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ABSTRACT

Women have lagged behind as far as equity in all spheres of life is concerned and their participation in education management relative to men decreases at successive higher levels. World Bank report on gender and development (2003) noted that the number of women holding management positions was lower than that of men. In Kenya traditionally, women were viewed as inferior to men and marginalized in all sectors of development, Chacha (2004). There was need to look at the position of women in university management in public and private universities in Kenya. The purpose of the study was to investigate the factors affecting women career mobility in educational management in public universities in comparison to the private universities in Kenya. The main objectives of the study were to; establish the management positions occupied by men and women in public universities in comparison to private universities in Kenya, analyze from a gender perspective, the university policies and their effect on women career mobility in educational management in public universities in comparison to private universities in Kenya, investigate how policies on recruitment and promotion affect the career mobility of women in public universities in comparison to private universities in Kenya, establish the challenges hindering women career mobility in public universities in comparison to private universities in Kenya and finally examine the interventions put in place by public and private universities in Kenya. The findings of this study would fill knowledge gaps on women career mobility and provide policy guidelines on gender equity. The study was guided by survey research design. The data was collected from four public universities and three private chartered universities in Kenya. Instruments of data collection were women career mobility questionnaires, women career mobility indepth interview guides and document analysis guides. The instruments were tested for validity and reliability and then piloted. The population of the study was men and women in management positions. The target population comprised 1200 men and women in senior management positions that is, Vice Chancellors, deputy vice chancellors, deans of Faculties/Schools, registrars, and heads of departments in public and private universities in Kenya. Stratified random sampling and purposive sampling techniques were used. The sample of the study comprised 74 men and 50 women from public universities and 115 men and 61 women from private universities in Kenya. In analyzing the data, Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to compute the statistics and analyse the quantitative data. The findings of the study revealed that; women were under represented in university management in public and private universities in Kenya, there were more women in university management in public universities than in private universities in Kenya, Public and private universities had policies on recruitment and promotion but they were hardly implemented, women in public and private university management faced challenges like cultural stereotypes, lack of mentoring, lack of career and social networks, social and political factors that hindered their career mobility. The study further revealed that the interventions put in place by public and private universities to enhance women career mobility were not effective. The study recommends that men and women in university management be given equal opportunities during recruitment and promotion and implementation of legal frameworks and policies on recruitment and promotion and public and private universities put in place interventions that enhance women career mobility in university management in Kenya.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study

The background of the study was done from the global perspective, the regional and then the Kenyan situation. Effective management of an individual’s career within the organization can make an important contribution to an organization achieving competitive advantage from within.

Garavan (2006) emphasized on the relationship between organizational commitment and career issues and the need to manage the career of an employee in a strategic fashion. He noted that individuals and organizations view careers differently. While employees are more interested in opportunities for advancement, obsolescence of technical skills, ageing, impact of a decline in company performance among other factors, employers are more concerned with ensuring that managerial succession is orderly and efficient. He further emphasized that organizations desire their employees to pursue career development which is relevant to organizational goals and are essentially interested in making sure that there is a good match between the person and the job. He further noted that individual perspectives on careers focus on independent variables that predict career mobility. These include; education, social class, gender and family influences.

Gattiker & Larwood (2008) suggest that the frequency of promotion within an organization is valuable indicator of career success and mobility, since it is important
for an individual’s climb up the corporate hierarchy. In the world of work, Eagly & Carli (2007) in their study on gender hierarchy relationships in the United Kingdom observed that barriers to women in management exist worldwide. They also noted that although women represent more than 40 percent of the world’s labour force, their share of management positions remains unacceptably low. Further, they observed that even in traditional feminine professions such as social work and education, women do not occupy key decision making positions in relation to their numbers. Consequently, women tend to stay in “doer” positions with low-paying jobs while men plan, organise, direct and control.

Martin, Harrisson & Dinnitto (2003) noted that despite increasing participation rates in the labour force worldwide, very few women have risen to positions of leadership and authority. Martin et al (2003) asserts that there is a disparity in the attitude and approach towards women and men at the work place which translates into notable discrimination against women. Traditionally, and especially in less developed countries, women are preoccupied with domestic responsibilities which typically involve household chores and caring for the home, Martin et al, (2003). In fulfilling these responsibilities women often get involved in low paid tasks such as petty trade, handicrafts, subsistence farming and casual labour. Thus women are often associated with low status jobs.

Dines (1993) in her study on women in higher education management in universities in commonwealth countries said that cultural perceptions of the roles which women are expected to fill are reflected in the extent to which women participate in management. Dines further observes that majority of women in agrarian cultures were
destined to hard physical labour, domination by patriarchal systems of family life and limited to mastering and nurturing arts and crafts necessary for the survival of the community and appropriate to their servant role.

Cubillo and Brown (2003) observe that management positions in this sense “belong to male members of the society and women should refrain from attempting to attain this kind of position.” Otherwise, they are susceptible to various social sanctions such as reduced chance to marry (www.unesco.org, February, 2011). Brewer (2008) the chief executive of Equality and Human Rights Commission of United Kingdom noted that:

young women's aspiration is in danger of giving way to frustration. Many of them are now excelling at school and are achieving great things in higher education. They are keen to balance a family with a rewarding career, but work place forged in an era of ‘stay at home mums’ and bread winner dads are putting too many barriers in the way resulting in an avoidable loss of talent at the top.

The report cited a worrying trend of reversal or stalled progress on gains by women populace. Dines (1993) observed that few institutions in society change as slowly as social relationships and few as it would appear, more slowly than the systemic discrimination of women. Where there is change it has tended to be for such pragmatic reasons as the need to tap into the extra resources that the female workforce represents for boosting a nation's economy, (Dines, 1993). Research on gender equity in commonwealth higher education by World Bank (2005) showed that in spite of advances which women had made in many areas of public life in the two decades, in the area of higher education management they are still far from participating on the same footing as men.
World Bank (2003) report on gender and development noted that gender equity is very important to any country’s development and any substantial development in any nation requires the participation of both men and women. The report further observed that the number of women holding management positions was lower than that of men. Women were reported to be making slow and uneven progress in their careers.

1.1.1 Women career mobility in African region

Education statistics in Sub-Saharan African (SSA) countries show that women continue to lag behind men in education in general and specifically in educational management. Education stereotyping continues, with women and girls tending to study programmes related to so-called “women’s” occupations such as nursing, secretarial jobs and social work, UNDP (2003).

UNDP (2003) in its report noted that when formal education (in terms of schools) was introduced in SSA by the religious missionaries and colonial powers, girls were not allowed to go to school until much later. In Rwanda for example, girls were allowed to go to school 34 years after boys were.

The culture of marginalisation and discrimination of the women folk in education and employment has persisted to this day. The stereotyping of knowledge and skills given to girls and boys at the introduction of formal schooling combined with marginalisation and discrimination against women continues to influence the gendered nature of education even today and hence determines the occupation of men and women, UNDP (2003).
A study conducted in Nigeria by Ilo (2010) on women’s access to senior management positions in the university of Abuja Nigeria observed that years of equal opportunity rule, affirmative action strategy and anti-discrimination legislation in favour of women have failed to deliver the desired rise in hierarchy for female academics.

1.1.2 Women Carer Mobility in Kenya

In Kenya the situation is not any different from other countries in the world. Traditionally, women were viewed as inferior to men and marginalized in all sectors of development, Chacha (2004). A study by Suda (1991) on social cultural and demographic factors in female labour force participation in Kenya revealed that although Kenyan women have joined the labour force in large and increasing numbers over the last two decades due to increased access to education, majority of them are still concentrated in traditional "female occupations” and the informal sector. The urban labour force participation rate for women in Kenya had increased from 30% in the early eighties to 56% in 1995. Despite their growing participation in the workforce, there are still very few women in the top echelons of public decision and policy making positions in Kenya.

Suda (1991) observed that most women in Kenya are concentrated in low paying, low status occupations with poor fringe benefits and carried out under poor working conditions and therefore hold very little prospect for poverty reduction and upward mobility. Suda (1991) noted that majority of the women in the rural areas spend a great deal of time on low productivity work which has created major income disparities between men and women.
Data from the 1995-1999 Economic Surveys indicated that men were more heavily involved than women in almost all the key sectoral activities. These data also show that between 1996 and 1998 there was insignificant change in the participation of women in the labour force. The level of female wage employment in most sectors remained at around 25% except in the domestic and education sectors where women constitute about 40% of the total labour force. These two are among the sectors which are traditionally considered as female domains. The prevalence of gender segregation in the labour market has created a major barrier to the expansion of women’s employment opportunities leading to a skewed employment pattern in which women are under-represented in the modern wage sector with decreasing incomes. The survey revealed that women career mobility has been too slow over the years and that women stagnated in the same position for many years.

The Commission for Higher Education (CHE) report of 2011/2012 revealed than women occupied lower managerial positions as deans of students, welfare officers and students counsellors, CHE (2011). The situation was more or less the same in public and private universities in Kenya. However, this study observed that more women held management position in public universities that in private universities in Kenya. In one of the private universities in Kenya, out of the seven deans of faculties only one was a woman.

In another private university, out of the eleven members of the University Council in the 2011/2012 academic years only two were women. The university had over 6 women qualified with PhDs and over 5 years’ experience in university management. The ten member university council had only two women and out of the seven heads of
faculties (deans) only one was a woman. In this particular university all the five directors were men including the four campus directors and the ICT director, CHE (2011). In yet another university on the other hand, out of the sixteen (16) senior management positions only two (2) were held by women, this is 12.5% CHE (2011). In a second public university out of the sixty one (61) heads of departments only seventeen (17) are women, this is 27.8 %. This clearly shows that women career mobility is far below that of their male counter parts. In this university, over 15 women were qualified academically with PhDs and the required years of university management which meant that they were qualified for promotion. Academic qualification was therefore not an hindrance to women career mobility. This study was necessary to find out what affects women career mobility in public and private universities in Kenya.

The reports by CHE (2011/12) and the study by Majanja & Kiplagat (2003) revealed that women career mobility in universities in Kenya was not at the same footing with that of their male counterparts. It was necessary to find out what causes such a disparity.

The constitution of Kenya 2010 made a major step towards ensuring gender equity in all areas and in major making organs. Section 27, Chapter 3 of the Kenyan Constitution states that women and men have the right to equal treatment, including the right to equal opportunities in political, economic, cultural and social spheres. This was an important step because historically in Kenya, women have over the years been under represented in decision making on issues of governance and management. Women representation in all decision making organs is a fundamental issue in
advancing gender equality. This study was necessary in accessing if the public and private universities in Kenya implemented the policies on gender as stipulated in the constitution of Kenya. Women representation in all decision making organs is a fundamental issue in advancing gender equality. This study was necessary in accessing if the public universities in comparison to the private universities implemented the gender equity policies, including gender equity in employment and promotion as stipulated in the constitution of Kenya. The constitution made a provision for two thirds gender balance. Article 27 section 3 states that women and men have the right to equal treatment including the right to equal opportunities in political, economic, cultural and social spheres. This study sought to investigate the implementation of the gender equity principle as enshrined in the constitution by the public universities in comparison to the private universities.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Women have lagged behind as far as equity in all spheres of life is concerned and their participation in education management relative to men decreases at successive higher levels. In Kenya women are grossly under-represented in management positions where major decisions are made and it remains one of the countries where women have made little progress in their career mobility to management positions. This is particularly true in public and private universities in Kenya. Statistics indicate that only 18% of women are in positions of senior lecturers and above and only 0.6% are DVCs and above. Available research indicates that promotion in public and private universities is tilted in favour of men.
Kenya is a highly patriarchal society therefore the status of women remains relatively low compared to that of men. Women still remain marginalized and gender inequality prevails socially, academically, economically and professionally. Women play a key role in society therefore they need to be in the forefront when it comes to university management. For instance, the female university students look at them as role models, therefore, if they are lacking in management positions, the young girls will not aspire to occupy such positions or to pursue further education because they will have no one to inspire them.

Most of the decisions are made by those people in management positions, if women do not occupy these positions, all decisions will be made from men’s point of view which may disadvantage women and work against enhancement of gender equity. With the knowledge of gender inequity in university management, the study sought to look at the interventions put in place by public universities in comparison to the private universities in Kenya to enhance women career mobility in educational management.

1.3. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the factors affecting women career mobility in educational management in public universities in comparison to the private universities in Kenya.

1.4. Objectives of the Study

The study was guided by the following objectives, to:
i. Establish the management positions occupied by men and women in public universities in comparison to the private universities in Kenya.

ii. Analyse from a gender perspective, the university policies on recruitment and promotion and their effect on women career mobility in public universities compared to the private universities in Kenya.

iii. Establish the challenges hindering women career mobility in public universities compared to the private universities in Kenya.

iv. Examine the interventions put in place to enhance women career mobility in public universities in comparison to the private universities in Kenya.

1.5. Research Questions

The study was guided by the following research questions:

i. What are the management positions occupied by men and women in public universities compared to the private universities in Kenya in the years 2007-2011?

ii. What are the policies that guided the recruitment and promotion of university managers in public universities in comparison to the private universities in Kenya?

iii. How do the policies governing recruitment and promotion of university managers affect women career mobility in public universities compared to the private universities in Kenya?

iv. What are the challenges hindering women career mobility in public universities in comparison to the private universities in Kenya?
v. What interventions have been put in place to address the challenges hindering women career mobility in public universities compared to the private universities in Kenya?

1.6. Significance of the Study

The findings of this study if adopted would be useful in shaping the career mobility of women in university management in Kenya. The study would provide insight to educational planners on the factors leading to gender disparities in university management in public universities compared to private universities in Kenya.

Women bring with them additional value in management. By virtue of their experience as women has made them look at management differently from men for instance when dealing with conflict resolution. They bring in additional elements that would otherwise be left out leading to improvements in workplace relations. Hence the significance of this study on women as it is likely to bring in a new dimension of looking at women and their role in management. The recommendations of this study if adopted would provide more insight on the importance of having more women in management.

This study would seek to fill the knowledge gap on the factors that have led to continued underrepresentation of women in the university management and how to overcome them. The study will provide insight to women in university management on the challenges they are likely to encounter in positions of management in public and private universities in Kenya and suggest ways of overcoming these challenges. The results of the study would assist the university management in providing policy guidelines to ensure gender responsive management and administration of
universities. It will therefore guide policy implementation in public and private universities.

The findings of the study would be useful to the Commission for University Education (CUE). It would help in formulation of policy guidelines in regards to university education management. It would provide insight into the gender gaps in university management hence providing a guideline to formulation and implementation of policies to bridge the gap.

The recommendations of the study if adopted, would guide the Commission for University Education in providing support and frameworks to ensure the implementation of university polices on recruitment and promotion. This would address the issue of gender inequity in university management.

The study would assist the Ministry of Education and other education stakeholders and policy formulators in the provision of policy direction and guidelines that ensure gender equity and equality in the education sector. The findings and recommendations of this study would at the same time assist the Ministry of Education to institute gender-responsive management and governance structures in the education sector, including university councils, board of governors for colleges and secondary schools.

1.7. Scope of the Study

This study assessed factors perceived to affect women career mobility in educational management in public and private universities in Kenya. The study covered the period between 2006 and 2012. This was the time when gender mainstreaming was supposed
to be implemented without fail and Sessional Paper 2 of 2006 gave the rationale for
gender mainstreaming in institutions. The Kenya National Policy on Gender and
Development (NPGD), 2000 provided a framework for mainstreaming gender in all
policies, planning and programming in Kenya and put in place mechanisms to ensure
effective implementation.

The study focussed on public and private universities in Kenya. The study was
conducted in seven public and private chartered universities in five counties in Kenya.
The private chartered universities selected were those that had been in existence for
the last ten years. This is because they were assumed to have put in place relevant
policies that enhance gender equity in management. The study focussed on four
public universities and three private universities in Kenya. The study focused on men
and women in management positions. Men and Women in management positions
were those that occupied the posts of heads of departments, the registrars, deans of
faculties/ Schools, DVCs and VCs.

1.8. Limitations of the study

Limitations of the study included:

i. A small sample of 300 men and women was considered for this study.

ii. The study largely focussed on perceptions and not realities.

iii. The problem of obtaining information on women career mobility at the
universities because many universities were unwilling to disclose the details of
gender statistics due to constitutional requirement of not having less than $1/3$
of either gender in all appointments especially for those that had not met the
requirement.
iv. Information on recruitment and promotion is edited and usually considered confidential by many institutions and hence it took so long to get the necessary information for the study.

v. Most VCs were not available for interviews and a lot of follow up had to be done making the research take much more time than anticipated.

vi. One of the research instruments was a document analysis guide and the researcher had to analyse the policy documents on recruitment and promotion. Some universities were unwilling to release the policy documents and the researcher had in some instances to plead for information from the university management.

1.9. Assumptions of the study

The study assumed that:

i. Men and women were not equally represented in management positions in public and private universities in Kenya.

ii. All private and public universities in Kenya had policies that guided the recruitment and promotion of university managers.

iii. All private and public universities in Kenya implemented policies on appointment and promotion of university managers.

iv. All women faced challenges that affected their career mobility in public and private universities in Kenya.

v. Public and private universities had put in place interventions that enhanced women career mobility.
1.10 Theoretical Framework

Gender and feminist theories explain the development of gender and the underlying impact of the environment of nurture on the difference between males and females in the society. The research was guided by Chodorow’s theory of gender development of 1989.

1.10.1 Chodorow’s Theory of Gender Development

Nancy Chodorow (1999) developed her theory of gender development from Freud’s perspectives on gender identity. She argues that learning derives from the infant’s attachment to its parents from an early age. She places much more emphasis than Freud does on the importance of the mother rather than the father. A child tends to become emotionally involved with the mother, since she is easily the most dominant influence in early life. This attachment has to be broken at some point in order to achieve a separate sense of self. This implies that the child is required to become less closely dependent.

According to Chodorow (1999), the breaking process occurs in a different way for boys and girls. Girls remain closer to the mother, they are able to go on hugging and kissing her and imitating what she does. Because there is no sharp break from the mother, the girl and later the adult woman develops a sense of self that is more continuous with other people. Her identity is more likely to be merged with or dependent on another; first her mother, and later her husband. In Chodorow’s (1989) view, this tends to produce characteristics of sensitivity and emotional compassion in women. This aspect of women tends to bring out a unique characteristic of
management in them, an aspect that makes them look at management differently. By virtue of their gender they are able to empathize. They deal with the staff under them with sensitivity and compassion hence promoting understanding and unity in their institutions. This explains the value of incorporating women in management. Their experience as women brings another perspective in management. For instance due to their obsession with details makes them insist that things must be done in a particular way and ensures that what they set out to achieve is accomplished.

In the current study, women’s emotional reactions to family and societal attitudes are validated by the arguments of Nancy Chodorow on the development of femininity. According to the theory, She elucidates how the unconscious awareness of self and gender developed from earliest infancy continues to shape both the experience of men and women and the patterns of inequality and differences that exist throughout the society and culture. Some of these inequalities are grounded on cultural stereotypes that tend to work against women. They are treated differently and sometimes denied opportunities on the basis of their gender. This poses as a major problem to women later in life when they are treated differently from men. She posits that if women are seen by society and view themselves primarily as mothers, then any liberation of women will continue to be experienced as traumatic by society. The patterns of inequality in the society and culture later affect women career mobility. The inequalities later become a barrier to women career mobility even in university management.

