1 Results of the Findings .....	70
5.4.2 Conclusions .....	77
<b>CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b> .....	<b>79</b>
<b>6.1 Introduction</b> .....	<b>79</b>
<b>6.2 Conclusion</b> .....	<b>80</b>
<b>6.3 Recommendations</b> .....	<b>84</b>
6.3.1 Recommendation for Implementation of Affirmative Action Policy at the University of Namibia .....	84
6.3.2 Recommendations for further work.....	86
<b>REFERENCE</b> .....	<b>88</b>
<b>APPENDIX 1: Questionnaire to the Deans, Directors, and Senior Managers at the University of Namibia</b> .....	<b>96</b>
<b>APPENDIX 2: Questionnaires to Administrative and Academic Employees at the University of Namibia</b> .....	<b>102</b>
<b>APPENDIX 3: Frequency Tables of Academic Staff</b> .....	<b>107</b>
<b>APPENDIX 4: Frequency Tables for Administrative Staff</b> .....	<b>113</b>
<b>APPENDIX 5: Frequency Tables for Senior Managers</b> .....	<b>117</b>
<b>APPENDIX 6: Interview Questionnaire to UNAM Employees</b> .....	<b>121</b>
<b>APPENDIX 7: Academic and Administrative Staff at the University of Namibia</b>	<b>123</b>

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

First and foremost, I would like to extend my heartfelt appreciation to my initial supervisor Mr S. Nsingo, who gave me direction in identifying my study topic, and subsequently provided a lot of advice, and injected intellectual rigour this study. Without him, this work would not have been in its present form. A special word of thanks must go to Prof. P. Mufune who assisted in providing ideas that helped to elaborate the finer details of this work. I also wish to thank Dr H. Riruako who guided me to finalise this Thesis.

I also wish to thank my friend Supii Tjiramba, with whom I spent long hours of the night while we were both working on our individual research works. Profound thanks go to Mr. Mahindi, who assisted me with data entry. I also wish to acknowledge, all the UNAM staff, who completed the questionnaires and responded to the numerous questions, designed to help me understand how the Affirmative Action Policy was working at the University of Namibia. My sincere gratitude is also extended to Professor Geoffrey E. Kiangi who assisted me with drafting the questionnaires and in the interpretation of the result from the SPSS Software. He also encouraged me to keep going on when it was difficult for me to continue with the research work and Thesis writing, while at the same time attending to office work. Last but not least, I wish to thank everyone, who helped me in one way or another to make this work a success. To my parents and siblings, I remain most grateful for your encouragement and support.

## **DEDICATION**

I dedicate this study to my dear husband, Uapiona Turitjo-Tjipura who gave me all the support while doing this work.

## **DECLARATIONS**

This is a research paper prepared in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Public Administration, a study program with the University of Namibia (UNAM) in Windhoek, Namibia. The findings, interpretations and conclusions in this Thesis are of the author and not necessarily those of the institution. This Thesis has not been submitted elsewhere for a degree.

University of Namibia

P/Bag 13301

Mandume Ndemufayo Avenue

Pioneers Park

Windhoek

Namibia

## **ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS**

AA	Affirmative Action
AAP	Affirmative Action Policy
ACN	Action Christian National
ANC	African National Congress
COST	College of Out of School Training
CPST	Centre for Public Service Training
EEC	Employment Equity Commission
EEO	Equal Employment Opportunity
GRN	Government of the Republic of Namibia
MRCC	Multidisciplinary Research and Consultancy Centre
SRC	Student Representative Council
SADC	Southern African Development Community
OBC	Other Backward Classes
SPSS	Statistical Packages for Social Sciences
VC	Vice Chancellor
SWA	South West Africa
SWAPO	South West African People's Organisation (now "SWAPO Party of Namibia")
UNAM	University of Namibia
USA	United States of America
WCE	Windhoek College of Education

## **CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND**

### **1.1 General Introduction to the Study**

Namibia gained independence from South Africa in 1990. The country inherited a social structure that was not only racially and ethnically fragmented, but it was also characterized by gross inequalities in all spheres of life. Disparities along racial lines were the overriding features; where a small white minority had almost complete control over the economy of the entire country. The country is faced with the dilemma that despite the attainment of majority rule after many years of a bitter struggle, economic power is still concentrated in the hands of the white minority. It is for this reason that Namibia adopted a number of redistributive policies to try and provide a balanced share of resources between the previously advantaged groups, particularly the white minority and the disadvantaged groups, in this case, the black majority. On the question of gender, women for a long time had been sidelined from mainstream economic activities. One of the policies aimed at redressing these imbalances is the Affirmative Action Policy (AAP).

In response to the Government Act on Affirmative Action, the University of Namibia (UNAM) adopted the Affirmative Action Policy in 1999. It is the fundamental purpose of this study to find out whether or not the University has successfully implemented the Affirmative Action Policy in accordance with the requirements of that Policy; while at the same time identify pitfalls and lessons that can be derived from the implementation process of the Affirmative Action Policy.

It is significant to note from the onset, that the adoption of the Affirmative Action Policy was seen as a welcome step to level the playing ground and ensure a more balanced socio-economic development process in Namibia. The University of Namibia as a key partner in this development process, is expected by the community at large, to become a shining example in its internal implementation of the Affirmative Action Policy.

## **1.2 Background to the Study**

Through Affirmative Action, those who were discriminated against are expected to benefit through intentional corrective policies. For example, historically, women were not expected to have high posts in government and the corporate world. A study by Jauch informs us that in some instances, men would have been happier if women remained in the kitchen (Jauch,1998). In such a situation an Affirmative Action Policy would seek to encourage women also to attain high-level positions.

The apartheid policy implemented in South Africa in 1948, was racially motivated after the National Party came to power, and later was extended to the territory of Namibia after South Africa was given the mandate over Namibia by the League of Nations. Today, when Namibia is emerging from an era of colonialism, one of the distinctive features emanating from the apartheid policies, is the active suppression of the development potential of blacks. The adoption of the Namibian Constitution and its promulgation, gave birth to new laws that were intended to correct the apartheid ills. In view of this background, the Government of the Republic of Namibia introduced the Affirmative Action Act, (Act, No 29 of 1998) to redress the

imbalances and promote equality/ equal employment in Namibia. As a result of this Act, the University of Namibia, like other institutions in Namibia, is required in terms of the Act to submit to the government the Affirmative Action reports detailing how they have conformed to the requirements of the Act.

In addition to having a moral obligation to cater for all interest groups in the University as an Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) organization, UNAM is under the statutory requirement to ensure that the employment practices of the University reflect proper involvement of all the groups within Namibia. Its students and staff complement should be free from discrimination based on race, gender, physical condition, or other similar attributes. Conscious and deliberate steps should be taken to ensure that there are sufficient numbers of all designated groups within the University workforce (UNAM's Second Five Year Strategic Plan: 2002).

### **1.3 Statement of the Problem**

Since the University of Namibia adopted the Affirmative Action Policy in 1999, there has been no report detailing its experience with the implementation of the said Policy and what the results the process has yielded. UNAM should be accountable to the government and be responsive to the society it serves. At the moment, there is no clarity as to how the Affirmative Action Policy is progressing or how the intended beneficiaries feel about it.

Generally, the attitudes of people to Affirmative Action have been fluctuating from enthusiastic support to critical disapproval ever since its inception. A sense of impatience is growing among the University community. This can be deduced from the remarks in the newspapers and meetings, and from casual remarks by staff members who are affected by the implementation of the Affirmative Action Policy. The slow pace of the implementation of the policy could largely be attributed to lack of commitment by the University Management.

To illustrate this argument, the Unions for example, have officially pointed out the need to see more Namibians in managerial positions. The recently concluded Institutional Audit Report also noted the lack of females in the University's top cadre of management. In the early 2003, several open e-mail exchanges were made through UNAM intranet on the question of Affirmative Action, particularly as it relates to Namibians and non- Namibians. The e-mails reflected the University's inability to effectively implement the Affirmative Action Policy, thereby creating tensions between the different stakeholders.

Affirmative Action is, moreover, burdened with emotions, which are to be expected in a country like Namibia with an imbalanced colonial past, skewed income distribution among its people and a highly polarized society. All this exists without any systematic study to analyse the manner in which the policy is being implemented and its effect on the Institution. This study is aimed at systematically analysing this emotive situation and suggests ways on how the University of Namibia could effectively implement the Affirmative Action Policy.

#### **1.4 Research Question**

Given the above background, the following question is pertinent: Has the Affirmative Action implementation at the University of Namibia achieved the intended results as expressed in the requirements of the Affirmative Action Policy?

To answer this key question, it is necessary to examine critically how UNAM is implementing the Affirmative Action Policy since 1999, and what the results of this process have been. In doing so, a two-pronged approach is required. Firstly, analysis is needed on the process including its pros and cons. Secondly, results of the implementation thereof need to be identified and also analysed.

#### **1.5 Purpose of the Study**

The objectives of this study are:

- (i) Critically examine the process of implementing Affirmative Action Policy at UNAM.
- (ii) Evaluate the impact of AA on UNAM.
- (iii) Provide recommendations to enhance the utility of AA at UNAM; and

(iv) to discuss the theoretical background of Affirmative Action as a policy and to examine the available literature and experiences on the subject.

### **1.6 Importance of the Study**

No research has been carried out on Affirmative Action at UNAM. This study will provide the University with information on the process, the problems experienced and the results of the policy implementation process. This information can, hopefully, be used to improve on the implementation process. Besides, it can also be used as a springboard for other studies in this area.

### **1.7 Limitations of the Study**

Given the limited time, the study focused only on Affirmative Action at University of Namibia for the period 1999-2003. A note is made on the fact that the number of questionnaire forms distributed and received back was very small, and may not have provided a large enough sample to achieve a high level of accuracy. Efforts were made to obtain relevant literature that is directly useful to the Namibian experience. Due to the sensitive nature of the whole matter, some respondents did not feel comfortable to fill in the forms, even though confidentiality was assured. This reality was apparent when questionnaires were distributed and requested back, and may partly explain why the response rate was less than 30 %.

As explained above, the sample sizes for the different staff categories were very small to obtain a high-level of accuracy. This was made worse by the fact that the return rate of questionnaires was very low. Time and resources did not allow increasing the sample size.

Another limitation of the study is that no attempt was made to find reasons as to why the University was able or not able to do certain things. Whether the poor implementation was due to incompetent staff, apathy, or shortage of staff, etc., was not investigated. No comparative analysis was done on the implementation process at the University with that of other employers within the country who are considered to have done better than the University. Such an analysis would be useful to reveal further areas that may need attention.

The study also did not investigate reasons for the deep-seated divisions, which are observed to exist among many social groups at UNAM. Such an investigation would further enrich the findings. No comparative analysis was done between the implementation of the Affirmative Action Policy and other Policies that exist at UNAM. This too would have been useful.

Although it was intended to interview the Vice Chancellor and the two Pro Vice Chancellors the research was done during the transitional period. Hence the new office bearers had to settle into their new roles before they could pronounce themselves on Affirmative Action Policy in their new capacities. They, therefore, were unable to commit themselves to being interviewed. Compounding the problem,

the Affirmative Action Coordinator resigned during this period and thus could not be interviewed. It was also at times very difficult to secure appointments with the Employment Equity Commissioner. He is always busy with scheduled meetings and attending to Affirmative Action Reports of different organisations. Difficulties were also experienced in fixing appointments through the respective secretaries as they did not consider this exercise important.

Another major obstacle was that there is very little information on Affirmative Action Policy at the University of Namibia; hence the researcher has to rely on secondary data such as Affirmative Action Reports. Due to the sensitivity of the research topic staff members withheld this information and this had an impact on the study. The study for primary information relied on the interviews conducted with the Director of the Centre for Public Service Training, who assisted the Human Resource Department in compiling the University affirmative Action Reports. Most staff members were reluctant to be interviewed and answer questionnaires.

## **1.8 Approach and Organisation**

This Thesis is organized into Five Chapters:

Chapter One starts with a brief outline of the background of Affirmative Action. This is followed by an analysis on the background, statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, research question, and the importance of the study as well the limitations of the study.

Chapter Two discusses the theoretical background of Affirmative Action as a policy, and provides an examination of literature available on the subject. A review of Affirmative Action as a concept is made, and a discussion is presented on the negative aspects of Affirmative Action.

Chapter Three covers the methodology employed in undertaking the study using the triangulation method, while describing the data collection instruments and the research design; including population, and sampling types and data analysis, as well as statistical procedures.

Chapter Four presents an overview of the Namibian political economy that lead to the introduction of Affirmative Action Policy. From this, a review of the Affirmative Action Policy intervention at UNAM is made including the reality of its implementation.

Chapter Five continues with the discussions given in Chapter Four, by analysing questionnaire and interview information. Here statistical analysis of the questionnaires and interviews is made. Clear facts, trends and implications of the collected information are identified, in an attempt to understand the implementation process and its results.

In Chapter Six, solutions are discussed as viable alternatives, identified by the Study and provides recommendations aimed at improving the implementation of

Affirmative Action Policy. This Chapter also provides the conclusions and general lessons learnt from the Study. Recommendations for further research work are also given.

### **1.9 Definitions of Terms**

**Affirmative Action:** This term is used in this Thesis to refer to the explicit efforts to overcome the effects of discrimination by improving the competitive chances of those previously disadvantaged. The term ‘Affirmative Action’ originates from the United States of America (USA) where it was associated with a turbulent history of socio economic and political struggles between whites and non- whites. Whites pursued policies that polarized society according to colour. Anyone who was not white was considered to be inferior. In addition to colour, women were also considered to be subordinate to men. Many countries share a similar past of racial and gender discrimination.

However, it is important to note that Affirmative Action in America was employed to elevate the Black “minority” group, against white majority, while in other countries it is applied to address the plight of the disadvantaged majority against the privileged minority. In the United States, Affirmative Action, which has a history of more than thirty years, was recently declared unconstitutional. Issues of segregation and discrimination are not confined to the United States only. Similar experiences are found in South Africa, and to a lesser extent in many other countries.

Affirmative Action Policy is an instrument intended to address the social imbalances existing within a society. Given the historical background of racial discrimination and dispossession, the Government of Namibia has formulated an Affirmative Action Policy which all institutions in Namibia have to follow. At the University of Namibia, there are strong feelings that the implementation of the Policy is not yielding results.

This study attempts to analyse the implementation process, impediments, and possible results of Affirmative Action at the University through a questionnaire survey, interviews and literature review. Similar experiences elsewhere will be examined in an attempt to understand better the prevailing situation at the University. The results of the study will be useful for UNAM in understanding the intricate dynamics of Affirmative Action Policy, and adds to the literature in understanding the entire subject of addressing social imbalances.

## **CHAPTER 2: AFFIRMATIVE ACTION- A CONCEPTUAL EXPOSÉ AND CROSS NATIONAL REVIEWS**

### **2.1 Introduction**

The origin of Affirmative Action can be traced to the USA when President J. F. Kennedy issued an executive order, which compelled employers to treat job applicants of all races, creed, color, etc., equally (Days,1993). This was further reinforced by an Act on Affirmative Action to overcome discriminatory practices of the past (Weiner,1993). This did not only require equality in treatment, but also recommended positive efforts to remedy the lopsided environment, which over the years, had been created by the discriminatory practices. Other Orders and Acts were passed to effect the initial desired changes, and to ensure that minority groups were not marginalized but given commensurate opportunities (Fullinwider,1980; and Kennedy, 1993).

After independence, the new Namibia Government inherited a deeply divided society. The Government's task was to transform an ethnically fragmented, imbalanced, and gender-biased society into a unified state by correcting the past wrongs. For the Government, Affirmative Action was portrayed as the instrument to redress these imbalances (van Rooyen, 2000).

## 2.2 “Affirmative Action” as a Concept

Affirmative Action in Namibia has become a subject of intense debate, both in Parliament and within the broader society. Consequently, Affirmative Action has come to mean different things to many persons and organisations. The diversity of opinions that is clearly apparent, points to the need to clarify what Affirmative Action is.

Different authors have defined Affirmative Action in different ways, although on close examination, these are substantially similar. For the purpose of this study, affirmative action is understood as a selective group of extraordinary interim measures designed to redress specific imbalances of the past, especially where such inequalities were the result of deliberate state policy. Affirmative Action, thus, is a strategy to overcome the effects of past discrimination. In this regard “Affirmative Action” is defined as a set of “... *measures designed to ensure that persons in designated groups enjoy equal employment opportunities at all levels of employment and are equitably represented in the workforce of a relevant employer*” (Employment Act, Act No.29 of 1998:8)

Affirmative Action can be designed to achieve representativeness, to transform institutions or to effect redistribution. This is provided for in Article 23 (2) of the Namibian Constitution which legitimizes the redressing of social, economic or educational imbalances in the Namibian society arising from the past discriminatory laws or practices. The comparison between Affirmative Action and apartheid is

somewhat confusing, however. Apartheid, as a redistributive system in favour of the Afrikaners, had been underpinned by institutionalized slavery, an option not available to the new Namibian government (Ndopu,1993).

Seemingly differing understanding of Affirmative Action is evident when examining the definition from different analyses. (Smith, 1992), for example, considers access to social resources such as education, health, housing, job, etc., for persons who are members of groups that have been previously disadvantaged by adverse discrimination, to be the main parameters for consideration in Affirmative Action.

Maphai (1993: 6-8), on the other hand, regards attempts to correct the imbalances caused by historical, racial or sexual inequalities, intended to benefit historically subordinated groups, to deliberately benefit such groups, as Affirmative Action only if done where there has been a history that encouraged discrimination.

Gerber, Nel & van Dyk (1988:154) state that Affirmative Action may refer to racial preferential treatment for good reasons. Le Roux (1999: 33-34) defined Affirmative Action as the protection and advancement of the interests of persons disadvantaged by past discrimination.

The BMF Blueprint (1993:4-5) sees Affirmative Action as a planned and positive process and strategy aimed at transforming socio-economic environments which have excluded individuals or groups of individuals from gaining access to

opportunities, including developmental opportunities, based on their suitability. Blueprint treatment, unlike many other analysts bases his approach on the “environment” rather than specific population groups. This approach is likely to be more acceptable to the entire society.

The positive aspect of Affirmative Action was naturally echoed by Mandela of the African National Congress (ANC), through its journal *Mayibuye* in 1995, where it is mentioned that Affirmative Action is needed because social, political and economic inequalities ties do not spontaneously evaporate. So Affirmative Action is a transitory method to redress imbalances created by white domination (*Mayibuye* 1991:2). Affirmative Action could be seen as a synonym for a positive action call that aims at offering help to the past sufferers of racial discrimination. The aspect of assuring the public that AA is used to address identified problems within a certain time frame is a prudent approach, which many analysts seem to overlook.

### **2.3 Negative Aspects of the Affirmative Action Policy**

Recently, Affirmative Action has come under increasing criticism as approving discrimination in reverse, and for being racist, elitist and having limited results. At the same time, most private companies, state owned enterprises and public sector institutions, view it as necessary in some form or another. Private and Public Namibian employers have instituted Affirmative Action policies meant to provide employment opportunities to Black Namibians. A body of literature suggests that because of Affirmative Action policies, the hopes of marginalised groups are raised,

while the privileged groups tend to view such policies as having negative impact on their opportunities (Plous, 2003)

In many countries, this is partly because there is also a trend towards ethnic coercion with some politicians even calling for the allocation of positions on an ethnic basis. This will invariably lead to conflict. Corruption and nepotism under the guise of Affirmative Action generally plague well-meaning efforts, and tend to destroy the reputation of Affirmative Action Policies. It is important, therefore, to ensure that mechanisms are set in place to avoid these deleterious overtones. Otherwise, the Policy might have the unintended side effect of entrenching and deepening ethnic division.

According to Nzimande (1985:236-253), there are three ways in which white resistance to Black Africans rising up the professional ladders manifests itself. The first is explicitly racist, and is based on the belief that black people are inherently incapable of managerial work. The second way in which racism manifests itself is more sophisticated. The main argument of white managers is that the black people do not advance rapidly because their cultural background does not adequately prepare them for managerial positions in the corporate world. The third manifestation of white resistance is through the ideology of meritocracy. White managers often argue that 'black advancement' promotes or places blacks in positions which they do not deserve or for which they are unqualified.

It is within this context that Affirmative Action becomes a contestation over ideas, values and interests at the University of Namibia. Democratic institutions are exemplary in making Affirmative Action a reality. For Affirmative Action to work best, there is a need to create good, sustainable and effective democratic institutions (University of Namibia 2001-2003). The question is whether or not these are adequately present in our country or, indeed, at the University of Namibia.

To respond to the question on whether the University of Namibia's employees have influence on the implementation of Affirmative Action at the University, the study observes that in Namibia, as well as at UNAM, the civil society has the necessary structure put in place to participate. Due to some reasons mentioned in this study, they have very little influence at the moment. An important characteristic for the success of the implementation of Affirmative Action in a democratic society is tolerance.

Until tolerance has been solidified in the minds of all Namibians; until the bottom up approach of electing representatives has been established firmly and the top down approach dismantled; until all Namibians are allowed to effectively exercise power and actively participate in decision-making processes and contribute to policies that shape their destiny and affect their every day life; until ethnicity and democracy are abandoned, and totally rejected; until there is justice and equality to all regardless of colour, race and ethnicity; until there is economic empowerment of all the people; until gender and sex discrimination cease to exist; until basic fundamental human rights and freedom are guaranteed to all without regard to race or other similar

attributes; until oppressive and repressive tendencies are discouraged; until the philosophy which holds one group in society superior and another inferior is finally and permanently discredited and abandoned; until ignorance and illiteracy are rooted out; until all aspects that improve the life of people are in place; until there is no longer economic, education and social conditions disadvantaging people on the basis of social groups; until the tribal background in Namibia is of no significance and no longer used as a criterion for major decisions; and until there is no longer first class and secondary citizens of Namibia; until all such ills have been eradicated, the consolidation of democracy will remain but a fleeting illusion, to be pursued and possibly never attained by this generation.

It is in this context that UNAM inherited an institution with tension where many whites hardly supported and welcomed the advancement of blacks within the senior ranks of the institution. In this regard, the University has been criticized a lot and accused of advocating nepotism and that those who lead Namibia National Teachers Union (NANTU) at UNAM should do away with hypocrisy (Archibong 2003). Furthermore, nepotistic practices by which the white elites would easily use in the past to provide employment for their fellow whites, went against the efforts to create a new radical culture to contest the existing political and social order. NANTU at UNAM has been regarded to have failed, because it is argued that it has polarised the University community along ethnic lines (for example: Namibian vs. non-Namibians). Within this contestation, the reasons as to why Affirmative Action at UNAM has provided poor results are many and varied.

Black people in general have been referred to as people who cannot perform because of a whole lot of reasons. These reasons include inferior education, cultural background, poverty, lack of assertiveness, long years of deprivation and lack of exposure, unfamiliarity with the western culture, unsophisticated, absence of work ethic, inability to accept criticism, lack of appreciation on the concept of time, non-productive, etc. What is more distressing is to find out that there are blacks who believe these negative assertions about themselves to be true. The question will be what would stop blacks from being competent and successful? Whites are never looked at in terms of the above analysis. There are no researches conducted to identify and discuss competencies within the whites in Namibia. Instead, they are always portrayed as clever, ingenious, brilliant, assertive, intelligent, resourceful, tailored for success, full of initiatives and so on. Our media, therefore, has an important role to play in correcting the past wrongs. Therefore, the need for a more appropriate strategy is clearly apparent.

Many countries accepted the moral argument of Affirmative Action, as initially enunciated by the USA. However, the implementation process and the ensuing results differed widely. For the USA, positive results were noted in that various racial and ethnic groups were fairly represented in various ways. However, many analysts argue that Affirmative Action policies as implemented by the USA served to increase gaps within ethnic groups. As such, they argue that Affirmative Action remained meaningless to the poorest sections within the minority groups (Weiner, 1993).

Sri Lanka also adopted Affirmative Action to correct historical injustices where the Tamils who represent only 18 percent of the population historically had better education, and therefore were better represented in the professional fields and administration, while the Sinhalese from the South, representing 74 percent of the population were by-passed (De A Samarasinghe, 1993). Some of the Affirmative Action measures included the introduction of local languages as official languages and medium of instruction at the universities, and the introduction of a quota system for university admission. While representation of marginalised groups increased, this was accompanied by a drop in academic performance. The Affirmative Action was seen as blatant discrimination as it resulted in a slow economic growth rate with intense ethnic competition for jobs. The end result was violent ethnic conflict (De A Samasinghe, 1993). Therefore, Affirmative Action requires a systematic genuine empowerment strategy to bring people who faced discrimination into the mainstream of the economy.

Another example of Affirmative Action is in Malaysia, where policies were set to ensure that the Malays who constituted 50 percent of the population compared to the Chinese, who formed about 40 percent of the population, and other ethnic groups who were historically and economically disadvantaged are positively supported. As part of the Affirmative Action Policy, preferential treatment was given to the Malays in the issuing of trading licenses. Positions were reserved for them in the public service, in scholarships and efforts were made to ensure that they enjoyed a variety of educational privileges. The political elite, however, ensured that additional policies were in place to safeguard even the advantaged groups. The overall

implementation has been successful, particularly because of the high economic growth rate. A more balanced community emerged, and development was extended even to the rural areas. Analysts, however do not consider the implementation of Affirmative in Malaysia Action as problem free. Non Malays perceived these policies as discriminatory, and just like in the USA, the policies increased inequalities within each ethnic group and the poor members of the communities were neglected (Puthuchery and Sachs, 1992). Lessons in this context will require changing institutional culture as it is not enough to use policies only to address all matters of cultural diversity. As a mechanism to effect redistribution on an economic basis, Affirmative Action will have to address class-based inequalities.

India is a country that has been described as the world's most diverse conglomeration of nations, races, languages and cultures (Havanur,1992). This diverse conglomeration, apparently resulted in a caste system, characterised by diverse disparity in income and standards of living, which in some instances is encouraged by religious beliefs. These disparities prompted the Indian government to enact Affirmative Action laws and policies. These policies identified the lowest classes such as the Shindras (scheduled castes or "untouchables"), the scheduled tribes, and Other Backward Classes (OBCs) as beneficiaries of the Affirmative Action measures. The policies introduced included reservations in political institutions, civil service and the educational programmes, mostly through a quota system. Analysts contend that the measures have failed to ensure good accessible elementary education for all, and that the inferior education that still prevails for disadvantaged groups still prevents them from competing effectively at higher levels. The

Affirmative Action measures have not challenged the structures which in the first place caused the fundamental economic inequalities (Fuchs, 1986; and Beteille, 1993).

Newly independent African countries, typified by Zimbabwe and Namibia which gained independence in 1980 and 1990 respectively, have similar problems which are to some degree different from those of the rest of the countries in the world which adopted Affirmative Action. These countries emerged out of bitter liberation struggles. On gaining independence, the majority of the population who supported the liberation movements demanded concrete social economic changes. Affirmative Action policies adopted by these countries have been geared toward the redistribution of the means of production from the hands of the white minority to the majority, unlike in other countries where Affirmative Action was effected to protect minority groups from being marginalized. The force of the tide to bring the needed changes, and the existing social-political infrastructure within the fabric of the society, are therefore, fundamentally different. Consequently Affirmative Action has been described as imperative for all countries that obtained independence through the armed struggle (Eide; Klug and Maphai, 1992).

From the experiences and analyses of the implementation of Affirmative Action in various countries as described above, it can be noted that Affirmative Action measures were usually introduced to address the imbalances of the past that caused inequalities between different social groups. The arguments behind such a course of action have always been sound and with an acceptable moral base. The

implementation of the Affirmative Action measures generally involved the policies and orders that enforce the use of quotas in allocation of opportunities, which refer mainly to job allocation particularly in the public service, in political institutions as well as in gaining admission to educational institutions.

Few of these address the fundamental structural issues that brought the imbalances. Invariably, the policy formulation and implementation lacked wide public debate and consensus. As a result, these policies were in most instances regarded as reverse discrimination. Because of this perception, the Affirmative Action measures resulted in violent ethnic conflicts and generally became counter-developmental. Failure to address the fundamental structural imbalances meant that even though quotas for disadvantaged groups were increased, such groups still remained less competitive. For example, the quality of basic education for these disadvantaged groups still remained poor. Many analysts also observed that although in some cases disparities between groups were reduced, disparities within minority groups increased. In most cases, Affirmative Action did not address the poorest in the communities, and no tangible developmental programmes empowered the real impoverished.

It is also noted that Affirmative Action as applied to countries that recently got independence, many of which are in Africa differ markedly from those in other countries. While most countries implemented Affirmative Action to redress the disadvantaged minority groups within the country, in African countries, Affirmative Action is employed to gain back what the majority of the people regard as lawfully

theirs. The impetus, emotions, and public drive that demand change is fundamentally different.

Jauch (1998), in his book on Affirmative Action in Namibia, compared experiences of Sri Lanka, India, and Malaysia. He argued, in fact that “affirmative action does not eradicate the root causes of inequality.” The relevance of the above argument to the University of Namibian context, is that Affirmative Action can not be the only measure to play a significant role in overcoming the entrenched racial and gender inequalities in institutions which were dominated by white males, like the Academy which later transformed into the University of Namibia and the Polytechnic of Namibia.

Accordingly, the efforts of many institutions has come under the spotlight, including the tertiary education sector since a number of factors are involved if a balanced society is to emerge. The University of Namibia and other tertiary institutions have also come under pressure to reassess their traditional *modus operandi* in terms of staff recruitment and development, student selection and curricula development. Inequality means that some individuals are favoured or privileged.

When the Constitution was adopted in 1990, Article 23 was entitled ‘Apartheid and Affirmative Action’ laid the foundation for the Affirmative Action Policy in independent Namibia. It outlawed racial discrimination and apartheid and enabled Parliament to pass laws for the advancement of disadvantaged persons.

The inclusion of Affirmative Action in the Constitution also sanctioned the implementation of policies and programmes to redress imbalances resulting from past racial discrimination. The relevant article in the Constitution of Namibia reads as follows: “The practice of racial discrimination and the practice and ideology of apartheid from which the majority of the people of Namibia have suffered for so long shall be prohibited and by Act of Parliament. Such practices and their propagation, may be rendered criminally punishable by the ordinary Courts by means of such punishment as Parliament deems necessary for the purposes of expressing the revulsion of the Namibian people to such practices.”

Thus the Constitution encourages the development of instruments that support the advancement of persons within Namibia who have been socially, economically or educationally disadvantaged by past discriminatory laws or practices, the development and implementation of policies and programmes aimed at redressing social, economic or educational imbalances in the Namibian society arising out of past discriminatory laws or practices, and achieving a balanced structure of the public service, the police force, the defence force, and the prison service.

In the enactment of legislation and the application of any policies and practices contemplated by the Constitution as shown above, it is permissible to have regard to the fact that women in Namibia have traditionally suffered special discrimination and that they need to be encouraged and enabled to play a full, equal and effective role in the political, social, economic and cultural life of the Nation (The Constitution of the Republic of Namibia (1990), Article 23, (pp14-15)).

Article 10 of the Constitution also guarantees equality before the law for all persons and prohibits discrimination on the ground of sex, race, colour, ethnic origin, religion, creed, or social and economic status. Article 23 thus enabled Parliament to pass Affirmative Action legislation despite the provision for non-discrimination as expressed in Article 10. In its broad formulation, Article 23 left scope for the identification of the intended beneficiaries as well as for the formulation of strategies and timetables to guide the implementation of Affirmative Action programmes.