The current study rides on Chodorow’s theory (1999) to address such issues as achievement of career success for women, viz aviz the active unconscious “interference” of men with the efforts of women to further their course through such
actions as discrimination of women, traditional patriarchal ideas that relegate the woman to the kitchen and other manipulations by a male-dominated society. According to Chodorow (1999), the concepts expounded in the theory on development of masculinity show the emotional dynamics that give rise to the tendencies in men to manipulate women in all societies. It is on this background that this study sought to establish the factors that affect women career mobility in public universities in comparison to private universities in Kenya. This was drawn from the premise that, over the years most women have lagged behind in their career mobility in university management.

1.10.2 Liberal Feminism Theory

Liberal Feminist theory focuses on women’s ability to show and maintain their equality through their own actions and choices. Liberal feminists argue that society holds the false belief that women are, by nature, less intellectually capable than men; thus it tends to discriminate against women in the academy, the forum, and the market place. Liberal feminist believe that “female subordination is rooted in a set of customary and legal constraints that block women’s entrance to and success in the so-called public world”, and they work hard to emphasize the equality of men and women through political and legal reform, Tong, (1989).

Liberal feminists focuses on how to increase women’s power and influence by working within the current polices and structures, and hoping to promote change from within. The focus of the discussion in this study on women career mobility in university management has an underlying assumption that reforming and changing the practices within the existing structures and policies of the universities will eventually
result in a greater equity in gender representation at the top of university management in public and private universities in Kenya.

The liberal feminism approach focuses on issues such as sex segregation in the work force, percentage of women found in different levels of the organization, barriers to job entry and other issues of equal opportunity. In this approach, the underlying assumption is that power relationships between the genders within the universities can be made more equitable through processes of reform.

1.10.3 The feminist perspective

The feminist perspective attempts to explain the societal differences between men and women. The gender inequality theories recognize that women’s location in, and experience of, social situations are not only different but also unequal to men’s. Feminist argue that women have the same capacity as men for moral reasoning and agency, but that patriarchy, has historically denied women the opportunity to express and practice this reasoning. Women have been isolated to the private sphere of the household and thus, left without a voice in the public sphere. Even after women enter the public sphere, they are still expected to manage the private sphere and take care of household duties and child rearing.

The feminist perspective have a bearing on this study on the basis that the study sought to establish the number of women in management positions and whether they were promoted at the same rate with their women colleagues in the public universities in comparison to the public universities. The study also sought to establish the factors affecting women career mobility in public universities compared
to the private universities in Kenya. The feminist perspective guided the study in establishing the management positions of men and women in public and private universities in Kenya.

The feminist perspective had broad applications in the current study. First, the Kenyan society is a capitalist one that for a long time has clearly defined “male” and “female” spheres resulting into well-defined power relationships that make women easily exploited by men and their position relegated to the bottom of the ladder in education management. Out of the seven public universities for instance there were only two women vice chancellors despite having so many women with very high qualifications and most of them having applied for the said positions, UNESCO (2005).

Secondly, the Kenyan society is patriarchal meaning that women subjugation is clearly sanctioned by cultural norms. Male-dominated societies have always viewed women as unequal and relegated women to secondary career positions of teaching, nursing and care givers. This is still being reflected in the management of public and private universities in Kenya by assigning women more and more to routine and mundane jobs that hardly carry decision-making authority such as dean of students and welfare of others, UNESCO (2005). The current study hopes to establish the validity of whether these arguments in the feminist theories point at the resilient African woman that is able to succeed in the midst of seemingly insurmountable odds to get to the pinnacle of some notable institutions of higher learning, which are public and private universities in Kenya.
1.11 Conceptual Framework

In Kenya, the emergence of women in top management positions especially in institutions of higher learning such as public and private universities is a recent phenomenon. Men have for a long time occupied senior management positions compared to women. To bridge the gap between the positions of management by men and women in universities in Kenya it requires concerted efforts between the policy makers, the universities and women themselves. The Kenyan women’s promotion to higher ranks involves tremendous efforts on the part of the women who have many factors such as cultural stereotypes, lack of clear policies, gender based socialization and political interference which continuously work against their career mobility. Therefore, a comparison of public and private universities revealed that most public and private universities in Kenya are headed by men. The very few that were headed by women have registered tremendous growth both quantitatively and qualitatively in the arena of educational advancement. The researcher conceptualized that the Kenyan woman has to work hard to compete with her male counterpart for the management positions in public and private universities in Kenya. This would be possible through support systems like the implementation of policies on recruitment and promotion; women getting the right qualifications and networking to enable them overcome the challenges hindering their career mobility. The public and private universities on the other hand needed to put in place interventions to enhance women career mobility in Kenya. This would enable the woman to compete on the same footing with her male counterparts in public and private universities in Kenya. The keywords are management positions, policies on recruitment and promotion, challenges to career mobility and interventions to the challenges. The woman may still need to deal with
other factors like personal factors like family responsibilities, institutional factors such as university policies and societal factors such as cultural stereotypes and role socialization in order to cope with all the other emerging issues that will heavily gravitate against her career mobility.

Figure 1.1 shows the conceptual framework of women career mobility in public universities compared to private universities in Kenya.

**Figure 1.1 Conceptual Framework of women career mobility in public universities compared to private universities in Kenya**

*Source: Researcher*
1.12 Operational Definition of Terms

**Affirmative Action:** A policy or programme of taking steps to increase the representation of women seeking to redress discrimination or bias through active measures in education and employment.

**Basic Education:** Refers to primary and secondary education for the girl child in Kenya.

**Career Development:** Refers to lifelong series of activities that contribute to women’s career exploration, establishment, success and fulfilment.

**Career Management:** Is the process for enabling women to better understand and develop their career skills and interests and to use them more effectively.

**Career Mobility:** Is the addition of more value to a woman’s career through promotion to a higher level. It comes with the acquisition of more training for women working in institutions of higher learning.

**Career Planning:** Is the process whereby women carefully and deliberately become aware of their personal skills, interests, knowledge and motivation and establishes action plans to attain specific goals.

**Educational Management:** Is the process where women and educational managers design and develop educational objectives to achieve predetermined educational goals.
**Engender**
The process of ensuring that planning and programming is appropriate for and takes into account the female and male differences and concerns.

**Empowerment:**
The process through which women acquire knowledge and skills, and develop attitudes to critically analyse their situations and take appropriate action to improve their status or that of the marginalized groups in society.

**Gender:**
This refers to the socially determined power relations, roles, responsibilities and entitlements for men and women in management.

**Gender Discrimination:**
Refers to unequal or preferential treatment to individuals or groups of women that result into reduced access to or control of resources and promotion opportunities.

**Gender Equality:**
Refers to the equal treatment of women and men, so that they can enjoy the benefits of development including equal access promotion opportunities and resources.

**Gender equity:**
Refers to the practice of fairness and justice in the distribution of benefits, access to and control of resources, promotion opportunities, responsibilities, power, opportunities and services for both men and women. It is essentially the elimination of all forms of discrimination based on gender.
**Gender mainstreaming:** is the consistent integration of gender concerns into the design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of policies, plans, programmes, activities and projects at all levels of the university management.

**Gender parity:** This is a numerical concept referring to equal number of men and women relative to their respective numbers in the university management.

**Gender stereotyping:** The assigning of roles, tasks and responsibilities to a particular sex policy on the basis of pre-conceived prejudices in university management.

**Patriarchy:** It means ‘Rule of father’ and refers to the current male dominated social relations, ownership and control of power at many levels in society including the university management. It is thought to be the root cause of the existing system of gender discrimination.

**Power relations:** Refers to capacity of individual or group to initiate action and determine outcomes which change existing social, political and economic systems and norms, to equalize men and women in management.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

This chapter presents a review of work that has been done in Kenya and other parts of the world on women career mobility in university management in public universities in comparison to private universities. The literature review was organized according to the objectives of the study.

It highlights the factors that affected women career mobility in public universities compared to private universities globally, regionally and nationally and the interventions meant to enhance gender equity.

The researcher posits that higher education makes a vital contribution to sustainable development through the generation and dissemination of knowledge. The effective management of this domain merits top priority at a time when universities worldwide face critical challenges due to the unprecedented expansion yet there are drastically reduced resources of university education. The numerous complex issues facing society moreover demand that social investment in institutions of higher education is fully justified in terms of its return to the community.

The under-representation of women in higher education management is well documented and serves to demonstrate that the pool of managerial talent within the country is not optimally utilized. Current policies and practices of recruitment and promotion required investigation to shed some light on the factors that affect to
women career mobility and to identify interventions to enhance gender equity based on professional qualification. Strategies put in place by women to enhance their career mobility also needed to be investigated. The literature was reviewed under the following thematic concerns:

i. Women career mobility

ii. Establishment of men and women in management positions in public universities in comparison to the private universities in Kenya.

iii. Policies on recruitment and promotion in public universities in comparison to the private universities in Kenya.

iv. Challenges facing women in management in public universities compared to private universities in Kenya.

v. The strategies used to enhance women career mobility by public universities in comparison to the private universities in Kenya.

2.2 Women career mobility

Gattiker and Larwood (2008) suggest that the frequency of promotion within an organization is a valuable indicator of career success and mobility, since it is important for an individual’s climb up the corporate hierarchy. Organizational career mobility is a vertical job shifting following an increase in salary, source of betterment, and stage in life.

A study carried out by UNESCO (2002) observed that in spite of advances made by women in various areas of public life women are far from participating on the same footing as men (www.unesco.org). There was need to establish if the scenario is any different in the management of public universities in comparison to the private
universities in Kenya. Eagly & Carli (2007) observed that women's career mobility into executive-level positions continues to lag behind that of their male counterparts in both the private and public sectors.

According to a report by UNESCO (1997) Commonwealth on women in higher education management, the global picture is one of men outnumbering women about five to one at middle management and about twenty to one at senior management level. Women deans and professors are a minority group and women vice-chancellors and presidents are rare.

Research in the USA has shown that regardless of their functional and industry distributions, a general trend is affecting US women managers who are said to be plateauing at mid-level management positions. The numbers indicate that, while women have entered the workforce and managerial level jobs, they are encountering barriers to advancement to those positions which would allow them to define organizational strategy and policy.

Powell (2003) noted that women are gaining the necessary education and experience and are committed to their careers, but they still encounter a “glass ceiling.” Flanders (1994) in his study ‘Breakthrough: The career Woman’s Guide to Shattering the glass Ceiling, observed that when promotion opportunities arise and an employer is given the choice between a man and a woman with equal qualifications, the woman, he posits, is frequently viewed as the greater risk and therefore the man stands a better chance of getting promoted.
A research conducted by Lund (1998) on female staff members in universities in commonwealth countries found that women are still seriously underrepresented among full-time staff in both academic and administrative hierarchies of commonwealth universities. The study revealed that the number of women vice-chancellors or deputy vice-chancellors was negligible.

Dines (2004) in her study on women in higher education management and factors hindering their participating in higher education, a research carried out in different countries (West Africa, Arab States, India, Malaysia, Indonesia, the South Pacific, Peru, The united States of America, The Caribbean, Finland and France) notes that there is continuing under-representation of women in higher education management. She notes that women still have a long way to go from participating on the same footing as men in the area of higher education management. She observes that country after country women hold less than 50% of academic and administrative posts in higher education institutions. Representation varies between about 10% and 20% at middle management level and 0% to 10% at senior management level.

The global picture is one of men outnumbering women in the ratio of five to one at middle management level. At the higher level women deans and professors are a minority group and women vice-chancellors and presidents are still very low. There is need to investigate the root cause of the disparity.

A study by Ilo (2010) on women’s access to senior management positions in the university of Abuja noted that numerically, women trail behind men in senior positions in the university of Abuja.
A study carried out in Kenya by Onsongo (2002) in three public and three private universities in Kenya on the factors affecting women’s participation in university management revealed that none of the women were involved in key decision-making activities in the universities, for example, in policy making, monitoring and evaluation and budgeting.

Onsongo’s study pointed out that highly qualified women are left out of senior management. This study seeks to investigate the factors that contribute to women being left out of management positions. Most women instead shouldered heavy responsibilities in the support services like student discipline, teaching, guidance and counselling, roles which have been traditionally associated with women. This study seeks to compare the career mobility of women seeks to analyse the strategies put in place by the public universities in comparison to private universities in their efforts to enhance women career mobility.

The reviewed literature painted a grim picture of women career mobility globally, regionally and locally in Kenya. A study was necessary to ascertain the career mobility of women in public universities in comparison to those in private universities in Kenya. It was necessary to establish the status of women career mobility in public universities compared to the private universities in Kenya and the challenges to their
2.3 Establishment of Men and Women in Management Positions in Public universities in comparison to private universities in Kenya

Governance and management of education are equally male-dominated. Most heads of institutions especially of higher learning institutions are males. In the seven public universities, there were only two female chancellors recruited recently by Kenyatta University and Jomo Kenyatta University of science and technology respectively. Chacha (2004) noted that the participation of women in university management is very low and that women are under-represented in university management and gender disparities exist at all levels. He further observed that women academics are concentrated in the lower ranks of hierarchy and in the traditional ‘female’ social science and education disciplines while as administrators they are few and far between in the higher ranks of university management.

A Study by UNESCO (2007) noted that women form slightly over half of Kenya’s human resource base. The representation of women in management position in Kenya has been very low in all sectors of employment regardless of the fact that they constitute a large proportion of the total population, for example very few women are vice chancellors (VCs), deputy vice chancellors (DVCs) and deans of Faculties in universities.

A study carried out by Majanja & Kiplagat (2003) on the current status and occupational characteristics of women librarians in Kenya found that majority of women librarians in Kenya had adequate qualifications but held lower positions compared to their male counterparts.
Low representation of women at the university level implied that their ideas, input in policy and decision-making was minimal and therefore their interests were not taken care of as most decisions were made from the men’s point of view. This impacted negatively on the prospects of women career mobility in university management.

A report on elimination of discrimination against women by CEDAW (2004) observed that at various times throughout history, working women especially those in managerial positions were viewed as immoral and unfeminine objects of pity. Women were accused of being negligent mothers. This in turn seemed to influence the way of thinking for the working women.

Wanjama, (2002) in her study on the factors influencing gender mobility in the ministry of education in Kenya confirmed this information. Wanjama (2002) noted that young unmarried women refused responsibility for fear of not getting a husband. Wanjama’s study revealed that the higher a woman progressed the greater the chances of not getting a husband.

A report by Commission for Higher Education (CHE, 2010) indicated that out of the seven public universities in Kenya only two were headed by women as vice-chancellors these being the senior most position at the university.

The CHE (2010) report further revealed that very few women occupied the position of registrars and deputy vice-chancellors (DVCs). Women occupy lower managerial positions as deans of students, CHE (2010). The situation is not any different in private universities in Kenya. In one private university headed by a man out of the
eleven members of the university council in the 2010/2011 academic years only two are women. The ten member university council has only two women and out of the seven heads of faculties (deans) only one is a woman. In this particular university all the five directors are men including the four campus directors and quality assurance director, CHE (2011). In another private university on the other hand, out of the sixteen (16) senior management positions only two (2) were held by women, this was 12.5% CHE (2011). In one public university out of the sixty one (61) heads of departments only seventeen (17) were women, this is 27.8 %. There was need to establish what factors hindered women career mobility in public universities in comparison to the private universities in Kenya. The literature reviewed revealed that public universities had more women in management positions compared to the private universities in Kenya. This study explored how university policies affect the recruitment of men and women in public universities, viz a viz the private universities in Kenya. The study revealed that women had a career development plan but had quite a number of challenges that hindered their career progress.

Available information revealed a major gap in literature on women career mobility in educational management in Kenya. This situation was worse in private universities in Kenya. This study has identified this gap and therefore seeks to fill the gap by evaluating the factors affecting women career mobility in public universities in comparison to the private universities in Kenya. The study evaluated the interventions put in place by public universities in comparison to the private universities in enhancing women career mobility.
The university policies on recruitment and promotion were also examined to establish if they had been implemented during recruitment and promotion to give women an opportunity to participate on the same footing with men in the management of public universities compared to private universities in Kenya.

2.4 Policies on recruitment and promotion in public universities in comparison to private universities in Kenya

Policies should provide guidelines to decision making in institutions and recruitment and promotion should be guided by policy to ensure that every one stood at an equal chance of being promoted irrespective of gender. Research has shown that despite the gender consideration on paper, there is little effort to mainstream gender in university management. A study conducted by National Council for Science and Technology (2010) on Mainstreaming Gender in Science and Technology Policies and Programmes in Kenya noted that university management is male dominated and the female representation in top management and the Faculty was minimal. However, the study further revealed that more public universities compared to private universities implemented gender mainstreaming in recruitment and promotion.

The study revealed that there was little commitment by university management to mainstream gender. The study pointed that one public university headed by a man, did not have an operational gender policy neither were gender considerations taken into its plans yet it launched its gender policy in 2008, the reason given by the university was that they cascade their strategic plans and policies from the overall university strategic plan, which lacks gender considerations. The study further observed that there were no budgetary allocations for gender mainstreaming. This implied that
efforts to enhance gender equity were likely not to bear fruits due to financial constraints. The report indicated that the scenario was the same in both public and private universities in Kenya. The study recommended an investigation into the university policies on recruitment and promotion which this study seeks to address. Studies have pointed at lack of clear guidelines on recruitment and promotion as some of the challenges facing women in university management in Kenya. Onsongo (2002) in her study on factors affecting women’s participation in university management in Kenya, observed that women faced discriminatory recruitment, appointment and promotion procedures, political appointments, unclear promotion criteria and absence of documented staff development policies for senior managers. All these factors have continually hindered women career mobility. It was necessary to establish if the universities had put in place clear policies on recruitment and promotion to enhance women career mobility in university management.

Wanjama (2002) in her study on factors influencing gender mobility in the Ministry of Education in Kenya observed that criteria for promotions clearly articulated in the policy documents are rarely followed. Universities as the institutions of higher learner play a key role in policy development and implementation. There was need to establish the situation in the management of public universities in comparison to the private universities in Kenya.

2.4.1 The Kenya National Policy on Gender and Development

The Kenya National Policy on Gender and Development (NPGD), 2000 spelt out a policy approach of Gender mainstreaming and empowerment of women and clearly stated that it was the right of women, men, girls and boys to participate in and benefit
equally from the development process. The NPGD provided a framework for mainstreaming gender in all policies, planning and programming in Kenya and puts in place institutional mechanisms to ensure effective implementation.

The need for a national policy arose from the government’s realization that without a coherent and comprehensive overall framework for guiding gender mainstreaming within the different sectors and line ministries involved in development, enormous resources may continue to be misplaced. The context of this gender policy was informed by the fact that despite women forming 50.3% of the population and accounting for a large voting population in Kenya, glaring gender gaps continued to confront them in terms of representation in decision making positions, in accessing and controlling resources and socioeconomic opportunities, NPGD (2000).

The concept of bringing gender issues into the mainstream of society was clearly established as a global strategy for promoting gender equality in the Beijing Platform for Action (BPFA). The BPFA highlighted the necessity to ensure that gender equality was a primary goal in all areas of social and economic development. Gender equality is therefore an agenda for development effectiveness. As new evidence demonstrates, when women and men are equal, economies tend to grow faster, the poor move quickly out of poverty, and the well-being of men, women, and children is enhanced, NPGD (2000).