The Constitution thus provided a choice for Parliament and government to introduce Affirmative Action by making its enforcement possible, but not compulsory. This contributed to the confusion surrounding the policy as there was neither clear legislation nor a government White Paper to clarify what Affirmative Action was meant to achieve and how it was to be implemented.

The inclusion of the Affirmative Action clause in the Namibian Constitution was supported by all parties represented in the Constituent Assembly. The only party which expressed reservations was the Action Christian National (ACN). This concern was shared by South African court judge, Albie Sachs, who argued that the rule of law must provide a secure framework for the implementation of Affirmative Action. This, he believed, would guard against corruption and nepotism (Sachs, 1992).

This argument is based on a punish-reward model, which perceives Affirmative Action as a punishment of the previously advantaged in this case, the white male Afrikaner civil servants, while the previously disadvantaged black Namibians, especially SWAPO members, were to be rewarded. As such, Affirmative Action is understood as a backward-looking policy, which tries to rectify historical racial discrimination by reversing the process, using the same means.

This punish-reward model faces problems at three levels. Firstly, it punishes individuals for group faults by applying communal guilt to individuals. Apartheid as a system was designed to benefit whites as a group, but the punish-reward model of Affirmative Action targets individuals who are made to pay the price of the whole group, irrespective of their individual contribution to apartheid or even their struggle against the system. Secondly, the likely beneficiaries of such a system, are those who suffered less under the apartheid, namely those who obtained a high level of education which enable them to fill senior positions in the civil service. Likewise, the

likely victims of such Affirmative Action measures are not the main culprits of apartheid. The real section of the community whose privileges need to be regulated tend to hold secure high-level positions, which are not likely to be affected by Affirmative Action. Thirdly, it must be questioned if Affirmative Action is the appropriate form of punishment for the culprits of apartheid.

It seems more appropriate, instead, to implement Affirmative Action as a forward-looking strategy to change social structures in order to overcome the legacy of past racial discrimination. This implies the creation of openings in institutions such as the University of Namibia which were previously dominated only by certain groups. In this way, Affirmative Action becomes a measure that will allow competition on the basis of merit without being a punishment for certain individuals.

## **2.4 Conclusion**

This Chapter has made a comparative review of the meaning of Affirmative Action, current thinking on its benefits, empirical studies of its implementation in different countries and the possible benefits that can be derived. There are different perspectives on the meaning of Affirmative Action, although a broad consensus exists that the concept deals with “redressing past ills”. A review of existing literature, shows major flaws both in the implementation of the policy by many countries, as well as lack of consideration of certain specific aspects that will reduce rejection and enhance quicker attainment of the Affirmative Action objectives.

Firstly, all analysts have considered the question of inequality on the basis of “lack” of access to resources, rather than denial of opportunities. These two are different. Lack of access simply means once access is provided the problem is solved. This is not the case. The real issue is that of denial, and the resultant complexities. Solutions would require a systems approach that involves a complete interaction of many factors such as attitudes, abilities, traditions, etc.

Secondly, corrective measures have tended to use terms, and divide social groups in the same way as the practices that are condemned use. Although this may address the same people, the social connotation of the two is different. The first approach of targeting groups arouses rejection by the social groups that do not stand to benefit. The use of neutral terms that address a situation or environment stands a good chance of being positively supported by all social groups. It is in this regard that the literature lacks a good treatment on the question of tolerance and how it can be developed before AA is introduced, this being a subject of the entire question of addressing societal attitudes, which in the opinion of the author is quite central if AA is to be successfully implemented.

There are different levels of success with the implementation of the policy in different countries. In some countries the results have been a total chaos. Where there has been a good measure of success, it has been noted that Affirmative Action has actually increased disparities within the social groups that were intended to benefit from the Policy. In Namibia, the Constitution made provision for the government to adopt non mandatory Affirmative Action Policy. Article 141 of the Constitution

protected the position of the civil servants employed by previous apartheid government. This article guarantee continued employment of all public servants holding office at independence unless they resigned, retired and transferred or removed from office by the rule of law. This has created confusion and delay in its implementation. Extensive literature exists that warns that Affirmative Action should not become punitive to one social group.

In the view of the above, the Employment Equity Commission made the implementation of Affirmative Action Policy compulsory with a requirement to submit the Affirmative Action Reports as it is indicated in the Employment Act. Failure to submit the Affirmative Action Plan is an offence (Section 47). It may be that the language of Affirmative Action, as it is actually used means different things in different contexts and times. Despite the achievements of creating one unified education system the most important or difficult part of the matter is that the Act forces University of Namibia to be compliant with the requirements of Affirmative Action Policy.

## **CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

### **3.1 Introduction**

The triangulation method involving questionnaires, interviews and literature search was used to collect data. Triangulation is the application of different methods, theories, investigators, samples, and conditions of occurrence and the levels of analysis to study a phenomenon (Marshall, 1998:90). This method gave the researcher in this thesis, some degree of confidence that the conclusions and reliability are not only theoretical or simply eccentric views out of the ordinary, but are corroborated by more than one type of findings. The triangulation method helped to increase the validity of the results. This is because of the corroborative nature of the research instruments

Types of triangulation utilized in this research were: triangulation method; triangulation of investigator; triangulation of data; and triangulation of analysis level. Triangulation method refers to using different methods to study the same phenomena. For example, in collecting data, interviews and questionnaires were conducted in a manner as to answer more or less similar questions. Triangulation of investigator compared findings of one observer to those from several other observers. This increases confidence that investigator's bias has not distorted the findings. Conclusions from this research, therefore, involved findings from other investigators cited in the literature, findings from questionnaire that involves individual's direct responses, and findings by the researcher herself through interviews.

For this research, this was achieved by stratifying the research in different levels of staff as different groups of the total population. Thus, the same question was asked to representatives of different staff groups. Also the questionnaire was run at a different time from the interview. This afforded comparisons of results at different points in time.

Triangulation of analysis level, analyzed whether aggregate data supports a finding produced by non-aggregated data, such as interview transcripts. Whether data from studies, which focus upon interactions between members, would reinforce, or challenge, findings, which focus upon facts about individuals. This involves comparing data, which represent facts, or any research attribute that is comparable, as property of groups to which the individuals belong.

## **3.2 The Research Instruments**

### **3.2.1 Questionnaires**

Closed and open-ended questions were used in compiling the questionnaires. Questions were designed to allow explicit responses to some questions, and where necessary descriptive responses to others in order to explain in-depth knowledge of the respondents, and elicit unrestrained information. The questionnaire was anonymous in order to encourage the respondents to be honest and objective in presenting their responses without the fear of being identified.

A pilot survey was undertaken using the questionnaires, as generally recommended, and thus was used to refine the questions where respondents were not clear, or where information obtained suggested that further breakdown of a specific question would be useful. As earlier indicated, in order to have the triangulation of the data collected, the questionnaires were presented in three categories. Senior Management; Academic staff; and Administrative staff. More-or-less similar questions were asked in order to allow for the comparisons of the results. Questions, however differed where the functions of a specific category dictated so.

### **3.2.1.1 Research Design: Population and Sampling**

The researcher attempted to calculate the sample size that will achieve an acceptable level of accuracy. A brief review of the relevant statistical analysis is given here. The confidence interval of a sampling distribution of an infinite population is determined by the formula.

$$\bar{x} \pm \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}} \cdot z \dots\dots\dots 3.1$$

And for a finite population it is

$$\bar{x} \pm \sqrt{\frac{N-n}{N}} \cdot \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}} \cdot z$$

or

$$\bar{x} \pm \sqrt{\frac{(N-n) \cdot \sigma^2}{N \cdot n}} \cdot z \dots\dots\dots 3.2$$

For population proportions the confidence interval is:

$$p \pm \sqrt{\frac{(N-n) \cdot p \cdot (1-p)}{N \cdot n}} \cdot z \dots\dots\dots 3.3$$

and the maximum error in estimation is

$$E = \sqrt{\frac{(N-n) \cdot p \cdot (1-p)}{N \cdot n}} \cdot z \dots\dots\dots 3.4$$

Thus,

$$E^2 = \frac{(N-n) \cdot p \cdot (1-p) \cdot z^2}{N \cdot n} \dots\dots\dots 3.5$$

Where,

$\bar{x}$  = population sample

$\sigma$  = population standard deviation

n = sample size

N = population size

p = sample proportion

E = maximum error in the estimation

z = the standard z- value for a given confidence level.

It is the desire of the analyst to allow a maximum error of 10% with 95% confidence, and if we assume a population proportion (p) of 0.5, as the average for all parameters that will be included in the interview, then we can use the equation 3.5 to determine the sample size that will give us this desired accuracy. In that case:

Since  $p = 0.5$ , maximum error is 10%, or 0.05

Thus  $E = 0.05$

$N = 700$ , since the University has about 700 employees for whom the study is made.

$z = 1.96$ , as the standard  $z$ -value at 95% confidence

Substituting these values to equation 3.5 and solving for  $n$ , the sample size that will give us the desired accuracy we get

$$0.05^2 = \frac{(700 - n) \times 0.5 \times 0.5 \times 1.96^2}{700 \times n}$$

Simplifying the above equation we get  $n = 153$ . That is, if we are to ensure that the proportion of staff showing a certain property (e.g., who will answer No) from the sample size (i.e. staff responding to questionnaire), is not more than 10% away from the true population proportion (i.e., proportion of the entire population with the specific property being investigated) with a 95 percent confidence, then would need to have a sample of 153 staff members.(or roughly 20 percent of the population size)

Although the above sample size would be necessary to obtain the above stated accuracy, however, due to limited resources, it was decided to take sample size equal to 10 percent of the population. This was decided simply based on what was workable within the given time frame of the research. Given that there are 348 administrative staff and 339 academic staff, a sample of 10 % would mean 35

administrative staff and 34 academic staff. The researcher, therefore, decided to have a sample size of 40 staff from each category of staff.

To get the actual respondents, a stratified sampling with proportional allocation to size was obtained. Using this, if there are 71 academic staff whose group need to be interviewed, like the Faculty of Humanities, for example, then the proportional representation would require the sample  $(71/339 \times 40) = 8$  from this Faculty. That means that 8 academic staff members from Humanities should be taken. To pick those 8 staff members from that specific Faculty, systematic or random sampling was used. Names of all staff members in that Faculty were numbered in an alphabetic order. A random number was generated from a calculator. The random number is usually between 0 and 1.

This number was multiplied to the total number of the staff in that Faculty, and the result was rounded to the nearest whole number. The person whose rank in the list is the same as the whole number obtained was picked. For example, if the random number generated in a calculator was 0.354, then the researcher multiplied  $0.354 \times 71 = 25$  as the nearest whole number. Thus the 25<sup>th</sup> person in the alphabetical list was picked. This process was repeated until the required number of staff for a given Faculty, as calculated above was obtained. In this manner, bias was eliminated in sample selection.

A similar procedure was applied for administrative staff. After organising them into the departments, centers and faculties as shown in Tables A.7.2 in Appendix 7. This provided the overall sample breakdown by employment categories excluding the Northern Campus. The researcher was able to determine how many staff, and which staff to pick from each department, centre and faculty.

The purposeful sampling technique combining intensity sampling as described above that encompassed all employees at UNAM, was therefore, employed. This is because the population of UNAM is diverse. This stratified sampling approach is useful to identify areas of variations between administrative and academic staff in terms of perception in the implementation of the affirmative action policy. Selection was stratified according to their number per department, center as well as faculties. Tables A.7.1, A.7.2 in Appendix 7 provide the overall sample breakdown by employment categories.

### **3.2.1.2 Distribution and Collection of Questionnaires**

After identifying who was to be included in the sample, the researcher physically went to specific individual offices, discussed the purpose of the exercise, before asking the person to complete and return the questionnaire as soon as possible but not later than ten days. This was done in addition to having a covering letter seeking cooperation from the respondents.

For those whom the researcher did not find in their offices, the questionnaires were slipped under their doors, followed later by a telephone call to urge them to complete the forms. The respondents were asked to phone when they have completed filling the questionnaires, or send them through the internal mail system. After two weeks, the response was only 16 %. A follow up was made by telephone to each person who did not respond. This prompted some of those who had not responded to do so. In this way the response rate increased to 28%. Due to time constraint, it was agreed to proceed with the questionnaires received, as further follow-ups would require excessive additional time.

#### **3.2.1.3 Data analysis**

Questionnaires were appropriately coded and the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) Software was used to analyse the data. Frequencies were generated for each employment category; namely administrative and academic staff (These are shown in Appendix 3, 4 and 5). For the purpose of this study, the discussion of the analysis of data used either the actual number of respondents, or percentage of the total.

#### **3.2.2 Interviews**

Questionnaires are used to collect specifically defined questions. Interviews, however, are the most effective in understanding peoples attitudes, operations and functions. In order to understand better the attitudes of the staff at the University regarding the implementation of the Affirmative Action Policy at the University, it was necessary to undertake interviews. This method, as mentioned in Section 3.1,

was also employed as part of the triangulation method to augment the information gleaned from both the literature survey, and the questionnaire survey. A list of detailed questions that were similar to those used in the questionnaire survey were carefully composed. A total of 8 questions as included in Appendix 6 were used to form interview questions. In order to achieve the best and obtain the required information, the researcher proceeded in a methodical manner, and organized the interview in three main parts: preparation for interview; conducting the interview and following up the interview. A checklist below was used to ensure that nothing was overlooked.

#### **Checklist for the Interviews:**

Before the interview

- Establish the objective of the interview.
- Select the interviewees to be used.
- Build and complete the list of questions and issues to be discussed.
- Review related documents and materials to ensure relevant details are included in the interview.
- Set times agreeable to each interviewees; and
- Inform all participants of the objectives, time, and location, to allow adequate preparation by the interviewees.

#### During the Interview

- Briefly review the objective of the interview, and describe how the interview will be conducted.
- Look for exceptions, or possible errors and confirm with the interviewee if this is so.
- Probe for details by taking follow-up questions and showing keen interest.
- Take comprehensive notes; and
- Identify and document unanswered items and open questions.

#### After the Interview

- Review notes for accuracy, completeness, and understanding.
- Transfer information to appropriate models and documents.
- Identify areas needing further clarification; and
- Send a thank-you note to each interviewee.

#### **3.2.2.1 Preparing for the Interview**

The first thing was to establish the objective of the interview. This was stated as to what extent the staff are aware and support the implementation of the Affirmative Action Policy at the University. It was further explained that this was an academic research, although the results of the research will be freely shared with the Management.

In deciding for the candidates to be interviewed, it was necessary to obtain staff members from all sections of the University Community, thus it was decided to have staff from Management, Academic staff, Administrative staff, Deans/Directors, and the Labour union. One staff member was drawn from each of these groups, giving a total of 5 candidates who were interviewed. These were not part of those who filled the questionnaires to avoid double counting.

Ideally, the interview process should be conducted by two interviewers who can compare notes afterwards to ensure accuracy. This was not done due to the limitation of research budget to employ a research assistant, and also due to time constraints as the assistant will require some time to be trained. As mentioned before, a list of eight general questions was prepared to cover similar aspects as those in the questionnaires. This is a requirement of the triangulation method in order to allow for comparisons of results. In formulating the questions, it was also necessary to ensure that they are relevant with regards to the Affirmative Action Policy Act, The University of Namibia Affirmative Action Plan, and The Employer's Guidelines to the Affirmative Action Act documents. Some follow-up open-ended questions were also prepared to encourage discussion and explanation. Carefully selected questions were used to help get the discussion started and encourage the interviewees to provide details. Appointments were set well in advance, and care was taken to ensure that the location of the interview, which was either in the researcher's office or the office of the person interviewed, was reasonably quiet to avoid unnecessary interruptions. The objective of the interview was also communicated to all interviewees well in advance.

### **3.2.2.2 Conducting the Interview**

In all the interviews the researcher arrived well in time and dressed appropriately to show the seriousness of the research conducted. This had a good impact to the interviewees because they also gave the interview unwavering attention and the required seriousness. Interviews were arranged separately for each interviewee.