The National Policy on Gender and Development provided a basis for the Government to underscore its commitment to advancing the status of women. The Government of Kenya was determined to address any existing imbalances through
policy formulation and implementation taking into account different needs and skills of men and women. The policy advocated for interventions to enhance gender equity in all spheres including management, an aspect which this study sought to address though establishing the factors that affected women career mobility in university management in Kenya.

2.5 Challenges hindering women career mobility in public universities in comparison to private universities in Kenya

Research indicates that men tend to be promoted faster than women, even in organizations in which women dominate numerically and in which men are relative newcomers, Corby S (1995) Rusaw A. (1994) also found that the U.S. federal government promoted women more slowly and less often than male counterparts.

Reasons for these differences are varied.

Thomas P. (1994) explains men’s greater success in achieving promotion is part to their greater use of informal networks as opposed to women’s greater reliance on formal promotion processes alone. The operation of promotion policies in many organizations is an area which often has an unclear set of criteria attached. This allows for subjectivity rather than objectivity to enter the process with senior management allowed considerable scope for discretion, Coughlan A. (2002).

2.5.1 Gender stereotypes

Research findings suggest gender bias against female managers impact negatively on career advancement of women managers (Lyness & Heinman, 2006). Flanders (1994) observed that employers often believe that women were less committed to work and
less able to undertake a full time career than men, due to their biological make up, rather than ability. When promotion opportunities arise and an employer is given the choice between a man and a woman with equal qualifications, the woman he posits, is frequently viewed as the greater risk. Working in male dominated hierarchies is seen to reduce women’s advancement levels as male managerial hierarchies are more likely to promote men for managerial positions, as men feel more comfortable with other men than they do with women. Therenou (1995). This study sought to investigate the effect of gender stereotypes on women career mobility in public universities in comparison to private universities in Kenya.

2.5.2 Mentoring and networking

Mentoring and networking relationships are also potentially valuable for women’s advancement in view of boosting emotional support and confidence and careers satisfaction, Resign et al (1998). A study carried out by Cross (2010) revealed a clear realization among the female managers that their male counterparts were overtly engaging in networking activities which gave them increased levels of visibility among the senior management team. However, women in male dominated organizations often have limited networking and mentoring opportunities. Studies have shown that a significantly high proportion of women who have proved themselves successfully in career terms have received encouragement from their mentors, Arnold & Mackenzie (1994).

Although mentoring relationship is crucial to women in management in organizations, women are significantly less likely than men to develop these relationships Nieva & Gutek (1981). While researchers have demonstrated the importance of the mentor to
the women managers they are often faced with organizational barriers which restrict the development of mentor relationships. Female managers may also have fewer formal and informal opportunities to obtain mentors than their male counterparts. The other issue is how people will interpret the relationship between the female manager and her male mentor. The study seeks to assess these issues and how they affect women career mobility in universities in Kenya.

2.5.3 Organizational Structure

Research indicates that women in management positions in a variety of professions continue to face a number of barriers within the organization that affect career progression. A number of studies have identified a number of barriers working within the society and the organizations that have led to under representation of women at the senior level of management, Wood (2008).

The organizational climate which refers to the prevailing corporate perceptions of women’s professional capabilities and commitment affect their careers. It also includes attitude towards women that could result in unsupportive and discouraging work environment. Negative attitude permeate the workplace, questioning women’s professional capabilities, inviting them in turn to work harder to prove their credibility and commitment as part of the ‘invisible woman syndrome, Resign & Cotton (1998). Rosenbaum (2001) contends that career progress does not depend purely on individuals investing in their human capital (education and training) to improve their capabilities and future careers but also on organizational practices which are used to infer ability and allocate jobs and training. In this context, the fact that managers often do not possess full information about employees means that they supplement their
information by using structural indicators of abilities or “signals”. These signals include past education and job attainments (in terms of perceived status of jobs and departments) and evaluation of career velocity. Candidates who are judged most successful under these criteria “win” this stage of the tournament and consequently have more investment made in them by the organization in terms of training and development, which increases their likelihood to score highly on indicators of ability in the next round.

Often, promotion criteria are focused on a preconceived notion of who should perform the role rather than the qualifications required. A study conducted in Irish by Cross & Linehan (2006) revealed that promotional policies have a significant negative impact on the advancement of women to the senior management positions. Organizational culture can also present constraints to advancement of women to high level leadership and managerial positions where job advertisement for managerial positions require many years of continuous experience, Resign et al (1994). This study sought to address these issues by evaluating whether women in university management in Kenya are making necessary progression in their careers and whether those in public universities were progressing at the same level with their counterparts in the private universities.

2.5.4 Social cultural beliefs

Discrimination against women is still widely embodied in both law and custom. Customs that ignore or belittle women’s opinion are common in many developing countries (Wood, 2008). In some countries, it violates social norms for a woman to work outside home (Majanja, 2003). Women who work outside the home are usually
overburdened by having to add livelihood responsibility to domestic responsibilities thus women career advancement prospects are less than those of men.

Thomas and Pullen (2000) argued that research into organisation and management is almost exclusively from a gender-neutral position but point out that criticisms of this lack of gender awareness are not new. The model of the successful manager has traditionally been masculine and, while these stereotypes remain, they succeed in perpetuating the dominant place for men in management. This domination of management as being male paradigm is evident in both the theory underpinning and the actual experience of career in management.

Powell (2003) noted that women are gaining the necessary education and experience and are committed to their careers, but they still encounter a “glass ceiling.” By studying and understanding the career development and aspirations, as well as the barriers that exist for women in middle management positions, one can learn how to facilitate the development and achievement of women with regard to higher level management positions issues that this study seek to address by establishing the barriers to women career mobility.

2.5.5 Family responsibilities

Women encounter domestic and family responsibilities which interfere with their career (Mackelly & Dabul, 1998). A research carried out by Cross (2010), revealed that child bearing remains a barrier to women career progression. A research carried out in Malaysia by Ismail and Ibrahim (2008), revealed that Working whilst having family responsibilities was the most significant barrier by career women. Women
were having a hard time managing work assignment. Moreover, women struggled with gaining credibility and respectability from supervisors and managers. It was also found that the most pressing reason for women to resign was family responsibility. Chodorow (1989) in her feminism and psychoanalytic theory posits that if women are seen by society and view themselves primarily as mothers, then any liberation of women will continue to be experienced as traumatic by society. This study therefore sought to investigate the application of the tenets of this theory and their effects in women career mobility in university management.

2.6 Interventions to enhance women career mobility in university management

For women to compete on the same footing with men there must be a level playing field. This could only be achieved through gender equity. Lorber (1994) defines gender equality as meaning that women and men of all races would have the same opportunities to obtain professional credentials and occupational training, and would be distributed in the same proportions as they are in the paid work force across workplaces, job titles, occupations, and hierarchical positions.

Davis & Lubelska (2001) noted that despite equal opportunities policies, most women continue to feel disadvantaged and oppressed in relation to their prospects, representation and needs within higher education. Institutions and governments have come up with strategies to enhance women career mobility.
2.6.1 Affirmative Action

Affirmative action requires the employer to make efforts to recruit, hire and promote qualified members of groups formerly excluded. It aims at boosting efforts to uplift women in all spheres of development. It focuses on gender as distinctive category in the overall criteria.

Anderson (2002) observed that the employer must also ensure that the practices of those responsible in matters of employment, including all supervisors, are non-discriminatory. Affirmative action requires the employer to make additional efforts to recruit, hire, and promote qualified members of groups formerly excluded, even if that exclusion cannot be traced to particular discriminatory actions on the part of the employer.

Luke (2001) further observed that despite years of affirmative action and passing of statutes outlawing discrimination, the rate at which women have ascended academic career ladders in these countries is maddeningly slow. The study further observed that women in the United Kingdom constitute 7-8% of the professoriate, in Ireland just over 5%, in the United States 16% of those with full professorial status and in Finland 18%. Luke (2001) thus refers to universities as hotbed of both vertical and horizontal sex segregation. This study seeks to investigate the impact of affirmative action on women career mobility in public universities via aviz the private universities in Kenya.

United Nations economic Commission for Africa (2000) observed that another dimension for the issue of affirmative action that is equally distressing for not only
women but the entire society is that women end up not working hard. They sit back and wait for their communities and places of work to push them up the leadership ladder on the basis of affirmative action. They do not seek further training in terms of knowledge and skills. In the event that affirmative action is not done, the women are not able to rise to any higher level. They get stuck in one career thus, jeopardising their career development.

League of Kenya Women Voters, LCWV (2006), observed that affirmative action, though applied in most areas in our society is not the best for creating chances and opportunities for our women. This is because it brings out the idea that women need to only sit and wait for the society to give them handouts and tokens. When this happens and women happen to land in positions of senior management, it becomes obvious that they will lack the confidence of someone who has worked hard for the office. So they will tread with too much caution and no bold actions will be witnessed given that they are never sure of their abilities.

This study sought to investigate whether women in management positions in Kenyan universities work hard to earn their promotion and whether they applied for positions when advertised or they just waited to be handed over positions on a silver platter.

2.7 Women career development and progression

Women's career progression into executive-level positions continues to lag behind that of their male counterparts in both the private and public sectors. It has been perceived that the labour market is structurally gendered and women in managerial positions appear to enjoy the leadership role. Although there is no evidence to support
the contention that women are less efficient managerial leaders than men, as there are few differences between men and women in cognitive abilities and skills. Eagly & Carli (2007) perceive that women who hold managerial positions might exercise power somewhat differently from men. These gender differences bring a diverse perspective to the workforce. Career development looks at how individuals manage their careers within and between organizations, and how organizations structure the career progress of their members. It involves the person’s creation of career pattern, decision making style, integration of life roles, value expression and life role self-concepts.

Thomas and Pullen (2000) argue that research into organisation and management is almost exclusively from a gender-neutral position but point out that criticisms of this lack of gender awareness are not new. The model of the successful manager has traditionally been masculine and, while these stereotypes remain, they succeed in perpetuating the dominant place for men in management. This domination of management as being male paradigm is evident in both the theory underpinning and the actual experience of career in management.

2.8 Women career planning

The concept of career planning has been around for some time now, although many would argue that it is very difficult, especially if you happen to be a woman, to apply any kind of planning to a career. The general feeling is that too many other factors intervene and that a career tends to be largely a matter of chance and opportunity. Most people are too afraid of tempting fate to work out anything detailed or ambitious.
Mohammad & Marily (1994) observed that changes in the world of work in the last 20 years or so have changed the meaning of career. A career used to mean a secure employment with one organization for life, but now people whose careers go upwards may have a number of different positions. It is clear that many people speak of a career, when in reality what they have had is a series of jobs. The key is whether what you have done has enhanced your skills and knowledge, or whether you have just been doing the same things in different situations. Enhancement of skills and knowledge can occur not just by progressing upwards. Also, people tend to use the term “career” retrospectively, to look at past achievements, rather than viewing planning as a vehicle for getting where they want to be.

Most people’s careers are not planned. In fact, generally people seem to find themselves in their first employment because of a financial imperative, and it is only when they begin to reach middle employment years (between 35 and 55) what Jones (2007) refers to as “Career menopause” strikes. He observed that once in a job, the process of planning for change is important for positioning yourself to take advantage of future opportunities. Opportunities allowing you to change from a full-time post to a job share, or gaining experience of working in a more stimulating team environment, for example, might present themselves. In both these situations it is likely that others, in addition to yourself, will gain from your career move.
This point also serves to illustrate that career development does not necessarily always mean moving upwards. Jones (2007) notes, career development for any moves should be considered. This could include developing in your current post, moving sideways in the organization, moving upwards to a promoted post or changing to part-time work. All of these constitute career choices for which planning is needed, to ensure that the new position offers positive opportunities for developing new skills.

Studies have indicated that women are under particular pressure as there is a perceived need to be seen as not just equivalent to men, but better. Shaevitz (1995) talked of the superwoman culture that requires a female professional to be not just a wife and mother, or alternatively, to have a career, but to have both and, furthermore, to be successful at both!

Career planning is not just about moving up. All decisions benefit from analysis and project management – ones career is no exception, whether the move be up, sideways or out. There is an element of being in the right place at the right time, but one can cultivate opportunities by strategic thinking. This study seeks to address these issues by establishing whether women in university management in Kenya plan for their career mobility.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter dealt with methodological aspects of the study. It focused on the research design, research location, and target population, sample and sampling techniques used, data collection and data analysis methods.

3.2 Research Design

The study applied a descriptive survey research design. Descriptive survey design was appropriate as it involved collecting data to test questions concerning the current status of subjects of the study which ensured ease in understanding the insight and ideas regarding the research problem under investigations.

The study used quantitative and qualitative research designs. The information gathered was used to analyze the factors affecting women career mobility in university management in public universities in comparison to private universities in Kenya.

Descriptive Survey design is also best suited to gather information on current practices. In this study, Survey design was selected because it entails examining the current status of the factors that affect women career mobility in university management.
3.3 Location of the Study

The study was conducted in seven public and private universities in Kenya. Two public universities headed by women, that is; Kenyatta University, and Jomo Kenyatta University of Science and Technology which are in Nairobi and Kiambu counties respectively. One private university headed by a woman, that is; Africa Nazarene University in Kajiando county. Two public universities headed by men, that is, University of Nairobi in Nairobi county and Egerton University in Nakuru County were included in the study for comparison purposes. Two private universities headed by men that is, Kenya Methodist University in Meru County and Catholic University of Eastern Africa in Nairobi County were selected for the study. This was to ensure as much representation of the universities across the country as much as possible.

3.4 Target Population

The study targeted men and women in public and private universities for comparison purposes. This was to assess if women in management positions in public universities progressed in their careers at the same rate with those in private universities. There were seven public universities, fourteen private chartered universities, seven universities operating with letters of interim authority and one university operating with a letter of registration. The study targeted the public and private chartered universities that have been in existence for the last ten years. These are assumed to have put in place structures and policies that enhance gender equity in university management.

The target population of the study was 1200 men and women in management positions in the public and private universities in Kenya. Out of the 1200 men and women in management, 400 were in the universities selected for this study.
The position of management in this study implied those that were in the position of heads of department, directors, deans of Faculties / Schools, registrars, deputy vice chancellors and vice chancellors of public and private chartered universities in Kenya. This cadre of university managers was important in this study because they are in decision making positions as managers in their respective universities. As decision makers, they were seen as crucial in providing the much needed information on policies on recruitment and promotion. They would also provide information on the interventions put in place by the respective universities to enhance gender equity.

3.5 Sampling Design

The sampling design comprised a combination of stratified random sampling, simple random sampling and purposive sampling techniques.

3.5.1 Sampling of universities

The universities were stratified into private and public universities. Public and private universities were selected for comparison purposes. Four out of the seven public universities were purposively selected for this study to include two public universities headed by men and two headed by women respectively. This was 57% of the population. Purposive sampling was used to select four out of the eleven chartered private universities. This was 36% of the population.

Purposive sampling was to ensure that the selected universities met the selection criteria. All the private universities had to be chartered to be selected. This ensured only the universities that met the Commission for University Education (CUE) requirements and regulations were selected for the study. The four public and private
universities headed by women were purposively selected for this study because there were only two universities headed by women that met the selection criteria in each category and so all of them had to be included in the study.

3.5.2 Sampling of the respondents

The respondents comprised men and women in management positions in public and private chartered universities in Kenya. These were the men and women who held positions of head of department or equivalent and above up to the vice chancellor of either gender in private and public Universities in Kenya. The sample comprised Vice chancellors, deputy vice chancellors (DVCs), registrars, directors, deans of schools / Faculties and heads of departments.

Purposive sampling and stratified sampling were used to select the men and women in management position in public and private universities in Kenya. All the 8 vice chancellors (VC) were purposively selected for this study because there is only one VC in a university. All the 16 DVCs, 24 registrars, 38 deans of Faculties/ Schools and 34 directors of campuses and programmes were purposively selected. Simple random sampling was used to select a proportion of the departments in the universities. A total of 180 Heads of Departments (HODs) were randomly selected. The departments sampled were 10% in each university.

According to the Commission for Higher Education (CHE, 2011) men and women occupying management positions in academic and administration in both private chartered and public universities in Kenya were one thousand two hundred (1200) in number (http://www.highereduc.co.ke). Out of these four hundred are in the selected
universities for this study. Out of these four hundred, three hundred were selected for 
this study, which was equivalent to seventy five percent (75%) of the total population. 
According to Mugenda & Mugenda (2003), the normal sample should be 10%, in this 
case 50% was considered ideal to cater for attrition. The sample size was arrived at 
using the following formula;

\[ n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2} \]

Where n is sample size, N being the population and e being precision level e.g. 95%

For a population of 1200n=1200/ (1+1200(0.05)^2) =300

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Positions</th>
<th>Private Universities</th>
<th>Public Universities</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice chancellors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVCs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrars</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HoDs</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.6 Instrumentation

The instruments used in this study were:

i. Women career mobility in depth interview schedule.

ii. Women career mobility questionnaire for men and women in management.
iii. A document analysis guide.

Documents analyzed included: The Kenya National Policy on Gender and Development (NPGD), 2000, university policy documents on recruitment and promotion, rules and regulations, terms of service of various categories, gender policies, strategic plans and personnel appraisal forms.

3.6.1 Women career mobility in depth interview guide

An interview schedule was used to collect detailed information from the university vice chancellors, deputy vice chancellors, registrars of universities and senior administrators by way of prompting and probing to get all the information on factors affecting women career mobility in public universities in comparison to the private universities. Interviews provided a greater permissible length and also provided the researcher with an opportunity to correct misunderstanding by the clients. Interviews enabled the researcher to clarify issues and expound on the items or change the items in the schedule when need arose. Men and women managers interviewed must have worked for the institution for a minimum of three years because promotion period in Kenya ranges from three years to five years depending on the organisation and position one was aspiring for. For the purpose of this study the minimum number of years one should have been in management position was three years. This is because most institutions consider staff for promotion to the next grade after working for three years.

All the men and women in university management in the selected universities were interviewed. This is because they were assumed to possess adequate and relevant information regarding factors affecting women career planning and progression in
universities in Kenya by virtue of their positions. They were also assumed to have adequate information regarding policies on recruitment in universities due to their management position. Interview with well-qualified informants could greatly supplement and corroborate information available from records and questionnaire responses. Therefore, interviews with the VCs and DVCs generated more data as well as corroborate the information from questionnaires and document analysis. The interview guide aimed at gathering information from women in management.

3.6.2 Questionnaires

The questionnaire is the most appropriate data collection instrument which could reach out to many respondents. It encourages objective responses and flexibility especially where open-ended questions are used. Questionnaires assisted in the translation of the research objectives into specific questions which motivated the respondents to provide the information that was sought for. Each item in the questionnaire was developed to address a specific research objective of the study.

Questionnaires were used in this study because they were considered to provide views on the issue and helped avoid bias or errors caused by the presence or attitudes of the interviewer (Fraenkal & Wallen, 2009). Questionnaires also enabled the respondents to respond to questions on career mobility freely and frankly to all issues because they were not required to reveal their identities, this in return increased the likelihood of getting accurate information. Kumar (1996) noted that questionnaires offer a greater anonymity as there is no face-to-face interaction between the respondents and the interviewer. The questionnaires also led to uniformity in answering questions
allowing a great degree of comparison because they are stable, consistent, and of uniform measure, without variation.