In conducting the interview, the objective was first introduced and a brief explanation on how the interview would proceed. Questions were posed in general as prepared in the question list, and as the interviewees responded, follow-up questions, some of which were prepared before the interview, were posed to extract detailed information. A tape was carried to record the responses. Users were assured that once the tapes were transcribed, they will be destroyed. No one seemed to have any problem with this approach.

The researcher/interviewer listened carefully and made notes where there seemed to be exceptions, errors or contradictions. Clarifications were then sought on such incidents.

### **3.2.2.3 Follow-up after the Interviews**

Interviewees were informed that follow-up questions may be required after the interview to clarify some issues that may have been overlooked, or were not noted during the interview.

These follow-up questions were made after transcribing the recordings and understanding the mass of information collected. For each interview, this was done within the same day to ensure that both the researcher and the interviewee still remembered well aspects covered during the interview. For the question where interviewees were not able to answer, time was given to them, and during the follow-up time these were asked again.

## **CHAPTER 4: THE HISTORICAL REVIEW OF THE UNIVERSITY'S AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICY IMPLEMENTATION**

### **4.1 Introduction**

President Sam Nujoma signed the Affirmative Action Bill, which then became an Act (Act, No 29 of 1998) on the Affirmative Action. The Act fulfilled one of the main demands of the post-independence Namibian society. The drafting and parliamentary debate on the Affirmative Action Bill caused a long and highly controversial discussion over the entire Namibian society. A discussion of the University of Namibia's Affirmative Action Policy should include an analysis of Namibia's political economy. The prevailing socio-economic disparities after independence, and their causes, constitute the point of departure for designing feasible Affirmative Action programmes. This study outlines the socio-economic background, as a cause for the adoption of a policy on Affirmative Action after independence. The disparities and imbalances within the Namibian society are sketched and analysed against an economy, which was shaped by decades of colonial oppression and exploitation.

Namibia has inherited an education system with a legacy of apartheid Bantu education. Generally, schools are called on to perform many functions in society. Among these are teaching skills, transmitting culture, encouraging cultural adaptation, instilling discipline, encouraging group work, promoting ethical

behavior, selecting talent, and rewarding achievement. The Bantu education, which was provided to black people by the colonial government, lacked much of these educational ideals. Despite the efforts to reform the system after independence, the effects of Bantu education will continue to be felt for decades to come. Since independence, the Government of the Republic of Namibia (GRN) has adopted ambitious development plans to reform education, including higher education. Although the implementation has sometimes proven difficult, the nation has made significant progress in expanding and widening access to an increasing proportion of school leavers who join tertiary institutions.

Higher Education institutions in Namibia started around 1979/1980. Prior to this, all students wishing to pursue higher education had to go to South Africa or other countries abroad. The University of Namibia has its roots in the establishment of the Academy for Tertiary Education Act No.13 of 1980. Shortly after independence in 1990, it was resolved that the three components of the only existing higher education institution, the Academy, be dissolved into two independent higher education institutions, a University and a Polytechnic. The Former City Campus (Former Academy) housed the Polytechnic and the former Windhoek College of Education (WCE) premises became the University of Namibia.

The two institutions of higher education were fully de-linked from each other in December 1995. The University of Namibia became an independent autonomous institution in 1993 through Act No 18. of 1992 while the Technikon and the College of out of School Training (COST), were placed under the auspices of the new

University until the promulgation of the Polytechnic Act. Two years later, the Polytechnic of Namibia was established through Act No.33 of 1995 by merging Technikon and the College for out of school Training (COST). The Act provided for the gradual phasing out of vocational training courses and granting of degrees by the Polytechnic.

The University of Namibia's governing structure includes the Council as its supreme policy making body, the Senate which is responsible for academic affairs, the Vice Chancellor, the academic and administrative officers and a Student Representative Council (SRC). The kind of reforms that may become feasible, however, will always depend on particular circumstances. It is recognised that the Academy had appalling records concerning their treatment of black people. The top and middle management level posts at the Academy were dominated by whites, whilst blacks were relegated to the most junior and lower posts (Faculty of Science Yearbook 1990, 1992 and 1992, Faculty of Economics and Management Yearbook 1992 and Technical Training Yearbook 1990).

Affirmative Action significantly improves the livelihoods of beneficiaries, as was experienced during the time when UNAM was under review. During this period new structures were reviewed and redefined, and academic courses were restructured. Before independence racial consideration in job allocation was something which the Academy management would not care to admit. This was the rule rather than the exception.

When the Academy was established in 1980 many of white South Africans were seconded or invited by their next of kin to occupy especially the top and middle level management posts at the Academy. The conditions of service for whites were very lucrative with all sorts of in-built discriminatory benefits. Blacks did not enjoy these outrageous benefits. In some instances, two employees holding the same position and qualifications, but from the different racial groups would receive quite different salaries. The focus here is on how colonial legislation was used to create the hierarchical system between whites and blacks.

Priorities that existed at the Academy did not fully support the strategy of targeting human resources to key developmental areas such as agriculture, sciences, medicine, engineering, information technology, law, etc. These anomalies were immediately addressed when the new University was established. The University moved in a rational manner by phasing out inherited unnecessary activities to reduce costs. UNAM now awards diplomas, undergraduate and postgraduate degrees.

A number of efforts have been made to reform the University. The reason for the great increase in University education is credentialism, that is the practice of acquiring higher credentials for the jobs that were associated with fewer credentials in the past. An example can be seen in criteria used in employment at the Academy. UNAM inherited untrained staff resisting training to maintain outdated experiences and resist change and innovation. Even unskilled jobs now require a high school diploma. The University Annual Reports did provide a good information base to

assist in creating compensatory education, and publicising programs that help students from disadvantaged backgrounds catch up with more privileged students. An example can be seen in mature age entry programmes, access courses, etc.

Many Namibians and international students have received higher education from the University of Namibia. A number of them now hold senior positions in government, semi-state organizations as well as in the private sector. It is important that UNAM establishes relationships with foreign institutions as an essential part of human resources development to have exchange programmes with outside universities at both student and academic levels. Affirmative Action, which sometimes involves giving preferences in university admission to minority students, has aided black progress but continues to be controversial. The movement of UNAM towards accountability in education has spawned an approach called outcome-based education.

The presence of a sizeable number of expatriates (tables A.7.1 and A.7.2) at the University demonstrates the shortage of trained and experienced Namibians. A more efficient and effective system for understudies of Namibians is outlined. The University of Namibia is the highest institution of learning in the country and is a symbol of Namibia's intellectual and cultural growth and identity. Although Affirmative Action is often considered as an attempt to make up for wrongs of the past in the case of Namibians, it is really aimed at resolving present-day inequalities that stem from the current patterns of racial discrimination. Moreover, criticisms against Affirmative Action to assist the previously disadvantaged as providing unfair

preference in university admissions, for example, neglect the fact that Academy admissions in the colonial era always involved special preferences.

#### **4.2 Academic, Administrative Staff and Senior Managers**

The employee categories entitled academic and administrative were created at UNAM as part of the university personnel system. The definitions of academic and administrative staff are as follows:

- Academic staff are those who have specialized knowledge relevant to a given faculty, and have the requisite preparation and specialized knowledge in an academic discipline or field on which practice is based, and are able to exercise independent professional judgments. These individuals are engaged in teaching, research, and service, as well as a wide variety of other professional functions of the University.
- Administrative staff are those involved in policy development or execution, or in directing, coordinating, or supervising activities in the University. They are expected to have a thorough working knowledge of academic administration and all the associated support services.

#### **4.3 Implementation of Affirmative Action Policy**

Once the policy has been adopted, the next step is to implement it. This marks a departure from political policy to administrative policy. The adopted policy has to be articulated in such a way as to enable those who are supposed to put it in action to do so. The implementation of Affirmative Action in a parastatal institution such as the University of Namibia is governed by the University Act. It is policy application, as

it involves drafting policy, operationalisation of procedures and allocation of resources to the policy, scheduling and carrying out the required tasks so as to achieve the set objectives. This leads us to the question, what is implementation?

Implementation (A synonym to administration.) is where attention is on what is done to carry into effect or apply adopted policies (Anderson, 1984).

After demonstrating the colonial legacy of unequal distribution of employment at the Academy, the University of Namibia has embraced the implementation of the Affirmative Action programme, which is in compliance with the requirements of the Affirmative Action legislation. Through this, the University is obliged to address the needs of all the employees, and provide opportunities and employment, without regard to race, creed, origin, gender, age, mental or physical disability (Katjavivi 2000).

It is often being observed that Affirmative Action is aimed at improving the status of the disadvantaged who are usually many. The University of Namibia as a relevant employer, further agrees to undertake specific measures to create equity in employment, and to employ and develop designated employees. In employment, the University has developed procedures to ensure that appropriate steps are taken for placement (internal and external) to be done on the basis of the individual's qualifications and experience as they are directly related to the intrinsic requirements of the position.

The University of Namibia in its implementation phase of Affirmative Action Policy, is geared to the identification of the beneficiaries of Affirmative Action on the basis of previously disadvantaged group status and ensures that the most disadvantaged people of the University are reached, namely:

- Blacks;
- Women (irrespective of race); and
- Persons, with disabilities (physical or mental limitations, irrespective of race or gender).

This approach is intended to prevent ethnic mobilization. The call for specific quotas for women in positions of influence has already been controversial within the institution.

During the debates of leadership positions, no specific proposals have been made regarding the advancement of women at the University of Namibia. The concepts underlying the policy are discussed and comparisons with the previous established institutions (Academy) is undertaken. A critical evaluation is undertaken within the following parameters:

- Objectives of the policy as stated by Employment Equity Commission;
- Perceptions and misconceptions with regard to the policy by UNAM staff, for example, Senior managers at UNAM, Deans, Directors, Academic and Administrative staff at UNAM; and
- Implementation of Affirmative Action programme at UNAM.

In keeping with the universal norms specific to universities, the University of Namibia, especially in its formative phase, tried to attract and sustain highly qualified staff from different parts of the world. There is a need to consider the issues that are now being raised in a historical and political context. In addition, the University is committed to the policy of ensuring that the Namibian staff of the University are assisted through staff development. These include an effective staff development programme. The implementation of the Affirmative Action Policy is expected to produce better and faster results.

The human resources department is responsible for the administering of the University's recruitment, hiring and equal employment policies and procedures ensuring the University's compliance with related policies and regulations dealing with human rights. In conformance with the Affirmative Act, a written Affirmative Action Plan is being prepared by the human resource department.

With regard to understudies, the University of Namibia was and is fully committed to the aims and objectives of the Affirmative Action Act. The University of Namibia (UNAM) is a small institution with an annually increasing number of students studying at all its various campuses spread throughout Namibia.

As the only University in Namibia, UNAM is responsible for both full time undergraduate and postgraduate studies education and also distance undergraduate programmes at degree and diploma level throughout the country. UNAM has a network of study, teaching and administrative centers. They are at Oshakati, Tsumeb,

Swakopmund, Rundu, Otjiwarongo, Keetmanshoop, Katima Mulilo, Gobabis and Khorixas. At these centers, UNAM conducts face-to-face tutorials. In line with the Affirmative Action Act, in this instance UNAM, the employer, is required to draft a three year Affirmative action Plan in close consultation with employees, which must be submitted in the form of Affirmative Action Report to the Employment Equity Commission at prescribed intervals. This process must be repeated in three year cycles.

In terms of Section 5(e) of the Act, the Employment Equity Commission may for the purpose of achieving its objective, issue guidelines in relation to the application of any provision of the Act to assist the relevant employers in fulfilling their obligations (Affirmative Action (Employment) Act, 1998 (7:9)).

#### **4.4 Conclusion**

This Chapter has reviewed the genesis of Affirmative Action at the University of Namibia. This included a review of the situation prevailing within the institution as the policy was introduced. To understand the current situation, a background review of the institution has been given. The University of Namibia was formed 1992 from an institution called the Academy, which was established in 1980. The Academy, which existed during the colonial era operated practices that were racially discriminatory. Since most of the Academy staff were transferred to the University of Namibia, past negative attitudes about blacks still persisted. Policies of the Academy had to be revised to be in line with the aspirations of the new Namibian Nation. Resistance, conflicts and mistrust continued.

Further to the existing tensions, most of the staff from the former Academy were not well qualified since they were not employed on merit but on the basis of colour. For the University to forge ahead, it needed to train both the unqualified white staff, as well as the incoming black people who were formally denied opportunities to progress. Since resources were limited this created further tension between White and Black staff.

The Chapter, however, has shown that despite these dynamics, the University positively accepted to implement the affirmative Action Policy as required by the Government.

## **CHAPTER 5: DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS**

### **5.1 Introduction**

This Chapter evaluates the data collected from questionnaires, interviews and documentary search, in an attempt to understand the process, success and social dynamics related to the implementation of the Affirmative Action Policy at UNAM. The results from these different sources are compared to show consistency in the observed patterns. The results are also compared with the experience of Affirmative Action Policy elsewhere, in order to understand well the challenges, pitfalls and opportunities that the Policy holds for UNAM. This allows for recommendations to be drawn on the way forward.

### **5.2 Questionnaires**

This Section discusses the information gathered by administering questionnaires to the University employees, both Academic and Administrative, as well as to the University Management, i.e., Directors, Deans, and Middle Level Managers. The main aim of the survey was to find the answer to the research question, i.e., how has UNAM implemented the Affirmative Action Policy since 1999, and what the results of that process are.

Questionnaires were designed for three categories of staff: Academic, Administrative, and Senior Managers at the University. The Senior Managers category included Deans of Faculties and Directors of Centers. Although some questions were similar, the questionnaires were designed particularly to suit each

category of the University staff. Appendixes 1 and 2 show the questionnaire for each staff category. These questionnaires were distributed to the staff to complete. Forty (40) questionnaires were sent out for each category. From these, six (6) questionnaire forms were received back from Senior Managers, nine (9) from Administrative staff, and thirteen (13) from Academic staff. Although it would have been desirable to have a better response rate, time did not allow to follow up those who did not respond, or to send out more questionnaire forms. The forms received back were coded and then processed using SPSS Software. Appendixes 3, 4 and 5 show the SPSS statistical outputs. Below is a discussion of the outputs.

### **5.2.1 Awareness of the Affirmative Action Policy**

Table 1 shows the awareness of the Affirmative Action Policy among different staff categories.

**Table 1: Awareness of Affirmative Action Policy (percentages)**

<b>Staff Category Knowledge</b>	<b>Senior Manager</b>	<b>Administrative</b>	<b>Academic</b>
<b>Know</b>	83.3	88.9	84.6
<b>Don't know</b>	16.7	11.1	15.4
<b>TOTAL</b>	100.0	100.0	100.0
<b>Number of Respondents</b>	6	9	13

Going by the data in the above Table, which is built from the questionnaire results in Tables A.3.3; A.4.3 and A.5.3 from the appendixes 3, 4 and 5, the Table shows the percentage of Senior Manager, Administrative staff and Academic staff who are aware of the Affirmative Action Policy at the University, and those who are not. All

respondents were asked whether Affirmative Action Policy was needed at all at UNAM. These results are shown in Table A.3.4 in Appendix 3 for Academic staff, and Table A.4.4 in Appendix 4 for Administrative staff. All Administrative staff (Table A.4.4) agreed that there is a need for it. Only 84.6 percent of the Academic staff members saw (Table A.3.4) that there is need for an Affirmative Action Policy. Academic staff that did not see the need for Affirmative Action argued that the University should appoint only the best candidates regardless of the group a person belongs to. If certain groups lack the required competencies they should be trained. Hence, there should not be favoritism on the grounds of what social group one belongs.