3.6.2.1 Women career mobility questionnaire for university managers

The senior university staff questionnaire on career mobility comprised both open and closed ended questions. The open-ended questions were aimed at capturing new and additional information. The questionnaire was divided into seven sections.

The first section had eleven structured questions that sought to obtain demographic information from the men and women in management. The information sought was on type of university, Faculty, sex, age, years of teaching experience, highest academic qualification and the position held at the university.

The second section had four semi-structured questions and two Likert scale questions, one on a five point scale ranging from ‘Not at all ’ to very great extent’ sought information from the senior university staff on whether they knew of policies governing the recruitment and promotion of senior university staff. The second Likert scale had five point scale seeking information on their opinion regarding the given criteria used for promotion of senior university staff in universities in Kenya.

The third section comprised three structured and semi-structured questions seeking information on the establishment of management positions occupied by men and women in public and private universities in Kenya. Information from those in public and private universities was used for comparison purposes. The questions further enquired on the factors affecting women career mobility in public universities in comparison to private universities. This was aimed at establishing whether there were
any similarities or differences in the career mobility of women in the two categories of universities.

The section had an open ended question seeking to establish the availability of policies on recruitment and promotion in the public universities and private universities respectively. The section also had two Likert scale questions on a five point scale ranging from ‘Strongly ‘Not effective; to ‘very effective’ and sought the opinion of the respondents on the effectiveness of available policies on recruitment and promotion in enhancing women career mobility in their respective universities. The other Likert scale question on a five point scale ranging from ‘strongly disagree’ to ‘strongly agree’ was used to collect information on factors that influenced the recruitment and promotion of staff to management position in the university.

The fourth section comprised a combination of open ended questions that sought information from the respondents on the opportunities available for career progression and the factors that enhance career mobility in public universities in comparison to private universities. There were two Likert scale on a five point ranging from ‘Not at all’ to very great extent’ that sought to know the extent to which the given factors contributed to the respondents career progression in public universities in comparison to private universities in Kenya. The second Likert scale was a five point scale ranging from ‘strongly disagree’ to strongly agree’ with questions seeking the respondents opinion on the factors considered important in enhancing women career mobility in public universities in comparison to private universities in Kenya. This section also sought information on the challenges that affected women career mobility in public universities in comparison to private universities in Kenya.
The fifth section comprised semi-structured and open-ended questions that sought information on whether women had career development plans and the strategies they had put in place to enhance their career mobility in public universities in comparison to private universities in Kenya. The section also had items that required the respondents to indicate if the universities were making any efforts to enhance women career mobility and their opinion on what the university should have done to enhance women career mobility in public and private universities in Kenya. The items of the questionnaire also sought to know the career aspirations of the respondents.

Section six comprised three open ended questions which sought information on the challenges that hinder women career mobility in their universities. A five point Likert scale sought to know from the respondents, the factors that they considered as hindering women career mobility.

The seventh and the last section comprised semi structured and likert scale questions ranging from ‘Not effective ’ to ‘Very effective’. The items in this section sought information on the interventions put in place by the public and private universities to enhance women career mobility in university management.

3.6.3 Document analysis guide

Document analysis was aimed at collecting secondary data. It also provided the information that the respondents were not able to give due to factors like absence of the respondents or lack of information. It was also used for the corroboration of the questionnaires and interview guides. The researcher got information on policies on
recruitment and promotion in public universities in comparison to private universities in Kenya. Documents that were analysed included the following; The Kenya National Policy on Gender and Development (NPGD), 2000, Policy documents on recruitment, employment and promotion, rules and regulations, terms of employment of various categories, gender policies, strategic plans, Kenya Education Staff Legal Notice 2010 and personnel appraisal forms. The document analysis helped to identify information gaps so that they could be filled.

3.7 Validity of research instruments

Mugenda & Mugenda (2003) observed that data to have validity and reliability, the data collection techniques must yield information that is relevant and correct. Reliability and validity are measurements of this relevance.

Validity entails the accuracy of the measurements. Validity has to do with how accurately the data obtained in the study represents the variables of the study (Orodho, 2003). The instruments were given to two groups of experts in research and education management in the Faculty. One group was expected to assess the content validity the instrument was meant to measure, that is, a measure of the degree to which data collected using a particular instrument represents aspects of career mobility and the other group would determine the construct validity, that is, whether the set of items accurately represents the concept under study. In this research content validity helped in ensuring that all content of the variables were included in the research instruments. The instruments were accessed for external validity that was, to access the degree in which the research findings can be generalized to other settings. Validity of the qualitative instruments that is the interview schedule was tested by use of peer
reviews. The pilot study was used to ensure that items in the instruments were stated clearly and had the same meaning to all respondents hence ensuring validity of the instruments.

3.7.1 Reliability of research instruments

Research requires dependable measurement. Nunnally, (1978) observed that measurements are reliable to the extent that they are repeatable and that any random influence which tends to make measurements different from occasion to occasion or circumstance to circumstance is a source of measurement error. Reliability is the degree to which a test consistently measures whatever it measures. Reliability tests for consistency of the measurements, Gay,(1987). If a study yields contradictory or incompatible results, the reliability is questioned. Reliability is not measured but estimated, Borg and Gall (2007).

The most commonly used method to split the test into two is using the odd-even strategy. Split-half reliability which is a form of internal consistency reliability was used. Gay,(1987). Since longer tests tend to be more reliable, and since split-half reliability represents the reliability of a test only half as long as the actual test, a correction formula, Spearman-Brown prophecy formula was applied.

Reliability of the research instruments was also tested by use of internal consistence method. Measures of internal consistency estimate the extent to which items which constitute a test or measure are consistent across all the items. All the items in the instrument were split in all possible ways and estimated using internal consistency. Internal consistency estimates reliability by grouping questions that measure the same
concept, Borg & Gall (2007). The degree of reliability is usually given by a numerical running between 0 and 1, called the coefficient of reliability. The closer the number is to one, the higher the reliability estimate of the instrument, Borg & Gall (2007).

For this study, the researcher wrote two sets of three questions measuring career mobility and after collecting the responses ran a correlation between the two groups of three questions to determine if the instruments reliably measured career mobility. Cronbach’s Alpha was used to compute correlation values among the items on the instruments. For this study, a correlation coefficient greater than 0.7 (r > 0.7) was considered reliable. The instruments were then reviewed on the basis of the responses obtained.

3.7.2 Pilot study

Following the pre testing and revision of questionnaires, a pilot study of all the research instruments was conducted in two universities; one public university and one private chartered university in Kenya for comparison purposes. The two universities were not in the main study because the experience gained by subjects in the pilot study may bias the results of the main study if the same subjects were included. These universities were pilot tested because they have been in existence for over ten years hence they were considered ideal to give adequate and relevant information for this study.

The purpose of pilot testing was to assist the researcher to check whether; the instruments adequately generated the required information, the items were logically arranged to facilitate response, to detect the presence of any redundancies and
repetitions that called for elimination of some questions. The pilot test found out that five items did not generate the required information on career mobility and three of the items were not clear. So they were removed and replaced with revised items.

The pilot study helped to verify whether; the data collected was quantifiable, analyzable and useful, the questions asked were acceptable to the respondents. The pilot study also addressed other broad concerns such as the availability of the study population and how the respondents daily work schedules could best be respected. This was addressed by leaving the instruments to be filled and collected after one week to give the respondents more time. The pilot study also assisted to gauge the acceptability of the methods used to collect data and the willingness of respondents to answer questions. It also helped verify the length of time needed to administer the interview guide, questionnaires and to analyse the documents. It enabled the researcher to carry out a preliminary analysis which ensured that the wording and format of questions did not present any difficulties when the main data was analyzed. After the pilot some items were edited to ensure the questions were well worded and formatted.

3.8 Data Collection Procedures

The researcher obtained an introduction letter from Kenyatta University and a research permit from the National Council of Science and Technology. Arrangements were made to visit the selected universities for introduction and to find out the appropriate time to administer the questionnaires to the respondents and appointments for interviews were booked and arrangements were made for the documents to be analysed. The first phase of primary data collection involved the administration of the
questionnaires to the respondents. Questionnaires were collected on the same day where possible and for those that did not manage to fill the questionnaires on the same day the instruments were collected after three days. The questionnaires that were missing by mistake were replaced on the day of collection.

The second phase of primary data collection involved conduction of in-depth interviews by the researcher using the career mobility interview guide for women in the public and private universities in Kenya. In addition, the researcher made use of observation to capture any information pertinent to the study which might have been omitted in the interviewing process or in the questionnaire as she administered the instruments. This helped in drawing conclusions relevant to key questions of the study. Observation of the situation in its natural setting gave the researcher a deeper understanding of the situation. Observation was also made to check for the presence of any posters on gender equity. Information on availability of policies on recruitment and promotion in public universities viz a vis the private universities was established. Secondary sources such as reports, studies and internet materials were employed to supplement the primary data collected by use of interviews and questionnaires. Data collected was triangulated to ensure scientific integrity of the research and validity of research findings. Methodological triangulation refers to the process in which data collection in research is effected through more than one approach (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). Rigorous selection criteria of participants was undertaken to ensure that relevant, useful, accurate and correct information was collected for this study.

The demographic information of the respondents was established for the purposes of determining factors affecting women career mobility in education management.
through a comparative study of Public and Private Universities in Kenya. The information captured included the respondents’ age, gender, marital status, academic qualifications, administrative experience, management position in the university and the category of the university, that is, whether it was public or private university.

3.9 Data Analysis

Before the actual data analysis, the data that was gathered using questionnaires, in-depth interview schedules and document analysis guide. Questionnaires were cleaned of vague responses and proof reading was done to ensure consistency in the data collected. The data assisted in the tabulation of cumulative frequencies and percentage tables for each variable. The transcriptions and schedules were validated, edited, coded and then entered in the computer for analysis using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), version 17 which offers extensive data handling capabilities and numerous statistical routines that analyzes statistical data.

Data analysis was done using both quantitative and qualitative techniques. Descriptive statistics were used to enable the researcher to meaningfully describe distribution or measurements using statistics. The data was presented using descriptive statistics such as percentages and frequencies.

Interview schedules were transcribed and then arranged as per the items and responses in thematic manner, relating these themes to the research objectives. To facilitate the making of recommendations of the study, the findings were presented according to the objectives of the study. Besides that, a qualitative analysis of personal views and
opinions were presented as direct quotations and incorporated into recommendations of the study.

3.10 Ethical Considerations

Protecting the rights and welfare of the participants is a major ethical obligation of all the parties involved in a research study (Mugenda & Mugenda 2008). The respondents got a written letter of commitment from the researcher guaranteeing them confidentiality, privacy and anonymity. The respondents were not required to indicate their name in the questionnaire and their consent was sought. The relevant authorities were informed and their permission sought before the researcher embarked on the current study.
CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

The purpose of the study was to establish factors affecting women career mobility in public universities in comparison to private universities in Kenya. The chapter was organized into five sections including the demographic data. The findings were presented according to the objectives of the study as follows:

i. Demographic information

ii. Establishment of management positions in public universities in comparison to private universities in Kenya.

iii. Policies and practices that guided the recruitment and promotion of university managers and their effect on women career mobility in public universities compared to private universities in Kenya.

iv. Challenges hindering women career mobility in public universities in comparison to private universities in Kenya.

v. Interventions put in place by public universities in comparison to private universities in Kenya to enhance women career mobility.

4.2 Demographic information

The demographic information sought was on type of university, age, gender, sex and academic qualifications of the respondents.
4.2.1 Distribution of men and women in management by type of university

The men and women in management were requested to indicate whether they worked in a public or a private university. The distributions of respondents from public and private universities are illustrated in Table 4.1 and Table 4.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of university</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>private</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 shows that out of the 146 respondents from the public universities, 81 (55.5%) were men while 65 (57.3%) were women. Among the 80 respondents from private universities, 32 (40%) were males while 48 (60%) were females. The results show that public universities had more men in management positions 81 (55.5%) compared to private universities which had more females, 48 (42.4%) in management.

The management positions here referred to those that were in the position of a head of department (HOD) directors, deans, registrars. DVCs and VCs. Table 4.2 presents data of respondents by universities.
4.2.2 Distribution of men and women in management in public universities in comparison to private universities in Kenya by gender

The men and women in management were desegregated by gender. Table 4.2 illustrates the gender of the respondents in public universities in comparison to private universities in Kenya.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of university</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private universities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University 1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University 2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University 3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public universities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University A</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University B</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University C</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University D</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 shows that public universities had more men in management positions, 80 (55.5%) as compared to 65 (44.5%) women. The private universities on the other hand had more women in management positions, 48 (60%) as compared to 32 (40.0%).
4.2.3 Distribution of men and women in management based on faculty/school

The respondents were further requested to indicate their Faculties/Schools at the public universities in comparison to private universities in Kenya. Table 4.3 shows the study findings.

Table 4.3: Faculties of the men and women in management in public universities in comparison to private universities (n=226)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Public universities</th>
<th>Private universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown on Table 4.3 respondents were drawn from various faculties/schools to ensure that all schools and faculties within the universities were captured in the study for determining the factors affecting women career mobility in educational management. From the study findings, 26 (32.1%) male and 27(41.5%) female respondents from public universities were drawn from Faculty/School of Business, 22 (27.2%) male and 24 (36.9%) female were drawn from the Faculty/School of Education, while 18 (12.3%) were from the Faculty of Education in public universities. On the other hand, among the 80 respondents from private universities, 37.5% comprising 11 male and 19 female respondents were from the Faculty of Business, 16(20%) were from the Faculty/School of Education. The findings of the
study therefore revealed that the Faculties of Business and Education had more women in management in both public and private universities whereas the Faculties of Science and Medicine had more men in public universities and an equal representation of gender in private universities.

4.2.4 Distribution of men and women in managements based on age

The respondents were requested to indicate their age. This was necessary to find out the ages of those in management positions in public and private universities in Kenya. The findings are shown on Table 4.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age range</th>
<th>Public universities</th>
<th>Private universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 years and below</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 years and below</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 shows age distribution of the respondents in public universities in comparison to those in private universities in Kenya. A big number 60 (41.1%) of the male and female respondents in management from public universities were aged between 46 and 50 years. The same scenario was replicated in private universities.
with 34 (42.5) of those in management being at the age bracket of 46 and 50 years. The results further illustrates that a notable proportion 17 (21.3%) of male respondents from public universities were aged 41-45 years whereas 26 (40%) of female respondents were aged between 46-50 years and 56-60 years. On the other hand 24 (50%) of female in private universities were aged between 46-50 years.

The findings of the study therefore revealed that age was a factor considered during promotion of university managers as seen from those in management. The fact that those in management were above 45 years bracket is a clear indication that age was a factor that was considered for promotion by both public universities and private universities in Kenya.

4.2.5 Distribution based on marital status of the respondents

The respondents were requested to indicate their marital status. The study findings are shown on Table 4.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>Public universities</th>
<th>Private universities</th>
<th>(n=226)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings showed that majority of the respondents in both private and public universities were married. Table 4.5 indicates that 111 (76.0%) respondents (63 males and 48 females) from public universities were married. On the other hand, 59 (73.8%),
with 26 males and 33 females from private universities being married. The findings of this study therefore revealed that marital status was not an hindrance to women career mobility both in public and private universities in Kenya. It is not about marital status because women from all marital status were presented in the study. Those that were single, married, divorced and widowed held management positions. The issue therefore was that some people were women and so they were represented in low numbers. This study concurs with the argument in Chodorow’s (1989) theory of gender that women remain discriminated against in the labour force.

### 4.2.6 Respondents experience in university teaching

The respondents were requested to indicate the number of years they had been teaching at the university. The responses are shown in Table 4.6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of experience Teaching</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 20 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study findings on experience in university management indicate that a bigger number 43 (43.9%) of female respondents had experience in teaching at the university for periods ranging between 6 and 10 years. This was followed by 25 (25.5%) of female respondents who had been teaching at the university for periods ranging...
between 11 and 15 years. On the other hand, quite a number 44 (45.4%) of the male respondents indicated that they had been teaching at the university for a period ranging between 6 and 10 years whereas 24 (24.7%) indicated that they had a teaching experience of 5 years and below. The findings therefore reveal that work experience was a factor that was considered in the promotion of men and women in public and private universities in Kenya.

4.2.7 Respondents experience in university management

The respondents were requested to indicate their positions in management at the university. Management positions in this study referred to the following positions; VCs, DVCs, Deans of Faculties, Registrars and HODs.
Table 4.7: Respondents experience in university management  (n=246)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of university</th>
<th>gender</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>0-5 years</th>
<th>6-10 years</th>
<th>11-15 years</th>
<th>16-19 years</th>
<th>20yrs &amp; above</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>head of department</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>head of department</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>dean of faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>head of department</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>head of department</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>dean of faculty</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>head of department</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>head of department</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>dean of faculty</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>head of department</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>head of department</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>dean of faculty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>head of department</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>dean of faculty</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7 shows the study findings on experience in university management. The findings indicated that majority of the respondents from both public and private universities had gained experience in management for periods ranging between 1 and 10 years. The findings showed that the number of the respondents who had gained experience in university management and served for 1 to 5 years was higher in both public universities, with 52 (78.8%) of male and 10 (47.6%) of male and 17 (63.0%) of female in private universities respectively. However, there was a noticeable change among women in public universities. The study observed that a bigger number 19
(48.7%) of women in public universities had been in management for periods ranging between 6-10 years.

Results also showed that public universities had a big number of staff who had worked in management for 20 years and above, 66 males and 39 females respectively. This could have implied that public universities had a managerial staff with more experience compared to those in private universities. This could be attributed to the fact that majority of public universities have been in existence for long and therefore have staff members who have served for a long time. Notably, there was an increasing number of those who had served 20 years in private universities as seen in 27 females and 21 males. Most of these confessed to have retired or resigned from public universities. This could be attributed to the rapid growth in higher education especially the private universities in Kenya who are in turn in need of experienced managers to manage the public and private universities in Kenya.