### **5.2.2 Methods of Conveying Information Within UNAM**

Table 2 below which has been constructed from Table A.3.6 for Academic staff in Appendix 3, Table A.4.6 for Administrative staff in Appendix 4, and Table A.5.6 in Appendix 5 for Senior Managers shows how Senior Managers, Administrative staff, and Academic staff members received information about the Affirmative Action Policy at the University. It is apparent that office memo was the most widely used method, followed by meetings. For example, 80 percent of Senior Managers, 33 percent of Administrative staff and 55 percent of academic staff became aware of the Affirmative Action Policy through a memo. On the other hand, 20 percent of Senior Managers, 33 percent of Administrative staff, and 27 percent of Academic staff received the information through meetings. These are rather passive ways of communicating information as sensitive as the Affirmative Action. Workshops are a better method in informing and seeking acceptance on difficult matters. This is

because in a workshop participating staff members can discuss and debate the issue on which differing views exist.

**Table 2: How Information on the Affirmative Action Policy was received**

<b>Employee category Information method</b>	<b>Senior Management (Percent)</b>	<b>Administrative staff (Percent)</b>	<b>Academic staff (Percent)</b>
Memo	80.0	33.3	54.5
Meeting	20.0	33.3	27.3
Memo & meeting	-	-	9.1
Media	-	-	9.1
Workshop	-	11.1	-
Voting campaign	-	11.1	-
From Human Resources Departments	-	11.1	-
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Number of Respondents	6	9	13

These results confirm the importance of communication methods. One may assume that an improved level of communication at the University could also indirectly strengthen the support of Affirmative Action at UNAM. Even if implementation of Affirmative Action Policy is important, implementation requires ongoing participation of all UNAM employees. When resolutions are made at the end of a workshop, staff members feel that their contributions are valued. The University of Namibia needs to take note of this. What can also be noted is the fact that Administrative staff have a wider information source base (have more information methods). There is a need to also widen the information base for the Academic staff members.

### **5.2.3 Implementation of the Affirmative Action Policy**

In order to properly implement any policy, it needs to be very clear to those responsible for the implementation of the policy – the Senior Managers. Results from the questionnaires in Table A.5.4, Appendix 5 show that half (50 percent) of the managers regard the Affirmative Action Policy not to be clear. Only 33 percent consider the Policy as clear. This is a very serious problem. No policy can be implemented well when only about one-third of the implementers are clear with the Policy.

Given that the Policy is not clear to many managers, it is not surprising to note from the information gathered that half of the managers as shown in Table A.5.5 in Appendix 5, consider the University's Affirmative Action Policy difficult to implement. As a matter of priority, the University needs to institute measures to ensure that Senior Managers, who are the ones overseeing the implementation of the Affirmative Action Policy, are very clear on what to implement.

Indeed as stated earlier, the results from the questionnaires show that half of the Senior Managers are not clear of their responsibilities regarding the implementation of the Affirmative Action Policy at the University. Table A.4.7 in Appendix 4 shows that about 44 percent of Administrative staff see Affirmative Action as a threat; while 56 percent see it as an opportunity. On the other hand Table A.3.7 shows that about 54 percent and 31 percent of Academic staff see it as a threat and as an opportunity respectively.

It is interesting that a greater proportion of the Academic staff members are worried about the Affirmative Action than of the Administrative staff. It is difficult to know the reason, but it was pointed out earlier that most academics regard merit as the only criterion to be used for employment and promotion. Among the reasons given in support of the Affirmative Action by both Administrative and Academic staff as shown in Tables A.3.8 and A.4.9 in Appendixes 3 and 4 respectively are:

- Locals will facilitate academic improvement;
- Affirmative Action Policy provides opportunities for the disadvantaged;
- Promotion will be different for different groups; and
- Affirmative Action enables self-development.

Reasons given against Affirmative Action are:

- International thinking calls for equal opportunities; and
- The only people benefiting will be women.

These reasons show a limited understanding of Affirmative Action. One can sense a tension between Namibians and Non-Namibians and to many, Affirmative Action is solely viewed within this context. Others wish to have different promotion requirements for different groups. In other words, for the same job position, one group should be allowed to have lower skills. This is precisely what most analysts have argued Affirmative Action not to be. Affirmative Action is not meant to dilute standards or lower performances, but rather it is a conscious effort to identify areas of deprivation and provide the necessary support to equip, empower, and elevate to

the required proficiency that will allow for a fair competition. Others as Tables A.3.8 and A.4.9 show, take Affirmative Action as limited to gender only. In order to remove the misconceptions and alleviate unnecessary negative feelings, the University needs to ensure that there is a proper understanding of Affirmative Action Policy among the staff members.

#### **5.2.4 Implementation Stages of the Affirmative Action Policy**

With regards to the implementation stages, half the managers as shown in Table A.5.8 in Appendix 5, responded that they are past the introductory stage and are now in the implementation stage. None has started to appraise the results of implementation. What is worrying is that three years since the initiation of Affirmative Action at UNAM, 33.3 percent of senior managers say that they are still in the introduction and familiarization stage. The University Management needs to ensure that better progress of the implementation is achieved.

When Senior Managers were asked to assess specific achievements that they have made since they started implementing the Affirmative Action Policy in their Departments, it can be seen in Table A.5.9 in Appendix 5 that only 16.7 percent noted significant achievements, while 33.3 percent reported minor achievements. One-third reported categorically that nothing had been achieved. Overall, it is clear that results have been very modest.

Table A.5.10 in Appendix 5 shows that fifty percent of the managers reported that their staff are aware of the Affirmative Action implementation strategy set in their Departments, while 33.3 percent reported that their staff are not aware. This could mean that there is no Affirmative Action implementation strategy in those Departments. When asked whether their staff have been made aware of the expected outputs from them regarding the Affirmative Action strategy within the Department, Table A.5.11 in Appendix 5 shows that only 16.7 percent reported that they have made their staff aware. Again there is need for a clear participatory approach in the implementation of the Affirmative Action Policy at departmental levels. Regarding methods employed by managers to involve their subordinates in the Affirmative Action Policy, fifty percent reported that they have done nothing, 16.7 percent used written communication, and another 16.7 percent reported to have used the Affirmative Action Policy Documents. Again, this shows that much remains to be done at the departmental levels.

With regard to staff members, 44.4 (22.2 + 22.2) percent of Administrative staff as shown in Table A.4.11 in appendix 5, and 46.2 of Academic staff as shown in Table A.3.11 in Appendix 3, reported that they have noted some positive effects in their Departments as a result of the implementation of the Affirmative Action. About 55.5 (22.2 + 33.2) percent of Administrative staff and 46.2 (23.1 + 23.1) percent of Academic staff are dissatisfied because there is little or no progress.

When respondents were asked to express how they perceived the University as an equal opportunity employer, a total of 69.2 percent of Academic staff as shown in Table A.3.12 Appendix 3 and 55.6 percent as shown in Table A.4.12 in Appendix 4,

of the Administrative staff reported that the University does not have clear policies to encourage majority (blacks) groups at the University. Indeed 33.3 percent of Administrative staff and 69.2 percent as shown in A.4.14 and A.3.12 respectively, of academic staff mentioned that discriminatory practices still exist at the University. Whether this is true or not, the University does not seem to have convinced its own staff, particularly the Academic staff members, that it is an equal opportunity employer.

On the question of efforts made by the University to provide a supportive environment, Tables A.3.14 in Appendix 3 and A.4.15 in Appendix 4 show that 53.8 percent of Academic staff and 55.6 percent of Administrative staff, respectively, think that enough efforts have been made to provide a socially supportive environment free from intimidation, sexual harassment and the like. Table A.3.15 in Appendix 3 shows that 30.8 percent of Academic staff and Table A.4.16 shows that 33.3 percent of Administrative staff accept that the University has made some efforts to cater for the physically challenged. Regarding the question on what people consider as problems in the implementation of the Affirmative Action, both Administrative and Academic staff gave a variety of reasons. Some of the problems listed as shown in Tables A.3.16 and A.4.17 were:

- no cooperation among staff;
- inadequate staff development programme;
- Affirmative Action Policy is regarded as reverse discrimination;
- lack of transparency;

- perception that Affirmative Action Policy will impede academic growth;
- the University still operates on old regulations;
- Policy not revealed in detail to lower ranks;
- Affirmative Action viewed simply as politicking; and
- no regular updates on progress.

Many of these reasons are very valid and they support findings from other Sections of the questionnaires. For example, one of the problems mentioned is lack of cooperation among staff. Earlier discussion has shown that half the number of Senior Managers regard Affirmative Action Policy not to be clear. How can you have support for a Policy that is not clear?

#### **5.2.5 The Way Forward**

Senior Managers were asked to identify major obstacles on the way forward. Table A.5.13 in Appendix 5 shows that half of them cited unclear directives as the major obstacle, and 16.7 percent mentioned lack of resources as the problem. Thus, if the University is to make faster progress with the implementation, clear directives are needed as well as resource commitments. Responding on the best way forward, Table A.5.14 in Appendix 5 shows that half of the Senior Managers mentioned that assigning responsibilities to Task Forces provides better results, and that the Affirmative Action Policy should be linked with a properly funded Staff Development Plan. Others also mentioned the training of line managers on the implementation of Affirmative Action. Academic and Administrative staff also

provided suggestions on the way forward. Some of the reasons as listed in A.3.17 in Appendix 3 and Table A.4.18 in Appendix 4 include:

- organization of meetings and workshops on the Affirmative Action Policy;
- promotion of capacity building; improved information dissemination; and
- improved Senate and Faculty management structures.

Some suggestions bordered on sentimentalism, for example, the Pro-Vice Chancellor (PVC) position should be a woman; Deanship should be rotated based on a gender roster; and Affirmative Action Policy should only be applied to Namibians, etc. What was interesting was, that the Academic staff members gave most of the sentimental answers.

### **5.3 Interviews**

To complement information gathered through the questionnaire survey, interviews were conducted with a selected group of staff to represent all University constituencies as described in the methodology. Eight questions were framed around same issues that were covered in the questionnaire. This approach was deliberate, to allow for comparisons of results between the two methods.

#### **5.3.1 Implementation of the Affirmative Action Policy**

All staff interviewed showed the awareness that Affirmative Action Policy is being implemented at the University. Most of them, however, were not sure at what stage the University has progressed with the implementation. One interviewee mentioned that the only information received was only when statistics were gathered from them

(staff in human resources) to compile the University Affirmative Action report. Those who were to some extent aware of the extent of implementation, who knew details of the reports the University submitted to the Employment Equity Commissioner, were not sure to what extent the University has actually complied with the Affirmative Action Plan. Suggestions were made that the University Affirmative Action Consultative Committee should do more to ensure effective implementation, particularly in recruitment. Targets need to be set against dates, and reviews should be done to evaluate progress. More publicity should be attempted among the university staff. Some showed strong reservations that important documents and policies are never implemented.

### **5.3.2 Extent of Implementation**

According to the Employment Equity Commission, the University is required to draw up a 3-year plan on how the institution intends to redress the Affirmative Action issues. Some of the interviewees showed to be aware of this requirement and questioned whether the University, after completing the three year plan, has done any assessment to identify problems arising from the implementation and analyse the way forward. Some interviewees had in-depth knowledge on issues, and were able to mention that the University received queries from the Employment Equity commission with regards to the implementation. Others seemed to be totally unaware and consider that nothing has been done. On the question of localization, some of the interviewees were satisfied with the progress made, and mentioned that since universities are universal, there is a need to maintain a small percentage of foreign staff to allow for international flavour. Some commended the University for making

a significant effort in staff development, while others thought a lot need to be done. Even though more black people have taken important positions, many interviewees thought more effort need to be done to consider the previously disadvantaged groups and also bring women into management positions.

### **5.3.3 Mechanisms to Sensitise Staff**

All interviewees agree that there has been nothing to sensitise staff about the Affirmative Action Policy and its implementation at the University. Many of them mentioned that issues of Affirmative Action are not openly discussed and only the Committee responsible for its implementation is familiar with the Policy and the implementation process. A number of methods were suggested which the University could use to sensitise the staff members. These included: video shows; workshops; meetings; distribution of policy documents; internal newsletters; memos; and circulars. The University was generally requested to improve the manner of information communication and distribution.

### **5.3.4 Information to Staff on Progress**

Here again all interviewees mentioned that there has been no information dissemination on progress. One interviewee, who was even a member of the University Management Advisory Committee, also did not know much about progress, and what he knew was from hear say. Others did not even know what is meant by the Employment Equity Commission, let alone its existence. So apart from poor communication by the University on Affirmative Action, it also shows that many staff members are poorly informed on ordinary public matters.

### **5.3.5 Employment Equity Commission Support**

While many were able to explain well the relationship of the Employment Equity Commission (EEC), again a few did not have a clue what EEC is. Those who knew, explained that EEC has been in contact with the University since the Commission was initiated. A staff member of EEC has been provided to specifically deal with the University on Affirmative Action matters. These interviewees were also aware that EEC has organized a series of workshops for all stakeholders interested in the Affirmative Action Policy, and are in continual contact to improve reports submitted to them and in clarifying matters.

### **5.3.6 Progress on Equal Opportunities at the University**

Many complaints were noted from the interviewees with regard to equal opportunity. The issue that was raised often was that Namibians are not given opportunity to occupy managerial positions. Some mentioned that even when Namibians are qualified, it is a fight to get the relevant positions. Some, however, noted that the imbalance of too many non-Namibians in managerial positions should not be blamed on anybody except the staff themselves who elect the leaders as most academic management positions are filled through elections. A call was made to review the guidelines to allow more Namibians into management. In order for a significant change to happen towards equal opportunity, some of the interviewees mentioned that there is a need for a good plan to be in place. This seems to be lacking.

Interviewees also mentioned the need for more representation of women in all positions at the University. It was also mentioned that the contributions of black men and women are not appreciated, and that whites who are not well qualified feel threatened by black people, and therefore deprive others of opportunities. One mentioned that what is happening at the University is happening only by “the Grace of God”, implying that things are very bad.

### **5.3.7 Problems of Implementing Affirmative Action**

This matter also received numerous comments. One of the problems mentioned was that top-management has not owned the Policy and, therefore, hardly follows up the implementation to see obstacles, and to communicate with staff and make them aware of progress. It was also mentioned that poor salaries of the University in comparison to the private sector made it difficult to retain able Namibians. Some of the interviewees mentioned that to effectively implement Affirmative Action, you need considerable amount of resources for staff development. However, resources have been limited. Others mentioned that the poor progress of the implementation of the Affirmative Action is due to incompetent staff who are driving the process.

Obstacles also mentioned included:

- Deprivation of information for fear that people will demand their rights;
- Those holding power fear to be replaced;
- Colonial mentality by both blacks and whites who believe that black people cannot be competent;
- Policies that discourage Namibians from progressing to higher positions; and
- Jealousy by those involved in the promotion committees.

### **5.3.8 Suggestions for Successful Implementation**

Interviewees recommended that top management must take ownership of the process. A standing committee with a convener must be established, and this must be required to report progress to management and the relevant University committees at specific intervals. All documents need to be made available for easy access by staff. The process needs to ensure the involvement of all stakeholders of the University, and comparative analysis with other institutions needs to be made in order to see whether or not progress is satisfactory.

Some interviewees demanded that the University need to allocate more resources to improve the terms and conditions of service to ensure that the best Namibians are attracted and retrained. Increased transparency is needed on all efforts made, and there is also a need to publicise widely the plans, including training opportunities. A call was made for an informed, consultative management process.

## **5.4 Summary of Findings**

### **5.4.1 Results of the Findings**

The literature survey conducted in Chapter Two shows that Affirmative Action as a policy has normally been applied in situations where historical factors have shaped events to result in glaring inequalities among different societal groups. The Affirmative Action itself constituted deliberate extra ordinary interim measures to redress the imbalances.

Namibia's setting as a country that emerged out of the apartheid regime presents a typical case for application of Affirmation Action. It is interesting that Namibia did not start with the introduction of Affirmative Action immediately after independence. Instead, the country started by emphasising reconciliation. This was a wise move and produced a positive effect. Only after eight years following the independence was the Affirmative Action Act promulgated in 1998. This was immediately followed by the production of the document titled "Employer's Guidelines to the Affirmative Action (Employment) Act", which considerably helped employers and institutions in implementing the provisions of the Act.