4.2.8 Respondents’ views on progression to the management position currently held

The respondents were asked to give information on how they progressed to the management positions they are currently occupying. The managers interviewed for this were those that were in the position of HODs and above. The respondent’s views are presented on Table 4.8.
Table 4.8: Respondents experience in university management (n=226)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career mobility through:</th>
<th>Public universities</th>
<th>Private universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>59.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study findings indicate that recruitment was the main mode of progression in both public and private universities. This is shown by 33 (68.1%) recruitments in public universities and 43 (53.7%) in private universities. Notably, both categories of universities recruited more men than females as seen in 59 (40.3%) recruitment of males in public universities as compared to 41 (27.8%) recruitment of women. In private universities (33) 41.3% of males were recruited compared to 10 (12.5%) of females. This could explain the low number of females in management positions in both public and private universities. This is because if fewer women are recruited, then a similar number too will be promoted. More males 20 (25%) were promoted in private universities compared to 9 (11.3%) of females. Promotions were lower in public universities 29 (36.3%) compared to private universities 35 (24.3%). This could be attributed to movement of staff from public universities to private universities where the chances of promotion were higher as the emerging private universities strived to build their staff capacity. Appointments were few in both public 4 (2.8%) and 3 (3.8%) private universities.
4.2.9 Respondents academic qualifications

The respondents academic qualifications are shown on Table 4.9

Table 4.9: Respondents academic qualifications  
(n=226)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic qualification</th>
<th>Public universities</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Private universities</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD degree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters degree</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor degree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Qualifications</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9 shows that more women than men in management positions had high academic qualifications in both public and private universities in Kenya. Public universities on the other hand had the highest number of males and female with PhD qualifications, 22 (15.1%) males and 24 (16.4%) females in comparison to 6 (7.5%) males and 9 (11.3%) of those in private universities. This implied that women had the academic qualifications which was one of the requirements for promotion in university management. Therefore, academic qualifications was not an hindrance to women career mobility in public and private universities in Kenya.
4.2.10 Respondents career aspirations

The study sought to identify the career aspirations of the respondents. Table 4.10 shows the findings of the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career aspirations</th>
<th>Public Universities</th>
<th>Private Universities</th>
<th>(n=86)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study revealed that 8 (22.9%) males and 2 (10.5%) female men and women in management in public universities aspired to be professors compared to 3 (16.7) males and 3 (21.4%) female in private universities. A bigger number, 24 (68.6%) male and 14 (73.7%) female from public universities reported that they wished to be senior lecturers whereas a bigger number 24 (68.6) of males and 12 (66) females in public universities aspired to be senior lecturers compared to 12 (66.7%) males and 8 (57.1%) females from private universities who aspired to be senior lecturers. These finding implied that both men and women aspired to progress in their career in university management. Therefore lack of aspirations among women cannot be blamed for their low numbers in management positions. This implies that there were other factors that hindered their career mobility and that is what this study seeks to address.
4.3 Analysis of the establishment of management positions in public universities in comparison to private in Kenya.

The first objective of the study was to establish the management positions occupied by men and women in public universities in comparison to private universities in Kenya. The study aimed at comparing the career mobility of women in management positions in public universities to those in private universities in Kenya. This aimed at establishing whether women in management in public universities progressed the same way as their counter parts in private universities in Kenya.

The study also sought to establish the number of men and women holding management positions in public universities in comparison to private universities in Kenya. Management positions included the chairmen of departments, directors of campuses/ programmes, deans of Faculties/Schools, Registrars, DVCs and VCs. The study observed that most management positions in public and private universities in Kenya were held by men. The findings are shown on Tables 4.11 and 4.12 respectively.
Table 4.11: Staff establishment in management positions in selected public universities in Kenya in 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Position University</th>
<th>University C Men f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Women f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>University A Men f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Women f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>University D Men f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Women f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>University A Men f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Women f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VC’s</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVC’s</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrars</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODs</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Commission for University Education

With reference to the public universities as seen on Table 4.11, the study established that in one public university headed by a male VC, out of the five DVCs, only one was a woman. In the same university, out of the 60 deans of Faculties, 49 (82%) were men and only 11 (18%) were women. Out of 145 Heads of Departments, there were 118 (81%) men and 27 (19%) women.

The information on Table 4.11 revealed gender disparity in the management of public universities in Kenya. The study showed that in the four public universities selected for this study, apart from the two VCs, all the other senior management positions were dominated by men. The same scenario is replicated in the private universities as shown on Table 4.12.
The study found out that more men than women held management positions in both public and private universities in Kenya. A comparison of women in management positions in public and private universities in Kenya revealed that there were few women in management positions in the two categories of universities as shown on Tables 4.11 and 4.12.

The study findings on the establishment of management positions in private universities in Kenya are presented on Table 4.12

**Table 4.12: Establishment of staff in management positions in selected private universities in Kenya by 2010 (n=95)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Position</th>
<th>Private Universities</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University 2</td>
<td>University 1</td>
<td>University 3</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVCs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrars</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODs</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.12 shows that all the seven DVCs and registrars in the private universities were men. These gender disparities cut across the public and private universities as seen in the management positions as shown on Table 4.11. For instance, in public universities out of the 51 directors, majority 35 (68.6%) were male and 16 (31.4%) were female. In the private universities on the other hand, out of the 18 directors, 11 (61%) were male and 7 (39%) were female. This in comparison to public universities
shows that gender disparity existed in both categories of the university as shown on Table For instance among the 93 deans of Faculties in the public universities, majority 72 (77.4%) were male compared to 21 (22.7%) female whereas at the private universities out of the 15 deans, 12. This scenario was not different among the heads of departments. Among the 290 heads of departments in the four public universities, majority 225 (77.6%) were males and the rest 65 (22.4%) were female. In the private universities on the other hand, out of the 45 HODs, 33 (73.3%) were males and only 12 (26.7%) were females.

The study observed that women did not progress at the same rate in their careers with their male counterparts in public and private universities in Kenya. This implies that women play minimal role in the management of private universities in Kenya and therefore all the decisions made are made from the men’s point of view leaving little room to discuss ways of enhancing women career mobility. This impacted negatively on women career mobility in public and private universities in Kenya. It could also have implied that the women in management in the public and private universities could not compete on the same footing with their male counterparts.

This disparity is an indication that the interventions put in place by the public and private universities to enhance women career mobility were yet to bear fruits. The study concurs with one by National Council for Science and Technology (NCST, 2010) which observed that the university management in Kenya was male dominated and female representation was minimal. The study by NCST (2010) further observed that there were no deliberate attempts by public universities to ensure that females are elevated to management in public universities in Kenya.
The low number of women in management position in universities could be attributed to lack of implementation of policies on recruitment and promotion by the public and private universities in Kenya. This is likely to create uneven playing field for men and women in management. For gender equity to be achieved both men and women must have equal opportunities and this can only be achieved through implementation of relevant policies that enhance gender equity at all levels of management.

This study concurs with the liberal gender theories that there is need to increase women’s power and influence in university management by working within the current policies and structures. Reforming and changing the practices within the existing structures and policies of the university would eventually result in a greater equity in gender representation at the university management in both public and private universities in Kenya.

**4.4. Views of men and women in management on policies governing the recruitment and promotion of university managers**

Objective two of the study was to analyse the policies on recruitment and promotion of men and women to senior management positions in public and private universities in Kenya. The respondents were asked if they knew of any policies governing recruitment of university managers. The responses are shown on Table 4.13
Table 4.13: Awareness of policies governing recruitment of university managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of university</th>
<th>Awareness of policies governing recruitment of university managers</th>
<th>Total respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University B</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University C</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University D</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University 1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University 2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>84.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University 3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>86.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the 187 respondents who indicated that they were aware of policies governing recruitment of university managers, 89 (47.6%) of the respondents were male and, 98 (52.4%) were female from both public and private universities respectively. However, a small number, 12 (13.5 %) and 11 (11.2 %) male and female respectively pointed out that either they were not aware of policies governing recruitment and promotion of university managers or the policies were not there altogether. This was likely to hinder women career mobility because if they are not aware of the policies they are likely to be left out during promotions due to lack of information on what is expected of them in regards to promotion.

4.4.1 Views from interviews with women in management positions on recruitment and promotion

The women in university management were interviewed. Those interviewed ranged from Vice chancellors, Deputy vice chancellors and deans of Faculties. From the
results of the interviews it was observed that the recruitment and promotion policies in both private and public universities did not conform to the 1/3 constitutional requirements regarding the recruitment and promotion of women. In six out of the eight sampled public universities for example, only two had a woman DVC, majority of deans of faculties/schools were men. Most heads of departments too were men in both private and public universities. Members of the university council and the senate were largely women with none of the universities meeting the 1/3 constitutional requirement that any appointment should not be less than 1/3 of either gender. Some women managers interviewed from one public university noted that women faculty were tacked into the time consuming service-oriented positions more frequently than the male faculty. The female respondents noted that the female faculty are shunted into educational work that is not as highly valued as traditional research work. One female associate dean of faculty from a public university had this to say:

Women tend to get put in jobs that are time consuming but that do not advance or build their careers. Men tend to be put in power oriented positions like recruitment committees whereas women are put in service oriented ones like staff welfare.

Another interesting issue that came out with female managers was the gender bias in the composition of the members of the interview committees. The respondents revealed that in most interview panels, the interviewers were men with one or two women in most of the instances. The women observed that this affected their performance at the interview negatively. They indicated that when interviewed by a group of males not familiar to them, it made them feel tense and anxious. These situations, according to the respondents reduced their performance. One female manager noted that in her case the all male group was convinced that she could not
manage a department because she exhibited fear and tension during the interview.

Five out of every ten women interviewed stated that they did not say what they should have said or know in the all male interview panel because of fear and apprehension. One female respondent commented.

> When I left the interview room I realised I had missed out on very important points all because of fear. For two good days I thought about what I should have said during the interview but did not say it because I was afraid. There are many instances in which I could not respond to questions not because I did not know but because I was afraid.

This comment revealed lack of gender equity in the composition of the interviewing panels at the university which calls for a review of the same to ensure that men and women are equally represented. As observed by the female respondent this was likely to affect the performance of women in the interviews hence affecting women career mobility in university management in Kenya.

### 4.4.2 Policies on promotion in public universities in comparison to private universities in Kenya

The study reviewed the university policies and the findings revealed that in two public universities in this study, the policies on recruitment and promotion were used to enhance the support of universities’ Strategic Plan. Among the three private universities in this study on the other hand, none of them had a policy on recruitment and promotion. The issue of staff development was elaborate in the strategic plans of both public universities and private universities which were part of the policy documents analysed for this study. However, the study observed that the gender policies in the public and private universities were not operational. This observation agreed with the study by NCST (2010) which observed that despite some public
universities having elaborate gender policies, they were not operational neither were gender considerations taken into their plans.

The study observed that the university managers knew what was expected as far as enhancement of gender equity was concerned, but this study noted that the challenge was implementation. However, some of the university managers interviewed from public and private universities noted that staff development was important for the organization and acknowledge the critical importance of career progression for the effective and efficient operations of the said universities and for the recognition of their staff. During the interview with one Vice Chancellor of a private university, she observed that;

Policies should recognise that the staff have different career stages and seeks to ensure that promotion recognises the priorities of teaching and research. The policies provide the principles such as academic standards, merit and equal opportunity that would underpin a fair and equitable promotion process and provide standards of performance. All applicants must, as a minimum requirement, meet the skills base requirements applicable and have a record of achievement that demonstrates they are consistently performing highly in duties appropriate to their current level and satisfactorily achieving beyond their current level for at least two of the three criteria.

The VC noted that one of the criteria for promotion was that one should have attained a minimum of a PhD to qualify as a lecturer. The other criteria is satisfactory performance in one position for a period of at least three years by which one is expected to have mastered the requirements of their office and demonstrated leadership potential.

However, most 57 (86.4 %) of those interviewed were of the opinion that even though the policies existed on paper, the implementation was still a challenge. Results from interviews with university managers indicated that there were a number of national,
regional, international and organisational policies that were in support of the introduction of gender equity policies in universities. For instance, the equal opportunity rule that aims at promoting gender equity and the affirmative action framework among other gender equity policies. Section 27, Chapter 3 of the Kenyan Constitution states that women and men have the right to equal treatment, including the right to equal opportunities in political, economic, cultural and social spheres. However, the monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of these strategic objectives of gender equity was lacking. Even though a big number of the university managers interviewed said they were aware of the policies on recruitment and promotion, they were quick to add that these policies were hardly implemented. One dean of a school from a public university had this to say:

There are a number of impediments to the implementation of gender equity interventions, including inadequate funding for the activities geared towards enhancing gender equity such as implementation of affirmative action and establishment of gender desks across the universities.

The study observed that this posed a major challenge to women career mobility in public and private universities in Kenya. The respondents also pointed at lack of gender awareness among students, staff and university managers, negative attitudes towards gender issues and lack of clear gender policy guidelines in universities as a major challenge. This contributed to low career mobility among women in public and private universities in Kenya.

From the document analysis, the policy documents from the sampled seven private and public universities were obtained and analysed. The study found out that out of the seven universities under study, only four universities, three public universities and
one private university had policies on recruitment and promotion. An analysis of the policy documents revealed that three out of the seven universities had policies on gender and only two universities had policies on promotion. Out of the seven universities five had policies on recruitment. Further analysis of the policies revealed that pertinent information on enhancement of gender equity during recruitment was lacking. For instance, there was no clear criterion that was singled out for use in enhancing gender equity during recruitment and promotion. For instance the section on what criteria to use to enhance gender equity was lacking in three out of the four public universities and two out of the five public universities. This posed a big challenge for the enhancement of career mobility among women in university management. The clause on equal opportunity employment often quoted in press advertisements for vacant positions in university management seemed not to have been implemented during recruitment of university managers in the private universities where the study observed a major disparity in gender during recruitment.

The views of university managers especially women did not always indicate that the implementation process was effective. The study actually established that two public universities of the four universities that had policies on recruitment and promotion did not implement them. This was evidenced from some women respondents who felt that they had stagnated in one job group for a long time yet the policy stated that one needed to have stayed for three years in one job group to become eligible for promotion to the next job group.
4.4.3 Criteria for Promotion of university managers

Further results from the interviews revealed that the criteria for appointment and promotion differed among public and private universities as a result of conditions that were internal and external to the individual universities. The study revealed that the criterion for promotion was not clear to all members of staff in private universities but was clear to almost all in public universities. In two public universities and one private university, a position had its requirements which all the applicants were required to meet to qualify for promotion to the next grade.

The study further observed that there were various categories of evaluations of criteria for promotion that were used and varied from university to university. Some of them included, research, teaching effectiveness, publication and member’s general contribution to the university and to the society. Three out of the seven universities had clear criteria for promotion of the staff members, two public universities and one private university. In one of the private universities there was an assessment matrix for assessing the applicants for promotion. The assessment matrix had the following criteria for evaluation; outstanding performance, excellent performance, good performance and not satisfactory performance. Outstanding performance is defined as exceeding and achieving all objectives at current level and performing satisfactorily at the higher level. Applicants are required to show evidence of performance and outcomes at the higher level.

Excellent performance was defined as exceeding and achieving most of the objectives at current level and performing satisfactorily at the higher level. Applicants needed to show evidence of performance and outcomes at the higher level. Good performance
was defined as achieving all objectives at the current level. Not satisfactory performance was defined as achieving none or only a few objectives at the current level. In the three universities, applicants were considered for promotion if they had a record of achievement that demonstrated that they were consistently performing highly in duties appropriate to their current level and, for at least two of the three criteria.

Applicants were normally considered to be promotable if their performance across the three criteria was assessed by the panel to be either: Outstanding, outstanding, satisfactory or excellent, excellent, excellent or outstanding, excellent, good. One Vice chancellor interviewed from one of the private universities with criteria for promotion observed the following:

The applicants for promotion in universities are expected to make contributions in three broad areas: teaching, research and publication. The applicants are expected to demonstrate that they meet the promotion criteria based on their activities in their current position at the university. They were assessed ‘satisfactory’ at their current level in any area and did not meet the standard of performance required for promotion, unless they were assessed ‘outstanding’ in two areas.

The respondent noted that teaching and leadership were other criterion used for promotion. According to the VC, leadership referred to motivating, influencing and inspiring others to achieving the goals of the university. Leadership was also demonstrated in organizing conferences, symposiums or exhibitions, undertaking a key role in review committees, contributions to Higher Education sector and community activities that contributed to core activities of teaching and scholarship.

Nearly five in every ten respondents from both public and private universities who participated in this study were either unaware of the existence of clear policies on
criteria of promotions or were uncertain if the policies did exist. These findings suggested that, in view of most managers, the promotion process at the universities was prone to abuse including gender discrimination. This was because if the managers who were supposed to implement the policies were uncertain of the policies to be followed, then there was a high likelihood that the implementation of the said policies would not be effective.

Six out of every ten public and private university managers interviewed, especially women noted that the promotion policies were never implemented. The respondents noted that the policies were not clear in that they did not state clearly who qualified to move to the next grade and what was required for one required to qualify. In cases where it was specified, the criterion was hardly followed. In instances where the promotion policies were not clear to staff, those in the lower cadre, especially women, easily believed that their gender was the hindrance to their promotion. This was because the criterion was not clear to them and they were therefore left to speculate.

It was reported during the interviews with the women managers that men often had an advantage of being selected when male and female candidates had equal scores on the criteria for promotion. Some of the women in management said they felt ‘invisible’ in their universities. They cited examples where they were excluded from important leadership positions, not holding significant roles in major committees like recruitment and promotion committees and not being rewarded or recognized for their productivity and accomplishments. One female head of department in a public university had this to say;

Women are unconsciously categorized by men. Women as a minority are left out of key committees where decisions are made. Women are not in key
management positions. Women are excluded from important committee work, or such committees mostly based on the timings of the meetings. If a (junior faculty) male member of staff publishes with a male mentor, they are “colleagues”, but if a (junior faculty) female publishes with a male mentor she is viewed as riding on his coat-tails, hanging on.

Some female managers complained that although the job advertisements posted said that female applicants were encouraged to apply, no special consideration was given to women. The respondents noted that the problem had been that, although cognizant of the fact that women should be recruited to enhance gender equity, no clear and explicit guidelines or practice of admitting women when they fulfilled the minimum criteria existed or was in use.

4.4.4 Views of respondents on factors governing recruitment of men and women to managerial positions in public universities in comparison to private universities in Kenya.

The study sought the views of respondents on factors affecting the recruitment of staff to managerial positions in public universities in comparison to private universities in Kenya. The respondents were asked to give their own views apart from what was in the policies on factors governing recruitment of university managers. Tables 4.14 and 4.15 illustrate the views of respondents on the factors governing recruitment of men and women to managerial positions in public universities in comparison to private universities in Kenya.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors influencing recruitment</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attaining a number of years in teaching experience</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>14.23</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High academic qualification</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>12.17</td>
<td>11.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>previous work experience</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>18.27</td>
<td>21.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attaining a certain age</td>
<td>14.21</td>
<td>16.29</td>
<td>27.40</td>
<td>18.32</td>
<td>18.273</td>
<td>9.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attaining an extra qualification</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>16.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people are automatically moved to the next job</td>
<td>29.46</td>
<td>22.38</td>
<td>21.33</td>
<td>14.24</td>
<td>10.159</td>
<td>14.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it is not clearly defined</td>
<td>26.45</td>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>18.31</td>
<td>14.28</td>
<td>10.175</td>
<td>15.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=198)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.14: Factors influencing recruitment of men and women to management positions in public universities in Kenya
When university managers were asked to identify the factors that influenced the recruitment of men and women to management positions from both public universities and private universities in Kenya, were of the opinion that high academic qualifications was a major consideration as seen 34 (49.3%) male and 34 (61.8%) female respondents from public universities in comparison to 14 (48.3%) male and 18 (42.9%) female respondents in private universities as seen from Table 4.14 and Table 4.15 respectively. In public universities 41 (63.1%) male and 27 (49.1%) female respondents said that previous work experience was a factor considered for recruitment compared to 17(41.5%) female respondents in the private universities.

At the same time 47 (74.6%) male and 24 (50.0%) female respondents from public universities agreed that attaining an extra qualification influenced recruitment to senior management position in public universities in Kenya, a factor that was slightly supported by their counterparts in the private universities, as seen in 9 (32.1%) male and 16 (41.0%) female.