The literature survey shows that in most places where Affirmative Action was nationally employed it resulted in turbulence, as it had been seen as reverse discrimination. Corruption and nepotism tend to be easily employed under Affirmative action. In some cases, retrogressive mentality that regards other social groups as inferior proved to be a serious impediment in accepting and supporting Affirmative Action. Inadvertent application of Affirmative Action, even though it had managed to reduce the gaps between social groups, is noted to have increased disparities in members within a given social group. Analysts also have noted significant drops in standards, where Affirmative Action was poorly applied. In short, even though the moral grounds for introducing Affirmative Action is acceptable by many, experience on its implementation shows limited success.

Namibia, on the other hand, took a prudent approach. The country though has the greatest income disparities, as results of apartheid, did not embark upon Affirmative Action immediately after independence. Doing so would have exacerbated the mistrust between whites and blacks and different social groups. Instead the country started by working through the policy of reconciliation. Affirmative Action (Employment) Act was only passed in 1998, eight years after independence. This approach has worked well. The revised “Employers Guidelines to the Affirmative Action Act” produced in October 2002 reports that “Commendable progress has already been achieved in implementing the provisions of the Act in the relatively short time of existence.” Indeed many employers have given cooperation and willingness not only to comply with the statutory requirements, but also to redress what they also accept are the imbalances caused by historical factors.

That Report shows that many institutions particularly big employers have done well in the implementation process. This study reviewed how implementation of this policy was undertaken at the University of Namibia, as one of the big employers.

The analysis of data from both questionnaires and interviews was quite revealing. The results provide a clear and consistent picture on the implementation of the Affirmative Action Policy at the University of Namibia. Many staff members do not seem to be clear or aware of the Policy and how it is being implemented. The majority of the staff regards Affirmative Action as essential; although there are a few who have reservations. However, the fact that the concept enjoys a majority support is important. What it means is that the University does not need to work hard to sell

the Policy to staff. Less effort is needed in educating, but more effort needs to be undertaken for awareness campaigns. It was noted that the most widely used method for communicating matters regarding the Affirmative Action Policy is through internal memos, followed by meetings. Staff strongly complained on poor communication, lack of sharing of information to the extent that some questioned the motives of both the management and the committee responsible for the implementation of the Policy. Many mentioned a dire need for workshops, seminars and regular de-briefing meetings. These allow for better communication because they provide opportunities for dialogue, allow feedback from staff members to be incorporated in the implementation process, thereby showing that staff contributions and participation are valued. Communication, indeed, is a serious problem since even some management staff was not aware of the process and progress.

Literature shows that in instances where Affirmative Action did not work well, it was mostly due to poor information. Those who were negatively affected need to be well appraised to allay their fears, and to show that it would not be to the best interest of the society to continue with the status quo. Transparency and information sharing will remove the possibility of nepotism being exercised under the guise of Affirmative Action. Those who are positively affected tend to think that changes are not implemented fast enough. Their involvement in the process will convince them that the best is being done.

The implementation process seems to have faced difficulties due to a variety of reasons such as:

- Policy not being clear to implementers;
- Policy is considered difficult to implement;
- Targets and responsibilities have not been set and communicated to all implementers; and
- No planned review exercises where deviations from expected targets can be noted and alleviated.

Another problem is that although almost all staff members consider Affirmative Action as important, nearly half of the members of staff regard Affirmative Action Policy as a threat to them. This matter needs to be addressed to provide assurance. This can only be done by clarifying the goals of the Policy, the process involved, and the intended effect on individuals. A clear and detailed action plan can address all these. The information gathered from both interviews and questionnaires shows some tensions between certain social groups. For example, there were allegations that some policies are deliberately made to disadvantage other social groups. Although, this may not be true, such allegations show the mistrust between the different social groups, which must be removed to ensure smoother implementation.

The reasons that staff have given in support of, or against, the Affirmative Action Policy show a very limited understanding of the concept. Again the University needs to undertake an awareness process for its staff, perhaps as suggested before, through workshops. Three years after the Affirmative Action Policy was introduced at

UNAM, there are a number of managers who have not started with implementation; they are still in the familiarization stage. Attention needs to be given to them to ensure that action begins. Indeed, many managers reported that tangible achievements since implementation of the policy have not been significant.

The results of the questionnaires as well as the interviews also showed that a lot still needs to be done for the implementation of the policy at lower level units like academic departments and administrative sections. Most staff at this level lamented the lack of clear implementation guidelines and policies, while arguing that discriminatory policies still exist within the University. A fair number of staff, though, agreed that there are visible efforts to create a socially supportive environment free from sexual and other harassments, where the needs of the physically challenged are also considered.

Many reasons were given as being obstacles to the implementation of the Affirmative Action Policy but both staff and managers emphasized the need to communicate, share and discuss as a way forward, especially through seminars and workshops. Clear assignment of responsibilities, and commitment of resources were seen as the most important items to achieve the needed progress. Regular progress reports, widely circulated and publicized, were also noted as a necessary component of the implementation process. The analysis also noted a high degree of sentimentalism among staff members on the issue of Affirmative Action, which need to be alleviated.

The Affirmative Action measures, as currently implemented at the University of Namibia, suffer similar shortfalls to those noted during its implementation in many countries as was discussed in the literature review Chapter. These include failure to undertake wide public debate where measures can be widely agreed and discussed; reducing Affirmative Action to simply the enunciation of a quota system in accessing windows of opportunities, thereby failing to address the fundamental structural changes that empower the disadvantaged. Like in most places where the Affirmative Action was not implemented well, there have not been clear mechanisms to also protect the interests of the privileged groups, thereby causing many to regard it as discrimination in reverse.

None of the interviewees, even those belonging to management mentioned the problem noted by analysts that inadvertent application of Affirmative Action can result in wider disparities of individuals within the same social group. The only way to avoid this is to ensure that opportunities for advancement are provided to all the sections of a social group from the top to bottom levels. Focus tends to be only for higher levels. The University implementation process needs to also address this matter.

### **5.4.2 Conclusions**

In the thirteen years of the University of Namibia's existence, numerous changes have been made. These have been described as major changes in the celebration of the tenth anniversary. However, the University of Namibia has yet to experience a peaceful transition of power. At present there is little to indicate that the new management will bring about such a change.

Efforts should be taken to make the managers aware of the Policy itself as well as their responsibilities in seeing to its implementation. Noting that some people view the Policy as a threat, workshops should be conducted for all members to enlighten them on the real essence of the Policy. A time frame should be set for the implementation, which specify what stage should be reached by what date. It is disturbing to note that Senior Managers, who should take the lead in the implementation of the Affirmative Action Policy, are the most ignorant about the Policy, with about 17 percent not even being aware that there is an Affirmative Action Policy at the University. A number of memos and meetings prior to this study stated that the University of Namibia has welcomed the Affirmative Action Policy. However, this study reveals that not all UNAM employees have a clear understanding on the concept of "Affirmative Action", and not all UNAM staff share the same understanding of that concept. This study also revealed, however, that UNAM employees require much more information about the implementation of Affirmative Action at UNAM. The lack of contact and information not only plays a crucial part in the understanding of Affirmative Action, but also shapes the demands

directed towards the Policy. Far from being exhaustive, the list of problems in the implementation of AAP were provided.

The University needs to do a significant amount of awareness campaign as a matter of urgency. The results of this study show that there is a need for change and improvement in the University communication process.

## **CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **6.1 Introduction**

This study has examined the implementation of AAP at UNAM and how successful it has been. The study has been enriched by an examination of literature on how AAP was first implemented. USA was the first country to initiate and implement such a Policy. Its implementation there faced many pitfalls, but some degree of positivity can be identified. Experiences vary from country to country. Many countries have failed to achieve the intended objectives. A few countries have managed to implement the Policy successfully; there are some few identifiable problems.

The Government of Namibia has decided to adopt AAP to redress existing social imbalances brought by the colonial apartheid regime. All employers are obliged to implement the policy and develop their own Action Plans. This study has examined in detail the implementation of this Policy within the University of Namibia. The University was formed from the former Academy, an institution that was established during the colonial era. In this regard, the University itself is a microcosm of the entire situation in the country where silent tension exists between different social groups. This study was undertaken by means of questionnaires and interviews. The results, which take cognizance of the historical background, the existing social structure, the available literature, and experiences elsewhere in the world has been quite revealing.

## **6.2 Conclusion**

- (i) This study analysed the Affirmative Action Policy as was implemented at the University of Namibia. The study used the triangulation approach which involved literature search, questionnaire distribution, and interviewing. The literature has revealed limited success of Affirmative Action as has been implemented in various countries around the world. For the countries where success has been limited, it was noted that the implementation of the Affirmative Action Policy has not been well planned, thus nepotism was practiced under the guise of Affirmative Action. In some cases it led to the erosion of quality of education or quality of service rendered.
  
- (ii) The study noted also that due to poor planning, although Affirmative Action managed to reduce gaps between different social groups, the literature review showed that there were many instances where Affirmative Action was implemented without undertaking wide public debate and awareness campaigns. Inevitably, the application of Affirmative Action meant that some of the benefits of previously disadvantaged groups had to be reduced or cut, in order to extend them to the disadvantaged groups. This calls for understanding, and if harmony is to be maintained there is need to sensitise the previously advantaged to see the move as essential for the general good of the public for which they are a part. In this regard, it is necessary to use terms and names that refer to groups in a manner that will not continue to segregate groups along the lines of division which existed in the past.

- (iii) It was also noted in this study that quite often in the implementation of Affirmative Action, the interests of the advantaged groups are completely overlooked perhaps due to the strong moral reasons behind the introduction of Affirmative Action, which are always easy to see. As a consequence, when Affirmative Action has been applied like that the previously advantaged groups have always treated such efforts with suspicion, and have claimed that such a drive is simply discrimination in reverse.
- (iv) The study argued that in order to avoid such ill feelings, awareness campaigns and building public consensus are necessary before implementation. The awareness campaign should not just mention the corrective measures, but should emphasize the general public good in creating an environment of peace, stability, equity and respect for one another within the social diversity in which the country exists.
- (v) The literature survey has also shown incidents where Affirmative Action has been successfully implemented. The effect was increased social harmony, increased economic prosperity for the entire country and better relationships between the different social groups. This happened when a strong public awareness campaign was done, and when the implementation process of the Affirmative Action Policy was well planned and carefully followed to ensure that there is no misuse, and that the intended results are obtained.

- (vi) An examination of the implementation process of the Affirmative Action Policy in Namibia shows that the plan was carefully introduced and well planned. Immediately after the independence, Namibia first focused on the policy of reconciliation. Only after 8 years since independence was Affirmative Action Policy introduced. This was a judicious approach that worked well. The first years were used to create social harmony, and to build trust between the different social groups. Thus when the Affirmative Action Policy was introduced, it was easy to implement. The implementation process itself was well planned. First the Affirmative Action Act was passed in Parliament, followed by the formation of the Employment Equity Commission charged with the implementation of the Act. The Commission formulated and documented guidelines to assist employers in the implementation of the Act.
- (vii) Following the promulgation of the Affirmative Act by the Government, each employer developed an Action Plan, which was reviewed by the Commission before approval. The Commission also vigorously followed progress at designated time intervals. Further to this a commissioner was allocated to every Employer to provide any additional guidance necessary. In recent documentation, the progress of the Affirmative Action implementation has been described by the Commission as very good.

- (viii) Questionnaires and interviews were used to analyse the implementation process at the University of Namibia. The results of the analyses from both the questionnaire and interviews were very much in agreement. These results were quite different from the national picture described above.
- (ix) The Study has revealed that the University of Namibia has done very little awareness campaign, as a result suspicion between different social groups within the University is rife and trust is very low. Those negatively affected regarded the Affirmative Action Policy as tantamount to reduction in quality, particularly in the academic sphere where excellence has always been regarded as the only hallmark for advancement.
- (x) Another key observation of the Study is that the implementation plan of the Affirmative Action Policy for the University is not clear both to the managers who are supposed to implement it, as well as to staff members. Feelings were expressed that some staff are being favoured to occupy high positions of managerial responsibility. There was striking similarities in the findings of the Affirmative Action Policy implementation in Namibia and those from the literature survey when the policy is poorly implemented. Like wise, there is very good similarity on the results of implementation at national level, as compared to the findings of literature, when the Affirmative Action Policy is implemented well.

### **6.3 Recommendations**

#### **6.3.1 Recommendation for Implementation of Affirmative Action Policy at the University of Namibia**

- (i) The University of Namibia need to conduct a comprehensive awareness campaign for its staff to be fully aware of the necessity of Affirmative Action. This can be done through workshops and meetings. This is because many staff are not aware of issues around Affirmative Action.
- (ii) This Study found out that very few people know the broad coverage of Affirmative Action. Many saw this only in terms of promotions, or in terms of Namibians versus non-Namibians. The University of Namibia need to educate its staff to understand the various aspects of Affirmative Action Policy as covered by the Act. This can be done through smaller departmental meetings, which provide ample opportunities for dialogue.
- (iii) Many staff showed ignorance about UNAM policies, their formulation, as well as how they are implemented. This caused many to unnecessarily blame University management, and confuse the normal implementation of University policies with the implementation of the Affirmative Action. University of Namibia should ensure that staff are aware of University policies and how they are implemented. Important policies should be published in form of Academic Ordinances, and also

placed on the internet. Seminars should be arranged also to familiarize staff with the policies.

- (iv) None of the people interviewed were aware of an implementation plan with targets, deliverables and due dates. There has been no outline of a review process to assess progress. It is recommended that the University sets all these for a smooth and transparent implementation process. Progress should be reported and openly discussed.
  
- (v) The study found out deep seated hostile attitudes between different social groups of the University staff. The University need to create social activities that will allow its entire staff to interact and share ideas. This will help diffuse the existing tension. In this regard, the University need to take the example of the government that worked on the policy of reconciliation first to diffuse tensions between different social groups before the Affirmative Action Policy was introduced.

### **6.3.2. Recommendations for Further Work**

- (i) In order to extend this work further, it would be recommended to follow up the study and find the causes for poor implementation process at the University as revealed by the study.
  
- (ii) The researcher also recommends that further work on the implementation process of other employers in Namibia should be made in order to substantiate the statement by the Employment Equity Commission that the implementation, country-wide has been good, and in order to show how the University compares with other employers. A list of best practices could be made from such a Study.
  
- (iii) Further study is needed to understand the reasons behind the deep seated divisions among the different social groups within the University. Without understanding the reasons behind the divisions, and how to overcome them, the implementation of the Affirmative Action Policy under such an atmosphere will only aggravate the situation further.
  
- (iv) Further study can also be made to analyse the implementation of other major policies at the University which are similar to the Affirmative Action, and assess whether there are any noticeable trends. It could be that the implementation of the Affirmative

Action Policy has been affected by managers who are averse to the policy itself. Such an analysis would assist to know whether that is true or not.

## REFERENCE

African National Congress, (1991) Mayibuye, (1991) August , Vol. 2, No. 7.

Anderson, J.E. (1984) *Public Policy Making: An Introduction*. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston.

Archibong, E. (earchibong @unam.na).2003 Sep 30. NANTU is wrong. Email to UNAM officials (unamusers@unam.na).

Beteille, A. (1993), "India: Equal Opportunity for all and Special Opportunity for some", *Development and Democracy*, Vol 20(60) pp. 5-6.

Black Management Forum (BMF) 1993. Affirmative Action in blue print. BMF, Johannesburg.

Burd, S.D, Jackson, R.B, & Satzinger, J.W (2002) *Systems Analysis and Design*. Thompson Learning, Canada.

College for Out of School Training incorporated in the Academy (1990) Technical Training Yearbook.Academy: Windhoek.

Days, D.S. (1993) "The United States; an Historical Perspective on Affirmative Action", *Development and Democracy*, Vol 20(6), pp 51-66.