The findings of this study revealed that women had the qualifications needed for promotion. Therefore the fact that there were fewer women in management is an indication that other factors other than qualifications affected women career mobility. This agrees with a study by Morrison et al (1987) which attributed the low number of women in management position to the ‘glass ceiling’, a transparent barrier which prevents women from moving up the corporate ladder past a certain point. The low representation of women in the management in public and public universities is an
indication that there are forms of gender bias that disadvantage women in career mobility.
This concurred with another study by Auster (1993), which pointed out that glass ceiling is not one ceiling or wall in one spot, but rather many varied and pervasive forms of gender bias that occur frequently in both overt and covert ways.
Table 4.15: Factors influencing recruitment of men and women to management positions in private universities in Kenya  (n=198)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors influencing recruitment and promotion</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attaining a number of Years in teaching experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high qualification or strong academic background</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>previous work experience</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attaining a certain age</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attaining an extra qualification</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>favour with an immediate supervisor</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people are automatically moved to the next job</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it is not clearly defined</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.15 shows that, the respondents from the private universities noted that high academic qualification was a major factor considered during recruitment and promotion as seen from the Table 4.15 but disagreed to favour 13 (44.8%) with an immediate supervisor and automatic recruitment and promotion to the next job 15 (53.6%). This view was held by their counterparts in public universities where, 29 (46.0%) male and 22 (38.6%) disagreed that people were automatically moved to the next job group. Attaining a certain age was not a factor that influenced the recruitment and promotion to management positions in public universities in Kenya.

As seen on Table 4.14 and 4.15, respondents from both public and private universities agreed that the major factors which influenced recruitment and promotion were; years of experience, academic background, previous work experience and attainment of extra qualification. However, factors that were not considered as reported by most of the study respondents included age and favours with immediate supervisors.

From the results of the study, it can be observed that a good number of male and female respondents confirmed that years of experience in teaching, academic qualifications, previous work experience and extra qualifications were factors considered during recruitment and promotion of staff in public and private universities in Kenya. From the study, most women in both public and private universities met the criteria. A few that missed out on promotion indicated that it was not because they missed the criteria but indicated that it was sometimes a choice not to take up a promotion as they engaged in
taking care of their families. This was echoed by one female professor in a public university;

Young women get disadvantaged when it comes to promotion because most of them try to balance career and family unlike men who aggressively pursue their career whether they have a family or not.

These sentiments implies that as long as the women and the society continue viewing themselves as mother and caregivers then the gender equity in management will remain a mirage. This study concurs with the tenets Chodorow’s (1989) gender theory, she posits that if women are seen by society and view themselves primarily and exclusively as mothers, then any liberation of women will continue to be experienced as traumatic by society.

4.4.5 Respondents views on availability of criteria for promotion in public universities in comparison to private universities in Kenya.

The respondents in both public and private universities were asked if they knew of a criterion for promotion in their universities. The findings were presented according to the type of university and gender of the respondents. Table 4.16 illustrates the perceptions of the respondents on availability of criteria for promotion.
Table 4.16: Availability of criterion for promotion in public universities in comparison to private universities in Kenya (n=184)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Type of university</th>
<th>Availability of criterion for promotion in the university</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.16 shows that 63 (91.3%) of male respondent from public universities compared to all the 26 (100%) of male respondents in private universities who indicated that there was a criterion for promotion. However, a smaller number of female respondents 11(20.4%) from public universities indicated that there was no clear criteria for promotion. This view was supported by 11 (12.4%) of the female respondents in private universities. However, majority 43(79.6%) of female respondents in private universities compared to all 35 (100%) of female respondents in private universities agreed that there was a criteria for promotion.

The study revealed that the public and private universities had a criteria for promotion. The fact that there was no gender equity in university management irrespective of the criteria for promotion would only imply that it was not followed during recruitment and promotion of university managers. If women career mobility is to be realised the criteria
for promotion must be adhered to. This study agrees with the tenets of the liberal theory whose underlying assumption is that peer relationships between genders within the corporation can be made more equitable through processes of reform. In this case reform would only be realised if the public and private universities applied the policies and the university criteria during the promotion process.

The respondents were further asked their views on the factors that they considered to have been used as the criteria for promotion to management position in private and public universities in Kenya. The findings are shown on Table 4.17
Table 4.17: Criteria for promotion in public universities in comparison to private universities in Kenya (n=178)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of University</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>not at all</th>
<th>low extent</th>
<th>moderate extent</th>
<th>great extent</th>
<th>very great extent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Men (f, %)</td>
<td>Women (f, %)</td>
<td>Men (f, %)</td>
<td>Women (f, %)</td>
<td>Men (f, %)</td>
<td>Women (f, %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>3 (7.7)</td>
<td>6 (20.7)</td>
<td>2 (5.1)</td>
<td>3 (10.3)</td>
<td>3 (7.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>2 (5.1)</td>
<td>6 (20.7)</td>
<td>4 (10.3)</td>
<td>4 (13.8)</td>
<td>4 (10.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appraisal Ratings</td>
<td>1 (3.4)</td>
<td>2 (5.1)</td>
<td>6 (20.7)</td>
<td>2 (5.1)</td>
<td>3 (10.3)</td>
<td>6 (15.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Influence</td>
<td>5 (7.9)</td>
<td>13 (35.1)</td>
<td>4 (14.3)</td>
<td>7 (18.9)</td>
<td>2 (7.1)</td>
<td>8 (21.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years of experience</td>
<td>1 (3.4)</td>
<td>2 (6.5)</td>
<td>8 (27.6)</td>
<td>4 (10.5)</td>
<td>4 (13.8)</td>
<td>6 (15.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Any other</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>1 (25.0)</td>
<td>2 (33.3)</td>
<td>1 (25.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>1 (25.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>8 (18.6)</td>
<td>7 (11.1)</td>
<td>9 (20.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>3 (6.5)</td>
<td>3 (5.0)</td>
<td>6 (13.0)</td>
<td>11 (18.3)</td>
<td>18 (39.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appraisal Ratings</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>3 (6.5)</td>
<td>4 (6.3)</td>
<td>4 (8.7)</td>
<td>17 (27.0)</td>
<td>20 (43.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Influence</td>
<td>30 (55.6)</td>
<td>10 (23.3)</td>
<td>18 (33.3)</td>
<td>7 (16.3)</td>
<td>3 (5.6)</td>
<td>16 (37.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years of experience</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>9 (19.6)</td>
<td>3 (4.8)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>3 (4.8)</td>
<td>17 (37.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Any other</td>
<td>6 (26.1)</td>
<td>3 (23.1)</td>
<td>6 (26.1)</td>
<td>6 (46.2)</td>
<td>8 (34.8)</td>
<td>1 (7.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Male and female respondents from the public and private universities held similar opinions on the criterion for promotion. Male respondents from public universities for instance agreed that competence, 35 (55.6%) training, 33 (55%) and years of experience 36 (57.1%) were used to a great extent as a criterion for promotion to management positions. The females in the public universities on the other hand indicated that training, 18 (39.1%) and political influence, 16 (37.2%) moderately influenced recruitment. The males and females in private universities indicated that, appraisal ratings and years of experience were criteria used during recruitment as noted by 15 (51.7%) males and 17 (43.6%) females and 12 (41.4%) males and 16 (42.1%) respectively.

Regarding training, during the interviews, female respondents noted that women had to compete on equal basis with men, who were the majority. They reiterated that they were handicapped from benefiting from training opportunities due to the conflicting and dual roles of family and work which were sometimes a hindrance of women from fully participating in management positions in public and private universities in Kenya.

Some women managers from private university observed that gender specific roles such as pregnancy, birth, bringing up children and managing family affairs became handicaps to career mobility especially in situations when extended family or hired support was unavailable or unreliable. One HOD from a private university observed that very often the university management used those situations related too family responsibility to bypass women and rationalize that even if given the opportunities women would not make use of them. It could therefore be argued that such scenarios
actually negatively affected women career mobility because women found themselves stagnating in the same position as their male counterparts scale up the career ladder. The above predicaments were voiced by one female head of department in a private university had this to say:

There is no such a thing as priority for females. If you fulfil the general criteria set for selection you will get a scholarship, if not you can’t. I have never encountered a situation where women are given a priority when it comes to training and promotion. The problem is that they apply the same selection criteria for men and women and that is why we always fail to get the training opportunities.

Some female respondents felt that the promotion criteria were inflexible, outdated and not reflective of the changing workforce. They stated that the promotional pathway needed to be updated to accommodate the major changes in the workforce, that is, women with families. They felt that unless this trend was arrested, women career mobility would always stagnate as that of their male counterparts took an upward trend.

4.4.6 Promotion in public universities in comparison to private universities in Kenya

The respondents were asked whether they had been promoted in their universities in the last five years. Table 4.18 illustrates the study findings.
Table 4.18: Promotion in public universities in comparison to private universities in Kenya

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of university</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Having been promoted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.18, shows that male 45 (65.2%) respondents in public universities indicated that they had been promoted compared to 31 (53.4%) of female respondents in the same category in comparison to 27 (64.3%) female respondents in private universities indicated that they had been promoted in their position in the past five years as compared to their male counterparts,18 (62.1%). On the other hand, 27 (46.6%) female respondents from public universities compared to 15 (35.7%) in private universities observed that they had not been promoted in their universities in the last five years. This is compared to 24 (34.8%) male in public universities in comparison to 11(37.9%) in private universities respectively. This showed that both public and private universities promoted more men than women and this was likely to negatively affect women career mobility as fewer women were promoted to positions of management. This calls for a paradigm shift in the way public and private universities manage their affairs as it regards promotion. This study rides on liberal feminism assumption that reforming and changing the practices within the existing structures
and policies of the universities will eventually result in a greater equity in gender representation at the top. It is only through reform that gender equity can be realised in university management. Ensuring the policies on recruitment and promotion are followed by the public and private universities during recruitment and promotion of university managers.

**4.6.7 Respondents views on promotion in public universities in comparison to private universities in Kenya**

The university managers were further categorized into male and female with regard to their promotion in university management in the last five years. The findings are presented on Table 4.19

Table 4.19, shows that 13 (50.0%) of male respondents from public universities reported not to have been promoted in the last five years and only a small number 6 (23.1 %) male and 1 (3.8%) female indicated that they had been promoted. Those who had worked for a period of between 6-10 years and said that they had not been promoted were 11 (24.4%) male and 14 (31.1%) female from public universities, whereas those that indicated that they had been promoted over the same period were 13 (28.9 %) male and 7 (15.6 %) female. More promotions were noted in private universities in comparison to public universities over the same period, as seen in 9 (25%) male and 16 (44.4%) female. The study observed that more women in private universities had been promoted in the private universities than the public universities in Kenya.
Table 4.19: Respondents views on promotion in public universities in comparison to private universities in Kenya (n=186)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of University</th>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>Ever been promoted in the university in the last five years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-19 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 years and above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-19 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 years and above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A slight increase on those promoted for the last ten years was a confirmation that the years of experience was a major factor considered for promotion in public and private universities in Kenya as indicated in the study. The years of experience were likely to have been a consideration because one is believed to have acquired more management and leadership skills with experience.

In one of the public universities headed by a woman, out of the three DVCs, one was a female, there were six male principals of colleges out of seven, twenty two male
directors of institutes out of twenty nine, six male deans of Faculties/Schools out of nine, three male registrars and not a single female and twenty three male heads of departments out of a total of thirty one.

In the private universities the situation was not any different. In one of the universities, the VC was a male and the two DVCs were male. Out of the nine deans of Faculty/School, only one was a woman, the two registrars and the financial controller were male.

During the interviews with one of the Deputy vice chancellors in a private university, he observed that given a choice between men and women of equal qualifications, he would choose a man for promotion. This showed that men stood a better chance of promotion compared to women. This observation tended to agree with a study by Flanders (1994) in his study ‘Breakthrough: The career Woman’s Guide to Shattering the glass Ceiling. He observed that when promotion opportunities arose and an employer was given the choice between a man and a woman with equal qualifications, the woman, he posits, was frequently viewed as the greater risk and therefore the man stood a better chance of getting promoted. The implications here in relation to this study is that women have to be twice as good as men since sexism and gender discrimination is still being practiced including in public and private universities in Kenya.
4.4.8 Respondents’ views on the promotion process in university management

Through the use of interview schedules, the respondents were requested to give their views on the promotion process. Those interviewed were of the view that guidelines and criteria for determining managerial ranks needed to be established to ensure academic excellence and to provide a broad and a consistent base of input to all decisions relating to promotion and performance. The respondents were asked to indicate whether the promotion process in their universities was transparent, fair, unfair, gender sensitive or insensitive. Four in every ten female respondents who were interviewed indicated that the promotion process was transparent, another five out of every ten interviewed indicated that the process was both transparent and fair whereas two of the respondents indicated that the process was arbitrary and there was no clear criteria for promotion from one grade to another.

4.5 How policies on recruitment and promotion affected women career mobility in university management

This section captures the views of women holding management positions on the effect of university policies in their career mobility. This information was gathered through interviews with men and women in university management. Five out of every ten women interviewed felt that the policies were available but rarely implemented and therefore not effective. One of the women deans in a public university had this to say:

Most universities have policies on promotion and gender equity but were hardly implemented. Plans need to be drawn up, targets need to be set, and monitoring needs to be undertaken and positive action put in place. Without these inter-related and essential elements to the implementation of equal opportunities, a policy statement could read like so many empty words.
The respondents from public and private universities were of the view that success of gender policies and legislation needed to be supported by the establishment of mechanisms and support structures which would ensure appropriate implementation. They noted that, support structures which were effective included the provision of clear guidelines on a wide range of gender related topics; the establishment of clear reporting procedures; the setting up, at university and national levels, of an agency which can enforce monitoring and reporting and the establishment of gender equity and equal opportunity for men and women in public and private universities in Kenya.

The respondents observed that universities should endeavour to develop practices and policies that support the career development of women in university management. This view is supported by Burke and Davidson (1994) in their study on Women in management. They observed that organizations which are successful in developing practices and policies that support the career development and aspirations of their women managerial staff create an environment where women are judged on their merits and increase their competitive advantage in several ways.

4.5.1 Views on the influence of policies on recruitment and promotion on women career mobility in public universities in comparison to private universities in Kenya.

The respondents were asked to give their views on the factors that they considered to influence recruitment and promotion to management positions in public and private universities in Kenya. The results of the study are shown on Table 4.20.
Table 4.20: Views of respondents on factors considered for promotion to management positions in public in comparison to private universities in Kenya (n=118)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors considered for promotion as per policies</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td>2 18.2</td>
<td>9 81.8</td>
<td>11 100</td>
<td>5 41.7</td>
<td>7 58.3</td>
<td>12 100</td>
<td>23 19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>9 56.3</td>
<td>7 43.8</td>
<td>16 100</td>
<td>8 50.0</td>
<td>8 50.0</td>
<td>16 100</td>
<td>32 27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>2 11.1</td>
<td>16 88.9</td>
<td>18 100</td>
<td>2 40.0</td>
<td>3 60.0</td>
<td>5 100</td>
<td>23 19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard work</td>
<td>4 23.5</td>
<td>13 76.5</td>
<td>17 100</td>
<td>7 41.2</td>
<td>10 58.8</td>
<td>17 100</td>
<td>34 28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 25.0</td>
<td>3 75.0</td>
<td>4 100</td>
<td>4 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>1 100.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>1 100</td>
<td>1 100.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>1 100</td>
<td>2 1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18 28.6</td>
<td>45 71.4</td>
<td>63 100</td>
<td>24 43.6</td>
<td>31 56.4</td>
<td>55 100</td>
<td>118 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.20, shows that a small number 7 (43.8%) of male and 7 (58.3%) of female respondents in public universities were of the opinion that the university policies promoted their career mobility. This is seen by the few respondents in public and private universities who reported that factors like competence and hard work were the major determinants of the promotion in the universities. This is because according to most university policies, these were the factors considered for promotion. Therefore the small number of respondents who felt that the factors considered for promotion were not considered is an indication that the policies were not effective in enhancing women career mobility.

The numbers from public universities are in comparison to the small numbers 9 (56.3%) of the male and 8 (50.0%) of the female respondents in the private
universities who felt that qualifications and competence were considered during recruitment and promotion.

The study found out that all the four public universities and three private universities involved in this study had policies on recruitment but half of the managers in these universities confessed that most of the time the policies are not always followed during the recruitment of the university managers. It was discovered that the universities did not have a way of sensitizing their staff on available policies, so the policies are known by the very few in top management of the universities. Therefore due to lack of information, some managers did not know if the policies were there or not. Due to lack of information, some of the women in university management did not believe that the universities had policies on gender equity. The constitutional requirement of one third rule, that none of the appointments should have more than one third of either gender is yet to be implemented. Such a situation is most likely to have an adverse effect on female staff who are already few in university management. Nearly all respondents were in agreement that the universities had clear policies on recruitment. Further analysis of the policies on recruitment revealed that they lacked a criterion for promotion of women to attain the gender balance. This implies that women were most likely to remain few in university management in Kenya.

One of the women respondents from a private university had this to say:

I have been in this university since it was started ten years ago. I am yet to see a policy on recruitment and promotion. You see new staff every day but you have no idea when and how they were hired. In some departments you find that those heading have no doctorate and yet the Commission for University Education (CUE) requires that all heads of departments (HODs) be holders of a doctorate degree. You may find that in the same department, staff with the same qualification but some are earning more than others or are even in a
higher job group than their counterparts with the same level of education and experience. Policies are there in most cases as a formality.

This study observed that, without any knowledge on university policies on gender, most women were unable to identify when they were being subjected to this form of discrimination. This implied that women would continue to lag behind as far as university management is concerned.

4.5.2 How policies on promotion affect women career mobility in university management

Majority, 64% (145) of the public and private university managers interviewed felt that there was need for gender responsive legal framework in universities to address the wide range and types of discriminatory practices which deprive women their full and equal rights and limit their chances of promotion.

The study sought to know the effect of policies on promotion on women career mobility. Around one hundred and eight 108 (48%) of the respondents from public and private universities, felt that the university policies on promotion were not gender sensitive. The respondents from private universities felt that women had more challenges affecting their career progress and therefore needed policy guidelines to support their career growth. The study found out that the policies did not adequately address the issue of gender equity. This has had a negative impact on women career mobility which was likely to lead to a situation where there were fewer women in management positions in public and private universities in Kenya.
4.6 Challenges hindering women career mobility in public universities in comparison to private universities in Kenya

The fourth objective of the study was to establish the challenges hindering women career mobility in public and private universities in Kenya. This study revealed that men occupy more management positions in university management in Kenya. This study therefore, sought to establish the challenges that hindered women career mobility in public universities in comparison to those in private universities in Kenya. Interviews were conducted among women deans, directors, deputy VCs and VCs on the challenges affecting women career mobility in university management.

4.6.1 Lack of training and development opportunities for women managers

Fifty six percent (56%) of women interviewed from public universities in comparison to sixty percent (60%) of those in private universities, noted that access to organizationally sponsored training and development schemes, and to educational opportunities was often unequal between the sexes. The human capital model is frequently adopted to justify differential treatment towards male and female employees with respect to training and educational opportunities (Anker, 1997). The model stressed that employees tried to maximize profits by minimizing costs to the extent possible. Women were often considered to be higher-cost workers due to family issues such as: women were late to work frequently (probably in part because of family members). Women had higher labour turnover rates, which could be an important indirect cost for employers who had to find and train new workers (Anker, 1997: Beck and Steel, 1998). The above position was buttressed by one of the women in management in one of the private universities who asserted that:
In this organization, consistency in attending duty and punctuality are some of the factors taken into cognizance when there are training opportunities, and am sure if I will not pass the test. Of course I used to be punctual and was never absent, but ever since I got married and became a mother, I have had to struggle. May be in a few years’ time I might be willing to do that, which again will depend on whether or not my husband will allow it.

4.6.2 Lack of organizational and career mentors

Mentors are considered critical for career advancement of protégés through sponsorship, coaching, role modelling, and counselling. A key impediment to women advancement is the lack of organisational and career mentors. At least five in every ten women interviewed highlighted various problems associated with the issue of mentoring such as the fact that there were fewer women mentors, ‘overbearing’ male bosses, sometimes ‘flirtatious’ male mentors who tend to see women as sex objects. The realities in universities in Kenya align with Scandura (1999) who suggest that there is scarcity of female mentors at higher organizational ranks, and because cross-gender mentoring relationship was less likely to engage in close friendship and that social roles that involve after work networking activities could be threatened with an appearance of romantic involvement. One of the deans of faculty in a private university had this to say:

I have worked in senior management for over twenty years. During my early years in management I had a male mentor. He was too bossy and spoke to me sometimes as if I were his girlfriend. He wanted me to stay late in the evening at work and also wanted me to meet him in restaurants and hotels. I could not keep up with these demands and our relationship became tense. I prefer to have a female mentor.....it is easier to compare notes and learn from one another’s effort. In Kenya it is hard combining motherhood with managerial duties.

This study agrees with the findings of a study by International Labour Organization, (ILO, 2004), where they found multiple (i.e. one mentor, several mentees) and same-
gender (i.e. female/female) mentoring were found to be more common and more successful than single and cross-gender mentoring. Women in this study overwhelmingly prefer senior women as their mentors or role models at work than men. However, the study noted that there are those women who felt that they preferred men mentors and some women did not like women as a mentor. The reason for this according to some respondents is that women tend to be bossier than men, and often allow their ego and position in the organization to get into their brain. One head of department in a public university had this to say:

We are our own worst enemy as women....For some reasons we women are more jealous of ourselves from the very mundane things like dressing to beauty, not to talk of qualifications and position attained. We tend to feel more threatened for no reason, and tend to make up our minds against ourselves easily. Men are luckier as they move on easily even when they have problems with themselves. Thus, how do you know what to do as a woman to please another who is supposed to mentor you?

This observation agrees with a study by UNESCO (1998) which observed that a number of women had refused to submit themselves to the cross gender mentoring relationship arrangement because, they preferred women as mentors. They thought that women, having gone through some experiences could be better to identify with their problems and challenges, whereas, they were doubtful whether men mentors would misunderstand these problems to be their weaknesses instead of helping them out with these problems.

4.6.3 Organizational networks and interpersonal relationships

Four in every ten women interviewed from public universities compared to five in every ten women respondents in private universities cited lack of networks essential for career advancement. Many women expressed the need to more opportunities for
women faculty to come together to network and collaborate. One woman dean of faculty had this to say:

Successful organizational networking positively impacts career outcomes, including access to information, social and professional advice, and increased job opportunities, promotions and career satisfaction. Women are lacking in networks that are important for advancement. Women are isolated in their individual needs. Networking opportunities at the universities are lacking.

One female DVC from a public university noted that cultural values restrain female managers from entertaining their colleagues in private clubs or on the golf course, places very well known among Kenyans as congenial for establishing networks and learning through the grapevine. Because of such exclusion, female managers have limited opportunity to socialize with influential executives (usually males) who could help promote their career mobility. One of the respondents pointed out that:

Networking among women folks will be one of the best thing that can happen to women career development as there will be so much to share as long as we keep focus. I do recognize that it will come as a challenge as class and status might be created in the course of it thereby making it impossible for some to be part of it. Because fear spring from ignorance, once you create a fence for some, the network will be labelled negatively. I am convinced that as women we stand to gain so much if we network in a coordinated manner.

The findings of this study showed that female managers strongly felt that lack of access to professional networks negatively impacted on their career mobility. The women respondents felt the need to consider initiating and organizing a women executive club to provide a forum for the interchange of ideas and experiences among the female managers. The organization can provide support, networking and training members and also serve as a lobbying group on behalf of female managers’ interests in university management.
4.6.4 Work-family conflict

This study observed that women in Kenya were expected to contribute to their family’s income and continue to fulfil their traditional duties as wives, mothers and daughters. Even when women hired domestic help (House helps), their major family responsibility still remained. As a result, they faced the “double burden” of employee and household manager. However, this factor only affected young women in management who were still bringing up families. The study observed that those women who had older children were able to comfortably balance between career and family.

A number of women especially those with young families felt that family obligations affected their career mobility. At least for every five women interviewed from public universities and for every six in private universities felt that given an option they would bring up their family first and then develop their career later. This study concurs with another one done by Hassan,(2007) which noted that a good number of women have problems with juggling roles as mothers, housewives, home makers and managers at work. The challenge of maintaining work /life balance has affected them in meeting their various commitments. They get frustrated and feel trapped.

A number of women respondents felt that juggling work responsibilities and family life in an inflexible and none supportive environment was a daunting task. They observed that there was lack of sensitivity to women’s dual role and the time demands of a family.

One of the female respondents had this to say:
The working environment in Kenya is difficult and very Macho. As a woman you have to strive harder and do twice as well as the men in order to succeed. Women are considered as not fully committed, especially if married with children. Even when they perform better than their male colleagues, the men always got the best positions. This is a situation I have learnt to accept and live with, so I always make sure that I work hard and that I am acknowledged. ....with three children and a husband , it has not been easy at all.....whatever I do , I always make sure I prepare my children for school every morning and I try to get home on time to check their homework”.

To cope with diverse conflicts, female managers need help from their employers. This study agrees with Brownell (1998), he suggested that family problems that might become workplace problems are threats to a company’s competitiveness and profitability. It is important for employers to take some primary responsibility for assisting young female managers in establishing and maintaining work and family balance. However, the study observed that quite a number of women were able to overcome this challenge and were able to effectively balance work and family. The study noted that there were women who had excelled in university management and built great families. All that is required is for the woman to strike a balance between family and career.

4.6.5 Aspirations of Women Managers

During the interviews with women in management, three in every ten respondents pointed out that they were not keen on promotion to senior positions at the university partly because it was demanding and so involving and sometimes likely to jeopardise their family lives. These findings agreed with one female head of department in a private university. She observed that that woman tended to direct their career goals towards occupations that were in line with social perceptions of female roles. She remarked:
I am not keen in being in senior management; let’s leave that role for men. I am happy with my role as the head of department. If I became the dean of faculty or vice chancellor I would not be able to cope with the family, children, husband and relatives; and you know that is a recipe for disaster.

Another respondent pointed out that;

Any time I arrived home late from work after my promotion, I had to do a lot of explaining to my husband. Sometimes he did not believe that I was from the office and he could refuse to speak to me for a number of days. Tension continued mounting and it was putting a lot of pressure on my marriage. Finally I had to resign as a dean to save my marriage and for the sake of my children. I wish men would be supportive in our career growth as we did to them.

4.6.6 Cultural Stereotypes

Other factors that affected women career mobility in universities were cultural discrimination which considers women inferior to men. Other women managers also indicated age as a barrier to their career development. Three respondents from private universities indicated that young women were denied promotion on the basis that they would take maternity leave and also be hindered by family obligations. This agrees with a research by Udegbe (2003) who reported that some employment and placement practices in the work place are such that women are not allowed to take jobs that may be hampered by their “reproductive health concerns.” All these have implications for the career mobility and retention of women in the work place particularly in male dominated occupations.

Four in every ten respondents in public universities compared to three in every ten in private universities noted that some challenges faced by women in career mobility were tied to different societal roles played by men and women. There are those jobs that are traditionally known to be men’s and vice versa, therefore those women who venture into jobs labelled to be men’s are likely to face serious challenges. This study
agrees with Flanders (1994), he observed that women suffer from age discrimination more than men. Women are more generally perceived to be less ambitious and to have reached their peak at earlier age than men. In addition, older women are also perceived to be less qualified than men because of maternity breaks and as having more time consuming family commitments. Flanders (1994, p.109), however, points out that in reality a woman’s family commitment are likely to decline with age, as her children become older and more independent. He also observed that employers often believe that women are less committed to work and less able to undertake a full time career than men, due to their biological make up, rather than ability. However a study by Families and Work Institute of Boston College, 2002) observed that young women are equally ambitious as their male counterparts to develop successful managerial careers. This view is supported by catalyst (2004) who noted that equal number of men (57%) and women (55%) want to occupy the most senior role (CEO or equivalent) in an organisation; emphasising that ambition for the most senior organizational position is not lacking in women.

One out of every ten women managers interviewed pointed at male dominance in leadership and cultural discrimination, which considers women inferior to men as one of the challenges. Majority of men and women interviewed felt that most universities preferred to appoint men to senior positions of management. These often-discouraged women and they opted to sit back as their male colleagues applied for promotions. Women are also seen as unlikely to have male characteristics which are dominant and aggressive and are considered as suited to leadership positions.
4.6.7 Societal expectations of men and women

Three in every ten respondents from public universities compared to three in private universities observed that some challenges faced by women in career mobility were tied to different societal roles played by men and women. They felt that men were given more challenging projects, which are also well paying while their female counterparts are given more soft roles like student deanship and counselling. Women are often underrated in their performance. They observed that this is a perception that females could not deliver like their counterparts. This has seen women being denied jobs that they have the experience, expertise, and qualifications. These jobs are offered to the males. They observed that, when a woman and man walk into the interview room, after a successive interview qualification, the man has a high probability of being granted the job by the company in favor of the women. This is a customary manifestation that should fade away from the today’s university executives and managers. One of the female university managers who shared her experience as she climbed the career ladder had this to say:

After successfully going through the interview my immediate supervisor refused me to be deployed in his department. The only reason he had was that he feared I could not manage the department because women had a myriad of issues to sort. It took a lot of convincing from me and other senior managers for him to allow me work in his department. I had to work extra hard to prove myself. I went through a hard time. As if what I was going through at work was not enough, at home my husband was on my case, I had to get home early and any time I had to be late at work I had to call in advance or else I would be in trouble. All because everyone believed the place for a woman is in the kitchen.

These findings concur with those of League of Kenya Women Voters, (2005), pointed out that through socialization, girls and women learn and internalize subservient beliefs, values and attitudes against themselves. Men have negative perceptions of girls and women’s abilities. Although participation in education by the marginalized
groups is generally low, girls and women are more marginalized, especially because of their gender roles, and inadequate access to and control of resources. Among some societies, female education is not a priority.

The respondents were further asked to give their opinion on the challenges that they perceived to have affected women career mobility in public universities in comparison to private universities. The respondents pointed out at a number of factors that acted as impediments to women career mobility in public and private universities in Kenya. Tables 4.21 and 4.22 illustrates the findings of the study.
# Table 4.21: Challenges hindering women mobility career in public universities in Kenya

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>not at all</th>
<th>low extent</th>
<th>moderate extent</th>
<th>great extent</th>
<th>very great extent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of recognition at work</td>
<td>13 19.7</td>
<td>6 10.3</td>
<td>13 19.7</td>
<td>7 12.1</td>
<td>16 24.2</td>
<td>21 31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20 34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of exposure to right experience</td>
<td>10 15.2</td>
<td>3 5.2</td>
<td>10 15.2</td>
<td>7 12.1</td>
<td>19 28.8</td>
<td>27 40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24 41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family obligations</td>
<td>3 4.3</td>
<td>10 17.2</td>
<td>3 4.3</td>
<td>7 12.1</td>
<td>17 24.6</td>
<td>21 30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14 24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25 36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>69 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of mentors</td>
<td>3 4.5</td>
<td>7 12.1</td>
<td>14 21.2</td>
<td>4 6.9</td>
<td>13 19.7</td>
<td>24 36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28 48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male dominance in leadership</td>
<td>3 4.3</td>
<td>3 5.2</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>3 5.2</td>
<td>6 8.7</td>
<td>41 59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32 55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19 27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14 24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>69 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In public universities, 41 (59.4%) male and 32 (55.2%) female respondents said that male dominance in leadership was a great challenge. This observation was supported by those in private universities among 11 (40.7%) male and 16 (38.1%) female. Among women in public universities, 28 (48.3%) indicated that lack of mentors was a hindrance to women career mobility in comparison to 9 (22.0%) of those in private universities. Family obligations were seen as slightly hindering women career mobility at 25 (36.2%) among women in public universities and 18 (31.0%) among men compared to 12 (44.4%) male and 8 (19.5%) female in private universities.

This agreed with the studies by feminist/gender theories and related explanations made by Anker (1997) who attributed subordinate positions being held by women to the fact that women carried out all the tough duties at the home front, and had little time at their disposal to work outside the home. This also agrees with other studies which indicated that mentoring and networking relationships are also potentially valuable for women’s advancement in view of boosting emotional support and confidence and careers satisfaction, Resign et al. (1998). A study carried out by Cross (2010) revealed a clear realization among the female managers that their male counterparts were overtly engaging in networking activities which gave them increased levels of visibility among the senior management team. However, women in male dominated organizations often have limited networking and mentoring opportunities. This is so for women in university management in Kenya because they are male dominated. The findings from private universities are shown on Table 4.22.
### Table 4.22: Challenges hindering women career mobility in private universities in Kenya  

n = 198

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>not at all</th>
<th>low extent</th>
<th>moderate extent</th>
<th>great extent</th>
<th>very great extent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of recognition at work</td>
<td>5 18.5</td>
<td>14 33.3</td>
<td>4 14.8</td>
<td>8 19.0</td>
<td>7 25.9</td>
<td>6 14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family obligations</td>
<td>1 3.7</td>
<td>13 31.7</td>
<td>3 11.1</td>
<td>4 9.8</td>
<td>3 11.1</td>
<td>2 4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of mentors</td>
<td>2 7.4</td>
<td>18 43.9</td>
<td>5 18.5</td>
<td>4 9.8</td>
<td>3 11.1</td>
<td>7 17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male dominance in leadership</td>
<td>3 11.1</td>
<td>7 16.7</td>
<td>4 14.8</td>
<td>7 16.7</td>
<td>2 7.4</td>
<td>5 11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of exposure to right</td>
<td>6 22.2</td>
<td>11 26.2</td>
<td>3 11.1</td>
<td>9 21.4</td>
<td>4 14.8</td>
<td>5 11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                                   | Men        | Women      | Men             | Women        | Men              | Women |
| total                             | 27 100     | 42 100     | 27 100          | 42 100       |                 |       |
The respondents in private universities on the other hand indicated that the factors which hindered career mobility were; family obligations 12 (44.4%) male and 8 (19.5%) female and lack of mentors 11 (40.7%) among male and 9 (22.0%) in female respondents. Other respondents indicated that male dominance was a challenge as seen among 11 (40.7%) male and 16 (38.1%) female respondents in private university category. This calls for an overhaul in the process of promotion and recruitment in public and private universities in Kenya. This agrees with the findings by Auster (19930 who observed that women absence in the ranks of university management are a telling signal that the whole process of selection, recruitment and promotion in universities is in need of a major overhaul.

4.7 Interventions put in place by the public universities in comparison to private universities to enhance women career mobility

The fifth objective of this study looked at the interventions put in place by public universities in comparison to private universities in Kenya in order to enhance women career mobility in university management. The study evaluated different interventions used by the public and private universities in Kenya to enhance women career mobility.

Development imperatives, such as the Millennium Development Goals (MDGS) and the African Union Solemn Declaration on Gender Equity, support the goal of gender equality. The Kenya government has enshrined gender equity in its constitution. It was therefore necessary for this study to evaluate the efforts by the public universities in comparison to private universities in Kenya in enhancing women career mobility.
All decisions in universities including recruitment and promotion are based on policies. It was therefore necessary for this study to evaluate the application of university policies on recruitment and promotion to enhance women career mobility in public and private universities in Kenya.

4.7.1 Establishment of the application of university policies on recruitment and promotion in public universities in comparison to private universities as an intervention to women career mobility

The study sought to establish whether the public universities applied policies on recruitment and promotion of university managers in comparison to the private universities in Kenya. The study sought to interrogate the university managers on policies on recruitment and promotion.

The study established that all the four public universities had policies on recruitment and promotion. Two public universities headed by women and two headed by men had policies on recruitment and promotion. However, six in every ten respondents from public universities in comparison to eight respondents from private universities said that the policies were not implemented during recruitment and promotion. Out of the four private universities two had a policy on recruitment and promotion. The other two were in the process of developing the policies.

However, five in every ten respondents in public universities in comparison to seven in private universities noted that recruitment and promotion was not done as per the university policies on recruitment and promotion. From the available information it can therefore be concluded that all employees did not stand an equal chance of
promotion to the next grade in public and private universities in Kenya. One male respondent from a private university had this to say:

It is not clear what policy is followed during recruitment and promotion in this university. You may have been hired at the same time and have the same educational qualifications and experience or even better with a colleague and yet find yourselves in completely different job groups and salary scales.

The study revealed that there was lack of willpower to implement the policies to guide comprehensive gender programmes in public and private universities in Kenya. The respondents observed that in the circumstances, lone and uncoordinated actions predominate. In such scenarios, the respondents felt that there was lack of a level playing field which ends up negatively affecting women career mobility. Table 4.23 presents the respondent’s views on policies enhancing women career mobility in public universities in Kenya.
### Table 4.23: Respondents views on policies enhancing women career mobility in public universities in Kenya (n=198)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policies enhancing women career mobility</th>
<th>not effective</th>
<th>less effective</th>
<th>fairly effective</th>
<th>effective</th>
<th>very effective</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equal opportunity rule</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>15 21.7</td>
<td>34 58.6</td>
<td>10 14.5</td>
<td>25 36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19 27.5</td>
<td>19 27.5</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>69 100</td>
<td>58 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affirmative action strategy</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>3 5.3</td>
<td>7 10.1</td>
<td>18 31.6</td>
<td>32 46.4</td>
<td>24 34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 17.5</td>
<td>6 8.7</td>
<td>4 7.0</td>
<td>69 100</td>
<td>57 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legislation in favour of women</td>
<td>3 4.3</td>
<td>3 5.3</td>
<td>11 15.9</td>
<td>27 47.4</td>
<td>28 40.6</td>
<td>12 21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 21.1</td>
<td>12 17.4</td>
<td>3 5.3</td>
<td>69 100</td>
<td>57 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>national gender policy</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>7 12.3</td>
<td>10 14.5</td>
<td>17 29.8</td>
<td>24 34.8</td>
<td>13 22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 29.0</td>
<td>13 22.8</td>
<td>7 12.3</td>
<td>69 100</td>
<td>57 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategic implementation framework for gender policy</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>7 12.3</td>
<td>10 15.2</td>
<td>20 35.1</td>
<td>27 40.9</td>
<td>8 14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29 43.9</td>
<td>15 26.3</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>66 100</td>
<td>57 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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As shown on Table 4.23, the respondents from public universities were of the opinion that equal opportunity rule was less effective in enhancing women career mobility as seen in 34 (58.6%) of females. From the information in Table 4.23, it was clear that the policies put in place by public universities in Kenya were not effective in enhancing women career mobility. Therefore, a lot is yet to be done to ensure there is gender equity in university management in Kenya. The views of the respondents in private universities are shown on Table 4.24.
Table 4.24: Respondents views on policies enhancing women career mobility in private universities in Kenya (n=198)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policies enhancing career mobility</th>
<th>not effective</th>
<th>less effective</th>
<th>fairly effective</th>
<th>effective</th>
<th>very effective</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equal opportunity rule</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affirmative action strategy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legislation in favour of women</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>national gender policy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategic implementation framework for gender policy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the study findings on Table 4.24, the respondents observed that 17 (58.6%) of male and 18 (43.9%) of female respondents from private universities noted that policies on equal employment opportunity, affirmative action strategy 13 (46.4%) male and 17 (42.5%) female and national gender policy, 13 (46.4%) male and 15 (38.5%) female were effectively employed in the university in enhancing women career mobility. The low number of respondents who responded to the affirmative shows the reason for few women managers in university management.