De A Samarasinghe SWR (1993) "Affirmative Action and Equity in a Muchetunic Society.", *Development and Democracy*, Vol 20(6) pp 38-50.

Eide, A. (1992) "Equality and Affirmative Action in a Non-Racial Democratic South Africa" in Affirmative Action in New South Africa. *The Apartheid Legacy and Comparative International Experiences and Mechanisms of Enforcement*. p. 109. Bellville: University of Western Cape.

Fölscher, Alta.1990 "Just hang in there" Forum 2(8): October: 1-2

Fullinwider, R.K. (1980) *The Reverse Discrimination Controversy: a Moral and Legal Analysis*, Rowman & Littlefield, USA.

Gerber, P.D, Nel P.S, & van Dyk, P.S (1998) *Human Resources Management*. Oxford University Press Southern Africa, Cape Town.

Gerber, P.D, Haasbroek, G.D, Nel, P.S, Schultz, H.B, Sono, T. J, van Dyk, P.S & Werner A (2001) *Human Resources Management*. Oxford University Press Southern Africa, CapeTown.

Government of the Republic of Namibia (1995/1996 - 1999/2000) *First National Development Plan (NDP1)* Volume1. National Planning Commission, Windhoek, Namibia.

Government of the Republic of Namibia.1990.*The Constitution of the Republic of Namibia*. Windhoek.

Havanur, L.G. (1992) "India's Experiment with Protective Discriminatory Policy" in *Affirmative Action in a New South Africa. The Apartheid Legacy and Comparative International Experience and Mechanisms of Enforcement*. pp. 95-110. Bellville: University of Western Cape.

Hugo, Pierre. (1992) *Redistribution on Affirmative Action: working on the South African political economy*. Southern Book: Natal.

Jauch, H. M. (1998) *Affirmative Action in Namibia: Redressing the imbalances of the past?* New Namibia Books. Cyson Printers South Africa.

Kaplan, B (1994). *Changing by Degrees Equity issues in South African tertiary education*. Cape Town, UCT Press.

Katjavivi, Peter. H. (2000) *Affirmative Action Policy Statement/ Commitment*. University of Namibia, Windhoek.

Kennedy, R. (1993) "The Current Debate on Affirmative Action", *Development and democracy*, Vol. 20(6), pp 67-82.

Keulder, C. (2000) *State, Society and Democracy - A Reader in Namibia Politics*.  
Gamsberg Macmillan, Windhoek, Namibia.

Klug, H. (1992) "Affirmative Action in Non-Racial Democratic South Africa" in  
*Affirmative Action in New South Africa. The Apartheid Legacy and  
Comparative International Experiences and Mechanisms of Enforcement*. pp.  
141. Bellville: University of Western Cape.

Konrad Adenauer Stiftung (ed.) (1992) *Namibian Views: Affirmative Action*, 22. KAS  
and NID, Windhoek.

Maphai, V.T. (1992), 'Affirmative Action-Clarifying the concept' in *Affirmative  
Action: Redressing the Balance*, University of Cape Town.

Maphai, V.T. (1989) *Affirmative Action in South Africa: a Genuine Option*. *Social  
Dynamics* (15) 1-24.

Marshall, P (1989) *Research Methods: How to design and conduct a successful  
project*. How To Books Ltd, United Kingdom.

Muundjua F. (1993) *Affirmative Action in Namibia*. Paper Presented at the workshop on Affirmative Action in the public and private sectors and implications for vocational education and training, held at Cutty Stark Hotel, Scott burg, 10-12 November 1993.

Mufune P, Fox T, & Winterfeldt V (2002) *Namibia, Society and Sociology*, University of Namibia Press, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences. Windhoek.

Ndopu, P. (1993) *Affirmative Action: a Hard and Counter-Revolution in Africa*. London & New Jersey: Zed Books.

Nzimande B, 1985 Industrial Psychology and the study of black workers in South Africa: A review and critique. *Psychology in Society*. 2 January 1985, in Redistribution and Affirmative Action.

Puthuchery, M (1992) "Affirmative Action in Public Employment", in Affirmative Action in a new South Africa. *The Apartheid Legacy and Comparative International Experiences and Mechanisms of Enforcement* ", Centre for Development Studies, University of the Western Cape, Durban, pp 51-52.

Republic of Namibia (1990) *Debates of the National Assembly*, Windhoek, Vol. I, 86  
- 87.

Republic of Namibia (1990) *Debates of the National Assembly*, Windhoek Vol. I,  
129 - 131.

Republic of Namibia (1991) *Debates of the National Assembly*, Windhoek, Vol. VIII,  
235 - 237.

Republic of Namibia (1994) *Polytechnic of Namibia Act*. Office of the Prime  
Minister, Windhoek, Namibia.

Republic of Namibia (2002) *The Employers Guidelines to the Affirmative Action*, Act  
No. 29 of 1998. Employment Equity Commission, Windhoek, Namibia.

Sachs, A (1992) *Affirmative Action and Black Advancement in Business*, South  
African Constitution Study Centre, Cape Town.

Sachs, A. (1992) *Affirmative Action and Black Advancement in Business*, 39. Cape  
Town: South African Constitution Centre.

Sikhosana M. (1993) *Affirmative Action: Its Possibilities and Limitations*. Durban:  
University of Natal.

Smith N (1992) *Affirmative Action: Its origin and Point. South African Journal of Labour Relations* Vol.16. no. 3 (23.36).

Staby, H-E. (1992) *Affirmative Action in Namibia*: observations on its implementation. In: Konrad Adenauer Stiftung (ed.) (1992) *Namibian Views: Affirmative Action*, Windhoek: KAS and NID; pp13-23.

University of Namibia incorporated in the Academy (1990) Faculty of Science Year book, Academy: Windhoek

University of Namibia incorporated in the Academy (1991) Faculty of Science Year book, Academy: Windhoek.

University of Namibia incorporated in the Academy (1992) Faculty of Science Year book, Academy: Windhoek.

University of Namibia incorporated in the Academy (1993) Faculty of Economics and Management Science Year book, Windhoek.

University of Namibia (2000-2001) *First Affirmative Action Report*, University of Namibia, Windhoek, Namibia.

University of Namibia (2001-2002) *Second Affirmative Action Report*, University of Namibia, Windhoek, Namibia.

van Rooyen , J.W.F. (2000) *Implementing Affirmative Action In Namibia: A summarised guide to the Affirmative Action (Employment) Act (Act 29 of 1998)*. Namibia Institute for Democracy, Windhoek, Namibia.

Weiner, M. (1993) “Affirmative Action: the International Experience”, *Development and Democracy*, Windhoek, Vol. 20 (6) pp 5-25.

**APPENDIX 1: Questionnaire to the Deans, Directors, and Senior  
Managers at the University of Namibia**

**UNIVERSITY OF NAMIBIA**

**DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE STUDIES**

**QUESTIONNAIRE FOR MASTERS OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION**

**RESEARCH PROJECT**

**AN ANALYSIS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AFFIRMATIVE**

**ACTION POLICY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF NAMIBIA**

**My name is Tekla Tjipura. I am undertaking a research project in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Public Administration degree at the University of Namibia. As part of this project, I would like to ask you some questions concerning the Affirmative Action Policy at the University. All responses will be held in confidence. Please answer the questions by ticking [✓] on the appropriate answer, unless otherwise stated.**

**DEANS, DIRECTORS AND SENIOR MANAGERS AT UNAM**

**SECTION 1: GENERAL**

1. (a) Faculty/Department/Centre

.....

(b) Gender

Male

Female

2. Are you aware of UNAM's Affirmative Action Policy?

Yes

No

3. (a) Is the Affirmative Action Policy of the university clear?

Yes

No

(b) Is Affirmative Action Policy easy to implement?

Yes

No

4. How were you as a manager introduced and made familiar to the Affirmative Action Policy for UNAM?

- Through a memo
- Through a meeting
- Through a workshop
- Through other methods,  
(please specify)

.....

.....

5. As a manager are you clear on your responsibilities regarding the Affirmative Action Plan?

- Yes
- No

**SECTION 2: IMPLEMENTATION**

6. At what stage of implementation is the Affirmative Action Policy in your Faculty/Department or Centre?

- Familiarization/Introduction stage
- Developing detailed implementation plan
- Implementation of the plan

- Appraisal stage to check achievement
- Complete conformity with the requirements of the Policy
- Other (Please specify)

7. What specific achievements has your department made with regard to the Affirmative Action Policy?

- Nothing has changed since the introduction of Affirmative Action Policy
- Minor achievements (Please specify)  
.....
- Moderate achievements (Please specify)  
.....
- Significant achievements (Please specify)  
.....

8. (a) Are your staff aware of the Affirmative Action Policy implementation strategy within your Department?

- Yes
- No

(b) Are they aware of the expected output?

Yes

No

9. What methods have been used to involve your staff and inform them about

Affirmative Action Policy and your implementation strategy?

None

Written communication

Scheduled meetings (Faculty boards etc)

Affirmative Action Policy meetings/workshops

Any other (Please specify)

.....

.....

.....

.....

**SECTION 3: CHALLENGES AND THE WAY FORWARD**

10. What do you think are the major obstacles (if any) in implementing the

Affirmative Action Policy in your Department or centre?

None

Unclear directives from Management.

Resistance from Staff

- Lack of Resources (Human, finance, skills etc.)
- Others (Please specify)

.....

11. What do you think is the best way to carry the Affirmative Action Policy initiative forward?

- Assigning these responsibilities to a specific Task Force and not to line managers but involve them
- Link this initiative to a proper Funded Staff Development Plan.
- Use line managers but train them and provide clear guidelines, including workshops and seminars
- Others (Please specify)

.....  
.....  
.....

END OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE. ONCE AGAIN THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE

**APPENDIX 2: Questionnaires to Administrative and Academic  
Employees at the University of Namibia**

**UNIVERSITY OF NAMIBIA**

**DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE STUDIES**

**QUESTIONNAIRE FOR MASTERS OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION ADMIN  
RESEARCH PROJECT**

**AN ANALYSIS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AFFIRMATIVE  
ACTION POLICY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF NAMIBIA**

**My name is Tekla Tjipura. I am undertaking a research project in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Public Administration degree at the University of Namibia. As part of this project, I would like to ask you some questions concerning the Affirmative Action Policy at the University. All responses will be held in confidence. Please answer the questions by ticking [✓] on the appropriate answer, unless otherwise stated.**

**EMPLOYEES AT UNAM (ADMINISTRATIVE AND ACADEMIC)**

**SECTION 1: GENERAL**

1. (a) Faculty/Department/Centre

.....

(b) Gender

Male

Female

2. Are you aware of the Policy (AAP) at UNAM?

Yes

No

3. (a) Do you think there is a need for an Policy drive at UNAM

Yes

No

(b) If No, why

.....

.....

4. How did you become aware of the Policy at UNAM?

Through a memo

Through a meeting

Through a workshop

Other (Please specify)

.....

.....

5. (a) Personally, do you see the Policy as a threat to you?

Yes

No

Explain your answer?

.....  
.....

5. (b) Personally, do you see the Policy as an opportunity scheme to you?

Yes

No

Explain your answer.

.....  
.....

**SECTION 2: IMPLEMENTATION**

6. Have you seen/noticed any changes in your Department as a result of the introduction of the Policy?

Yes (please specify)

.....  
.....

No

7. In your opinion are you satisfied with the progress made so far in the implementation of the Policy? (Tick the appropriate answer)

- Not satisfied, no progress made.
- Not satisfied, little progress made.
- Satisfied, moderate progress.
- Satisfied, significant progress made
- Others (Please specify?)

.....  
.....

8. How do you perceive the University of Namibia as an equal opportunity employer?

- No clear policies to encourage minority and disadvantaged groups.  
(Please specify groups that are marginalized)

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

- Some discriminatory practices exist (Explain?)

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

The University has made efforts to provide a supportive environment to all groups.

(i) Socially (e.g. prevention of harassments)

Yes

No

(ii) Physically (e.g. Facilities for physically challenged)

Yes

No

9. What are the problems of implementing Policy at UNAM?

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

10. Which areas and ways would you like the University to improve in the implementation of the Policy?

.....  
.....  
.....

**END OF QUESTIONNAIRE.ONCE AGAIN THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE**

### APPENDIX 3: Frequency Tables of Academic Staff

**Table A3.1 Faculty/ Department/Centre**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Education	1	7.7	7.7	7.7
	Science	6	46.2	46.2	53.8
	Economics & Management Science	3	23.1	23.1	76.9
	Humanities & Social Sciences	1	7.7	7.7	84.6
	Medical & Health Science	1	7.7	7.7	92.3
	Agriculture & Natural Resources	1	7.7	7.7	100.0
	Total	13	100.0	100.0	

**Table A 3.2 Gender**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	8	61.5	61.5	61.5
	Female	5	38.5	38.5	100.0
	Total	13	100.0	100.0	

**Table A3.3 Awareness of AA Policy**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	11	84.6	84.6	84.6
	No	2	15.4	15.4	100.0
	Total	13	100.0	100.0	

**Table A3.4 Any Need for AA Policy at UNAM?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	11	84.6	84.6	84.6
	No	2	15.4	15.4	100.0
	Total	13	100.0	100.0	

**Table A.3.5 Why no Need for AA Policy?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid UNAM should appoint only the best regardless of group	1	7.7	7.7	7.7
Need to train to get competent people	1	7.7	7.7	15.4
Not Applicable	11	84.6	84.6	100.0
Total	13	100.0	100.0	

**Table A.3.6 How I became aware of AA Policy**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Through a memo	6	46.2	46.2	46.2
Through a meeting	3	23.1	23.1	69.2
Media	1	7.7	7.7	76.9
Through memo and meeting	1	7.7	7.7	84.6
Not applicable	2	15.4	15.4	100.0
Total	13	100.0	100.0	

**Table A.3.7 Is AA Policy a threat or an opportunity to you?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	2	15.4	15.4	15.4
No	7	53.8	53.8	69.2
"Yes" f or Opportunity	2	15.4	15.4	84.6
Not stated	2	15.4	15.4	100.0
Total	13	100.0	100.0	

**Table A.3.8 Why AA Policy is a Threat/ Opportunity**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Locals will facilitate academic improvement	1	7.7	7.7	7.7
AA Policies provide opportunities for the disadvantaged	1	7.7	7.7	15.4
International movements call f or equal opportunities	1	7.7	7.7	23.1
Not applicable	9	69.2	69.2	92.3
Not stated	1	7.7	7.7	100.0
Total	13	100.0	100.0	

**Table A.3.9 Why AA Policy is or is not a Threat/ Opportunity**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid All management position should go Namibians	1	7.7	7.7	7.7
Promotion will be different for different groups	1	7.7	7.7	15.4
I'm a qualified person	2	15.4	15.4	30.8
Will give opportunities to the disadvantaged	1	7.7	7.7	38.5
Not applicable	6	46.2	46.2	84.6
Not stated	2	15.4	15.4	100.0
Total	13	100.0	100.0	

**Table A.3.10 Effect of AA Policy in my Department**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid yes	6	46.2	46.2	46.2
No	7	53.8	53.8	100.0
Total	13	100.0	100.0	

**Table A.3.11 Satisfaction with progress of AA Policy**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Not satisfied, no progress	3	23.1	23.1	23.1
Not satisfied, little progress	3	23.1	23.1	46.2
Satisfied, moderate progress	2	15.4	15.4	61.5
Satisfied, significant progress	1	7.7	7.7	69.2
Satisfied, the blacks have been empowered	2	15.4	15.4	84.6
Not satisfied, people should be supported by qualification	1	7.7	7.7	92.3
Not stated	1	7.7	7.7	100.0
Total	13	100.0	100.0	

**Table A.3.12 Perception of UNAM as an Equal Opportunity Employer**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No clear policies to encourage minorities	9	69.2	69.2	69.2
	Some discriminatory practices exist	2	15.4	15.4	84.6
	Not stated	2	15.4	15.4	100.0
	Total	13	100.0	100.0	

**Table A.3.13 Existence of Discriminatory Practices**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	9	69.2	69.2	69.2
	No	1	7.7	7.7	76.9
	Not applicable	1	7.7	7.7	84.6
	Not stated	2	15.4	15.4	100.0
	Total	13	100.0	100.0	

**Table A.3.14 Efforts to Support all Groups Physically**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	7	53.8	53.8	53.8
	Not applicable	1	7.7	7.7	61.5
	Not stated	5	38.5	38.5	100.0
	Total	13	100.0	100.0	

**Table A.3.15 Efforts to Support all Groups Socially**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	4	30.8	30.8	30.8
	Not applicable	1	7.7	7.7	38.5
	Not stated	8	61.5	61.5	100.0
	Total	13	100.0	100.0	

**Table A.3.16 Problems of Implementing AA Policy**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Foreigners	1	7.7	7.7	7.7
	Lack of transparency	1	7.7	7.7	15.4
	AA Policy will impede academic growth	1	7.7	7.7	23.1
	Academic merit should be the priority	1	7.7	7.7	30.8
	Lack of initiative from locals	1	7.7	7.7	38.5
	Old regulations	1	7.7	7.7	46.2
	Meeting the needs of the disadvantaged	1	7.7	7.7	53.8
	Few women interested in academics /internal politics	1	7.7	7.7	61.5
	Employ right people at right places	2	15.4	15.4	76.9
	Policy not revealed in detail to lower ranks	1	7.7	7.7	84.6
	Don't Know	1	7.7	7.7	92.3
	Not stated	1	7.7	7.7	100.0
	Total	13	100.0	100.0	

Table A.3.17 Areas you like UNAM to Improve in AA Policy

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
Employ Namibians as head/director/manager	1	7.7	7.7	7.7
AAP should apply to Namibians only	1	7.7	7.7	15.4
Have the right policy to educate/train for right jobs	1	7.7	7.7	23.1
SD tied to bonding/ one PVC be a women/ Deanship gender rota	1	7.7	7.7	30.8
regular update on progress	1	7.7	7.7	38.5
Workshop on AAP for employees	1	7.7	7.7	46.2
improve structure of senate and faculty management	1	7.7	7.7	53.8
Gender balance/ physical disability	1	7.7	7.7	61.5
Improve transparency through participation/ consultation	1	7.7	7.7	69.2
Apply AAP in promotions	1	7.7	7.7	76.9
Don't know	2	15.4	15.4	92.3
Not stated	1	7.7	7.7	100.0
Total	13	100.0	100.0	

## APPENDIX 4: Frequency Tables for Administrative Staff

**Table A.4.1 Faculty/ Department/ Centre**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid VC Office	1	11.1	11.1	11.1
ILRC	1	11.1	11.1	22.2
Estate Services	1	11.1	11.1	33.3
Dean of Students	1	11.1	11.1	44.4
MRCC	1	11.1	11.1	55.6
Education	1	11.1	11.1	66.7
Office of the Registrar	1	11.1	11.1	77.8
Human Resources	2	22.2	22.2	100.0
Total	9	100.0	100.0	

**Table A.4.2 Gender**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Male	4	44.4	44.4	44.4
Female	5	55.6	55.6	100.0
Total	9	100.0	100.0	

**Table A.4.3 Awareness of AAP**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid yes	8	88.9	88.9	88.9
No	1	11.1	11.1	100.0
Total	9	100.0	100.0	

**Table A.4.4 Any Need for AAP at UNAM?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid yes	9	100.0	100.0	100.0

**Table A.4.5 Why no Need for AAP?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Not Applicable	9	100.0	100.0	100.0

**Table A4.6 How I Became Aware of AAP**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Through a memo	3	33.3	33.3	33.3
Through a workshop	1	11.1	11.1	44.4
Through a meeting	3	33.3	33.3	77.8
At elections encourage vote for AA	1	11.1	11.1	88.9
From HR ( Policy section)	1	11.1	11.1	100.0
Total	9	100.0	100.0	

**Table A4.7 Is AAP a Threat or an Opportunity to you?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	4	44.4	44.4	44.4
No	5	55.6	55.6	100.0
Total	9	100.0	100.0	

**Table A4.8 Why AAP is a Threat / Opportunity**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Enable development of oneself	1	11.1	11.1	11.1
It is an advantage	1	11.1	11.1	22.2
Namibians will be given opportunity for promotion	2	22.2	22.2	44.4
Not applicable	5	55.6	55.6	100.0
Total	9	100.0	100.0	

**Table A4.9 Why AAP is not a Threat / Opportunity?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid To correct what went wrong in the past	1	11.1	11.1	11.1
It is an advantage	1	11.1	11.1	22.2
Namibians will be given opportunity for promotion	1	11.1	11.1	33.3
Only people benefiting are women	1	11.1	11.1	44.4
Not applicable	4	44.4	44.4	88.9
Not stated	1	11.1	11.1	100.0
Total	9	100.0	100.0	

**Table A.4.10 Any effect of AAP in my Department?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid yes	4	44.4	44.4	44.4
No	5	55.6	55.6	100.0
Total	9	100.0	100.0	

**Table A.4.11 Satisfaction with Progress of AAP**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Not satisfied, no progress	2	22.2	22.2	22.2
Satisfied, little progress	3	33.3	33.3	55.6
Satisfied, moderate progress	2	22.2	22.2	77.8
Satisfied, significant progress	2	22.2	22.2	100.0
Total	9	100.0	100.0	

**Table A.4.12 Perception of UNAM as an Equal Opportunity Employer**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid No clear policies to encourage minorities	5	55.6	55.6	55.6
Some discriminatory practices exist	4	44.4	44.4	100.0
Total	9	100.0	100.0	

**Table A.4.13 Existence of Clear Policies to Encourage Minorities**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid yes	4	44.4	44.4	44.4
No	3	33.3	33.3	77.8
Not stated	2	22.2	22.2	100.0
Total	9	100.0	100.0	

**Table A.4.14 Existence of Discriminatory Practices**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid yes	3	33.3	33.3	33.3
No	4	44.4	44.4	77.8
Not stated	2	22.2	22.2	100.0
Total	9	100.0	100.0	

**Table A.4.15 Efforts to Support all Groups Socially**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid yes	5	55.6	55.6	55.6
No	4	44.4	44.4	100.0
Total	9	100.0	100.0	

**Table A.4.16 Efforts to Support all Groups Physically**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid yes	3	33.3	33.3	33.3
No	5	55.6	55.6	88.9
Not stated	1	11.1	11.1	100.0
Total	9	100.0	100.0	

**Table A.4.17 Problems of Implementing AAP**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid No cooperation among staff	1	11.1	11.1	11.1
Staff development of local personnel	2	22.2	22.2	33.3
Regard of AAP as reverse discrimination	1	11.1	11.1	44.4
Not stated	5	55.6	55.6	100.0
Total	9	100.0	100.0	

**Table A.4.18 Areas You Like UNAM to Improve in AAP**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid arrange for informative meetings and workshops	1	11.1	11.1	11.1
Staff Development	2	22.2	22.2	33.3
Promotion and capacity building of local staff	1	11.1	11.1	44.4
Information disseminating and transparency	1	11.1	11.1	55.6
50% Staff development to admin staff	1	11.1	11.1	66.7
UNAM management	1	11.1	11.1	77.8
Not stated	2	22.2	22.2	100.0
Total	9	100.0	100.0	

## APPENDIX 5: Frequency Tables for Senior Managers

**Table A.4.1 Faculty/ Department/ Centre**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	VC Office	1	11.1	11.1	11.1
	ILRC	1	11.1	11.1	22.2
	Estate Services	1	11.1	11.1	33.3
	Dean of Students	1	11.1	11.1	44.4
	MRCC	1	11.1	11.1	55.6
	Education	1	11.1	11.1	66.7
	Office of the Registrar	1	11.1	11.1	77.8
	Human Resources	2	22.2	22.2	100.0
	Total	9	100.0	100.0	

**Table A.4.2 Gender**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	4	44.4	44.4	44.4
	Female	5	55.6	55.6	100.0
	Total	9	100.0	100.0	

**Table A.4.3 Awareness of AAP**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	8	88.9	88.9	88.9
	No	1	11.1	11.1	100.0
	Total	9	100.0	100.0	

**Table A.4.4 Any Need for AAP at UNAM?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	9	100.0	100.0	100.0

**Table A.4.5 Why no Need for AAP?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Applicable	9	100.0	100.0	100.0

**Table A4.6 How I Became Aware of AAP**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Through a memo	3	33.3	33.3	33.3
	Through a workshop	1	11.1	11.1	44.4
	Through a meeting	3	33.3	33.3	77.8
	At elections encourage vote for AA	1	11.1	11.1	88.9
	From HR ( Policy section)	1	11.1	11.1	100.0
	Total	9	100.0	100.0	

**Table A4.7 Is AAP a Threat or an Opportunity to you?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	4	44.4	44.4	44.4
	No	5	55.6	55.6	100.0
	Total	9	100.0	100.0	

**Table A4.8 Why AAP is a Threat / Opportunity**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Enable development of oneself	1	11.1	11.1	11.1
	It is an advantage	1	11.1	11.1	22.2
	Namibians will be given opportunity for promotion	2	22.2	22.2	44.4
	Not applicable	5	55.6	55.6	100.0
	Total	9	100.0	100.0	

**Table A4.9 Why AAP is not a Threat / Opportunity?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	To correct what went wrong in the past	1	11.1	11.1	11.1
	It is an advantage	1	11.1	11.1	22.2
	Namibians will be given opportunity for promotion	1	11.1	11.1	33.3
	Only people benefiting are women	1	11.1	11.1	44.4
	Not applicable	4	44.4	44.4	88.9
	Not stated	1	11.1	11.1	100.0
	Total	9	100.0	100.0	

**Table A.4.10 Any effect of AAP in my Department?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid yes	4	44.4	44.4	44.4
No	5	55.6	55.6	100.0
Total	9	100.0	100.0	

**Table A.4.11 Satisfaction with Progress of AAP**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Not satisfied, no progress	2	22.2	22.2	22.2
Satisfied, little progress	3	33.3	33.3	55.6
Satisfied, moderate progress	2	22.2	22.2	77.8
Satisfied, significant progress	2	22.2	22.2	100.0
Total	9	100.0	100.0	

**Table A.4.12 Perception of UNAM as an Equal Opportunity Employer**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid No clear policies to encourage minorities	5	55.6	55.6	55.6
Some discriminatory practices exist	4	44.4	44.4	100.0
Total	9	100.0	100.0	

**Table A.4.13 Existence of Clear Policies to Encourage Minorities**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid yes	4	44.4	44.4	44.4
No	3	33.3	33.3	77.8
Not stated	2	22.2	22.2	100.0
Total	9	100.0	100.0	

**Table A.4.14 Existence of Discriminatory Practices**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid yes	3	33.3	33.3	33.3
No	4	44.4	44.4	77.8
Not stated	2	22.2	22.2	100.0
Total	9	100.0	100.0	

**Table A.4.15 Efforts to Support all Groups Socially**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid yes	5	55.6	55.6	55.6
No	4	44.4	44.4	100.0
Total	9	100.0	100.0	

**Table A.4.16 Efforts to Support all Groups Physically**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid yes	3	33.3	33.3	33.3
No	5	55.6	55.6	88.9
Not stated	1	11.1	11.1	100.0
Total	9	100.0	100.0	

**Table A.4.17 Problems of Implementing AAP**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid No cooperation among staff	1	11.1	11.1	11.1
Staff development of local personnel	2	22.2	22.2	33.3
Regard of AAP as reverse discrimination	1	11.1	11.1	44.4
Not stated	5	55.6	55.6	100.0
Total	9	100.0	100.0	

**Table A.4.18 Areas You Like UNAM to Improve in AAP**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid arrange for informative meetings and workshops	1	11.1	11.1	11.1
Staff Development	2	22.2	22.2	33.3
Promotion and capacity building of local staff	1	11.1	11.1	44.4
Information disseminating and transparency	1	11.1	11.1	55.6
50% Staff development to admin staff	1	11.1	11.1	66.7
UNAM management	1	11.1	11.1	77.8
Not stated	2	22.2	22.2	100.0
Total	9	100.0	100.0	

## **APPENDIX 6: Interview Questionnaire to UNAM Employees**

**UNIVERSITY OF NAMIBIA**

**DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE STUDIES**

**INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR MASTERS OF PUBLIC  
ADMINISTRATION RESEARCH PROJECT**

**AN ANALYSIS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE POLICY AT THE  
UNIVERSITY OF NAMIBIA**

1. The University of Namibia has adopted the Policy and is currently implementing it, could you please comment on the implementation process of this policy?
2. To what extent has UNAM managed to implement its Plan?
3. What mechanism was used to sensitise staff about Affirmative Action Policy and its implementation?
4. How are staff members informed about the progress report on AA Policy?

5. In what ways do the Employment Equity Commission support the University in this exercise
  
6. What progress do you think has been made towards equal opportunities for all employees at this institution?
  
7. What are the problems of implementing the Plan?
  
8. What can be done to ensure that the Plan is implemented successfully

## APPENDIX 7: Academic and Administrative Staff at the University of Namibia

**Table A.7.1: ACADEMIC STAFF**

FACULTY CENTRE	MALE	FEMALE	NAMIBIANS	NON-NAMIBIANS	TOTAL
Agriculture and Natural Resources	20	9	13	16	29
Economics and Management Science	27	5	16	16	32
Education	26	15	28	13	41
Humanities and Social Sciences	39	32	55	16	71
Law	7	2	5	4	9
Medical and Health Services	4	36	39	1	40
Science	40	18	31	27	58
Centre for External Studies	8	8	10	6	16
Language Centre	8	10	12	6	18
MRCC	8	3	10	1	11
Library	5	13	11	7	18
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>339</b>

**Note:** Statistics exclude Part-time contract staff.

The number of academic staff has increased slightly in 2002, compared to the previous year 2001, figures to relieve highly stressed Faculties. It is significant to note that the ratio of Namibians vs. Non-Namibians has increased from 59:41 in year 2000 to 68:32 in year 2002. Namibians now constitute 68% of the academic staff complement. This drastic increase shows the University's commitment to the Affirmative Action Policy. Female academics constitute 44 percent of the academic staff complement.

**TABLE A.7.2: ADMINISTRATIVE AND SUPPORT STAFF MEMBERS**

<b>DEPARTMENT/ UNIT</b>	<b>MALE</b>	<b>FEMALE</b>	<b>NAMIBIANS</b>	<b>NON-NAMIBIANS</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Office of the Vice Chancellor	6	6	9	3	12
Office of the Pro Vice Chancellor (Academic and Research)	1	3	4	0	4
Office of the Pro Vice Chancellor (Admin and Finance)	1	1	1	1	2
Office of the Registrar	5	12	17	0	17
Faculties:					
Agriculture & Natural Resources	13	3	16	0	16
Economics & Management Science	2	4	6	0	6
Education	2	3	5	0	5
Humanities & Social Sciences	5	7	12	0	12
Law	1	4	5	0	5
Medical and Health Sciences	2	6	8	0	8
Science	10	8	17	1	18
Centre for External Studies	7	21	27	1	28
Multidisciplinary Research Centre	3	10	13	0	13
Language Centre	2	4	6	0	6
Northern Campus	4	3	7	0	7
Computer Centre	6	3	9	0	9
Dean of Students	21	32	53	0	53
Estate Service	48	7	54	1	55
Finance	14	16	30	0	30
Human Resource	6	9	15	0	15
Library	14	16	30	0	30
UNAM Foundation	1	3	4	0	4
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>348</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>355</b>

In examining statistics for Administrative and Support Staff members, it is important to note that female staff now constitutes 51 percent. Non-Namibians constitute only 2 percent. The overall statistics shows that the University had a total of 694 staff, of which 48 percent are females and 83 percent are Namibians (UNAM, (2001-2002)).