4.7.2 Efforts applied by the universities to enhance women career mobility

The study sought to find out whether the sampled universities were making any efforts to enhance women career mobility. In response, 127 (71.3%) respondents from private universities confirmed that their respective universities were making efforts while 51 (28.7%) indicated that the universities were not making any effort to enhance women career mobility. Table 4.25 shows the views of the respondents’ on the efforts used in public and private universities to enhance women career mobility.

Table 4.25: Views of men and women in management on the university efforts to enhance women career mobility (n=178)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Type of university</th>
<th>Efforts to enhance women career mobility</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The study findings on Table 4.25 revealed that 18 (27.7%) and 48 (42.5%) males from private and public universities respectively, indicated that their respective institutions were making efforts to enhance women career mobility. On the other hand, 31 (47.7%) female respondents from private universities and 30 (25.6%) from public universities reported that universities were making efforts to enhance women career mobility. From the results on Table 4.25, the low numbers of respondents indicated that no much attention was given to women career mobility by the public and private universities in Kenya.

The men and women in management were further requested to indicate the policies enhancing women career mobility in private and public universities in Kenya. The findings are shown on Table 4.26
### Table 4.26: Policies enhancing women career mobility in public and private universities in Kenya (n=178)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policies enhancing women career mobility</th>
<th>Type of university</th>
<th>NE f</th>
<th>LE F</th>
<th>FE %</th>
<th>E f</th>
<th>VE %</th>
<th>Total f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal opportunity rule</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative action strategy</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation in favour of women</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National gender policy</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic implementation framework for gender policy</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:** NE = Not Effective, LE = Less Effective, FE = Fairly Effective, E = Effective, VE = Very Effective
As shown on Table 4.26, over 40.0% of the respondents from the private universities reported that policies on equal employment opportunity, affirmative action strategy and national gender policy were effective in enhancing women career mobility in the universities. On the other hand, among those from the public universities, 49 (38.6%) of them reported that equal employment opportunity policy was less effective while 54 (42.9%) indicated that affirmative action strategy were fairly effective in enhancing women career mobility in universities in Kenya.

The study further desegregated the information on policies according to the gender of the respondents. The findings are presented on Table 4.27.

**Table 4.27: Policies enhancing women career mobility based on gender of the respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policies enhancing women career mobility</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>NE</th>
<th>LE</th>
<th>FE</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>VE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal opportunity rule</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative action strategy</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation in favour of women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National gender policy</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic implementation framework for</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender policy</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key; NA=Not at All, LE=Low Extent, ME= Moderate Extent, GE=Great Extent

As shown on Table 4.27, 42 (42.9%) male and 37 (37.4%) female respondents reported that equal employment opportunity policy, strategic implementation
framework for gender policy as seen in 42 (38.7%) male and 42 (38.7%) female respondents were effective in enhancing women career mobility. However, looking at the results of the findings on Table 4.31, it emerged that more female respondents compared to males felt that some policies were not effective in enhancing women career mobility in universities, for instance, more male 37 (38.1%) compared to 27 (27.8%) of female respondents were of the opinion national gender policy was effective in enhancing women career mobility.

The findings from the interviews with university managers on the interventions by the university management indicated that 113 (50.0%) of those interviewed were of the opinion that the universities have done very little in enhancing women career mobility. Other respondents however, gave a number of factors that they perceived to have enhanced women career mobility. These included; scholarships, development of gender indicators, continued research on gender, equality in education and training, and non-discrimination policies in the work place.

Table 4.28 shows the interventions perceived to be used by the public and private universities in enhancing women career mobility in both private and public universities in Kenya.
Table 4.28: Interventions put in place to address challenges hindering women career mobility in universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Type of university</th>
<th>NE f</th>
<th>LE f</th>
<th>FE f</th>
<th>E f</th>
<th>VE f</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal employment opportunity programme</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender mainstreaming</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of affirmative action</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender monitoring systems</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government policy on gender equality and equity</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: NA=Not Effective, LE=Less effective FE= Fairly E=Effective, VE=Very Effective
Table 4.28 shows that over 50.0% (combined effective and very effective) of the respondents in private universities reported that equal employment opportunity programme, 43 (65.0%), gender mainstreaming 38 (61.3%); and establishment of affirmative action 41 (62.1%) were the most effective interventions used in addressing challenges hindering women career development in both private and public universities in Kenya.

On the other hand, results implied that respondents from public universities were of the views that interventions like gender mainstreaming and government policy on gender equality and equity were less effective or fairly effective in addressing challenges hindering women career development. On the other hand, 54 (42.5%) of the respondents indicated that establishment of affirmative action was fairly effective in addressing challenges while 21 (16.5%) felt that the policy was less effective. In addition, 40 (31.5%) of the respondents indicated that government policy on gender equality and equity was fairly effective whereas 34 (26.8%) felt that it was less effective. Table 4.29 illustrates the policies applied in addressing the challenges hindering women career mobility by gender.
Table 4.29: Policies addressing challenges hindering women career development by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policies</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>NE</th>
<th>LE</th>
<th>FE</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>VE</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal employment opportunity programme</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender mainstreaming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of affirmative action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender monitoring systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government policy on gender equality and equity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As indicated in Table 4.29, 49 (51%) of the male respondents were of the view that equal opportunity programme and gender mainstreaming 40 (42.1%) policies were effective in addressing challenges hindering women career development. On the other hand, 31 (31.6%) of female respondents felt that gender mainstreaming policy, gender monitoring system 26 (26.3%), government policy on gender equality and equity 30 (30.3%) were less effective in addressing women challenges.

Results of the study implied that female respondents were less satisfied with the policies employed in the institutions to address challenges hindering women progression in career development compared to their male counterparts. Table 4.30 shows the programmes used in enhancing women career mobility in private and public universities.

Over sixty percent (60) of respondents interviewed observed that the programmes applied by the public and private universities were not effective in enhancing women career mobility. The respondents were of the opinion that these programmes needed to be evaluated if they were to provide a level playing ground for both men and women in university management.
Table 4.30: Interventions for enhancing women career mobility in public and private universities in Kenya

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Type of universities</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>May be</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide in-service training and development programmes</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University based quality mentoring programmes</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidy in academic training</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct critical self-evaluations for possible overt</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmarks the action of other organizations</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covert discrimination and/or attitudes</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of support mechanisms for female employees</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Other</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the study findings in Table 4.30, it was observed that 32 (51.6%) of the respondents from private universities compared to 81 (65.3%) of the respondents from public universities agreed that universities were successful in providing in-service training and development programmes. Moreover, 36 (61.0%) respondents from private universities and 64 (57.7%) from public universities agreed that universities were successful in conducting critical self-evaluation programmes. However, 69 (62.7%) of the respondents from public universities disagreed that the universities had implemented support mechanisms for female employees. This could explain the reason behind the low number of women in management positions in public and private universities in Kenya.

The respondents were asked to indicate whether the given programmes provided by the public and private universities enhanced women career mobility. Table 4.31 illustrates programmes enhancing women career mobility by gender.
### Table 4.31: Programmes enhancing women career mobility by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programmes</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>May be</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide in-service training and development programmes</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University based quality mentoring programmes</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidy in academic training</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct critical self-evaluations for possible overt</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmarks the action of other organizations</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covert discrimination and/or attitudes</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of support mechanisms for female employees</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 4.3 shows that most of the male and female respondents were of the opinion that programmes used to enhance women career in public and private universities had not been fully implemented. This was shown by 69 (77.5%) and 61 (65.6%) male respondents who indicated that the interventions were ineffective. Equally a number of female respondents, 52 (59.8%) of female respondents indicated that the policies were not implemented. This study agrees with a study done by Tlaiss and Kauser (2010) in Lebanon, which revealed that although many organizations have family friendly policies, interestingly the CEO (mostly male) did not believe that managers should be availing these policies.

### 4.8 Discussion of Findings

Universities being institutions of higher learning, the expectation is that they have better policy implementation strategies. However, from the findings of this study the situation was different. An analysis of the establishment of management positions occupied by men and women revealed that most management positions were occupied by men and women occupied less than thirty percent which was regarded a constitutional requirement that stated that all appointments should not be less than thirty percent of either gender. This was an indication that universities were not implementing gender equity policies. The study also revealed that most universities had policies on recruitment and promotion in place but the main challenge was their implementation hence their effectiveness. The study also revealed that private universities had more women in management position than the public universities. The study further revealed that in spite of good progress on integrating gender issues into policies and good policies to enhance gender equity in the society and economy, few resources were available and there was limited political will for implementation
and the progress and change was slow. Riding on Chodorow’s (1989) theory, women should always remember that there are inequalities and consciously work towards overcoming these inequalities so as to enhance their career mobility in university management in public and private universities in Kenya.

4.8.1 University policies governing the recruitment and promotion of women in universities

Application of university policies and practices affect the individual. The day to day administration or decision making in practice could help or hinder women’s career mobility in universities. The study aimed at looking at the factors affecting women career mobility in public and private universities in Kenya. The study aimed at assessing whether the universities had policies on recruitment and promotion of women because implementation of policies is the only sure way of enhancing gender equity. The findings of this study revealed that 50 percent of universities selected in this study had policies on recruitment and promotion. The study also found out that these policies were hardly implemented hence creating gender inequity in university management. In all the seven universities selected, men occupied over 70 % of management positions.

This implied that women are still lagging behind as far as university management is concerned. This study agreed with other studies carried out in relation to women career mobility. In a study carried out by Davidson & Burke (2004), it was noted that, while women advanced to university leadership roles, gender imbalance among senior university academics was an acknowledged problem in many countries.
Liberal feminism theory as discussed by Tong (1989) advocates the use of legal frameworks to address inequalities between men and women. This study agrees with the tenets of the theory in that universities can only enhance gender equity through implementation of policies on recruitment and promotion. This would enhance women career mobility in management of public and private universities in Kenya. The policies governing recruitment and promotion should also be gender responsive.

4.8.2 Effect of policies on recruitment and promotion on women career mobility

The study found out that very little was being done by the public and private universities to address the issue of gender imbalance in management. The employers need to help female managers cope with diverse conflicts. Majority of the respondents indicated that government policies on gender equality and equity and policies on gender monitoring systems had been less effective in addressing the challenges hindering women from progressing in their careers. Low number of women in management positions was attributed to lack of implementation of policies on recruitment and promotion by the public and private universities in Kenya. In conclusion, the study observed that in spite of good progress on integrating gender issues into policies to enhance gender equity in the society and economy, few resources were available and there was limited political will for implementation and the progress and change was slow. Women must therefore take personal responsibility for ensuring that they receive the training required and what it takes to progress in their careers.

Universities on the other hand should ensure that gender equity policies were implemented to provide a fair playing field for both men and women because given
the opportunity they can all perform well. This concurs with Catalyst (2004), he noted that women were as ambitious as men to attain chief Executive Officer positions. Their findings highlight that equal numbers of men (57%) and women (55%) wanted to occupy the most senior role (CEO or equivalent) in an organization; emphasizing that ambition for the most senior organizational positions was not lacking in women. There were other factors exterior to women that must be addressed by the public and private universities to enhance gender equity in university management. The only way universities can enhance gender equity is through implementation of policies on recruitment and promotion because policies guide recruitment and promotion of university managers.

The main challenge therefore was the lack of implementation of policies on recruitment and promotion. There should be mechanisms in the universities to ensure the policies are applied. Public and private universities should ensure that there are checks and balances to ensure there is no favoritisms during the recruitment and promotion of university managers so as to promote gender equity in promotion and recruitment consequently enhancing women career mobility in university management as advocated in the liberal feminism (1989).

4.8.3 Challenges hindering women career mobility in university management

Women faced insurmountable barriers as they navigated through their career path in universities in Kenya. These challenges faced by women contributed to low number of women in the realm of university management in public and private universities in Kenya. It was observed that, if women were to compete on the same level with their male counterparts concerted efforts to overcome these challenges had to be made by
women themselves and the universities. Some of the challenges included: Lack of mentors, family responsibilities, lack of social networks, lack of training and development opportunities, socialization of men and women and aspirations of women, and cultural values and attitudes that view women as inferior.

This study agrees with a study by Flanders (1994) who used the term “glass ceiling” to sum up the frustrations of working women at every level who could see where they wanted to advance but found themselves blocked by an invisible barrier.

This study echoes the findings of other studies; traditionally, women were viewed as inferior to men and marginalized in all sectors of development, Chacha (2004). This scenario is not only unique in Kenya but also in the entire Sub-Saharan Africa and the world. In the world of work, Eagly & Carli (2007) in their study on gender hierarchy relationships in the United Kingdom observed that barriers to women in management existed worldwide. Eagly & Carli (2001) observed that although women represented more than 40 percent of the world’s labour force, their share of management positions remained unacceptably low. Eagly & Carli (2001) observed that even in traditional feminine professions such as social work and education, women did not occupy key decision making positions in relation to their numbers. Women tended to stay in “doer” positions with low-paying jobs while men planned, organised, directed and controlled.

There was need therefore, to change societal attitudes and cultural situation that influenced female participation in management to make them more competitive. This agrees with Chodorow’s theory (1989) which observed that women remain
discriminated against in the labour force and unequal in the family and physical violence against women is not decreasing. She observed that we continue to live in a male dominated society, even though legal bases of male domination are eroding. There was need to put into practice a criteria for recruitment and promotion of university managers and implement available policies to increase women participation in university management and reduce the challenges that they encounter in their career mobility in public and private universities in Kenya.

4.8.4 Interventions used by universities to enhance women Career Mobility

The study established that the public and private universities were not doing enough to enhance women career mobility in university management. They pointed out that the available interventions were inadequate and ineffective in enhancing women career mobility. Some of the policies they cited were; equal employment opportunity policy, affirmative action strategy, national gender policy and strategic implementation framework for gender policy. However, the study revealed that the interventions were not effective in enhancing women career mobility in universities in Kenya. This observation agreed with the study by NCST (2010) which observed that despite some public universities having elaborate gender policies, they are not operational neither are gender considerations taken into their plans. The study observed that the university managers knew what was expected as far as enhancement of gender equity was concerned, but the study noted that the main challenge was implementation.

Comparing results from both public and private universities on interventions put in place to enhance women career mobility, it noted that one of the interventions cited
was the policy on equal opportunity employment policy which was hardly implemented. However a few respondents from private universities observed that the interventions like equal employment opportunity programme, gender mainstreaming and establishment of affirmative action were effective in the universities in Kenya.

However, a number of respondents from public universities were of the view that most of the policies were less effective in addressing challenges hindering women career mobility. These policies included; establishment of affirmative action, government policy on gender equality and equity. The respondents observed that the universities were not committed to implementing the policies.

If the public and private universities were to achieve gender parity in education management, adequate interventions must be sought and implemented. The existing interventions must be fully implemented and both men and women must agree there is a disparity in management that required some serious interventions. Women on the other hand should not wait for promotion on a silver platter. Riding on Chodorow’s (1999) argument on self awareness, women should be conscious of inequality in the university management and work consciously towards overcoming the challenges affecting them by changing the subconscious to face the reality of inequality and working towards dealing with it. It is important for women in university management to face the reality as it is. Accept that the society treats men and women differently and because they cannot change that reality, develop coping strategies so as to overcome the challenges that hinder their career mobility in educational management in both public and private universities in Kenya.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the summary and conclusions drawn from the findings of the study, recommendations were made and areas for further research suggested. The summary of the study was based on the study objectives.

5.2 Summary of the study

i. The purpose of the study was to establish the factors affecting women career mobility in university management. The study did a comparison of public and private universities in Kenya. The study was guided by the following objectives, to; establish the management positions occupied by men and women in public universities in comparison to the private universities in Kenya, analyse from a gender perspective, the university policies on recruitment and promotion and their effect on women career mobility in public universities compared to the private universities in Kenya, establish the challenges hindering women career mobility in public universities compared to the private universities in Kenya and finally examine the interventions put in place to enhance women career mobility in public universities in comparison to the private universities in Kenya.
5.2.1 Management positions occupied by men and women in public universities in comparison to private universities in Kenya.

The study established that governance and management of education were equally male-dominated and in both public and private universities, majority of management positions were occupied by men. These included the VCs, DVCs, Deans of Faculties and heads of departments. The disparity in management positions was caused mainly by lack of implementation of policies on recruitment and promotion. The participation of women in university management was very low and they were under-represented in university management and gender disparities existed at all levels.

The study established that public universities had more women in management positions in comparison to private universities in Kenya. The constitutional requirement of 1/3 gender rule for every appointment was yet to be implemented by some universities. However one public university headed by a woman had made strides as far as gender equity was concerned and had bypassed the thirty percent mark as far as gender equity in university management was concerned.

5.2.2 University Policies on recruitment and promotion

The study observed that despite the gender consideration on paper, there was little effort to mainstream gender in university management. More public universities compared to private universities had policies on recruitment and promotion. It was observed that most of the public and private universities had policies on recruitment and promotion but did not implement them. The criteria for promotions clearly articulated in the policy documents were rarely followed. This in turn negatively affected women career mobility in university management.
5.2.3 Challenges hindering women career mobility in public universities in comparison to private universities in Kenya

Challenges affecting women career mobility in university management included family, lack of social networks, lack of training and development opportunities, socialization of men and women and aspirations of women, and cultural values and attitudes that view women as inferior, lack of implementation of university policies on recruitment and promotion. The study observed that other factors like political factors affected women career mobility. Some posts like VC could be very political and individual effort could be inadequate.

5.2.4 Interventions put in place to enhance women career mobility

The study observed that both public and private universities had not put in place adequate interventions to enhance women career mobility. The study observed that gender mainstreaming and equal opportunity rule were some of the interventions seen as effectively addressing the challenges facing women career mobility in university management in Kenya.

5.3 Conclusions of the study

Based on the findings of the study the following conclusions were made:-

i. Men occupied more management positions compared to women in both public and private universities in Kenya

ii. In both public and private universities there were policies governing recruitment and promotion process. However, from the findings, the study concluded that most of the policies were not implemented and therefore, they were not effective in enhancing women career mobility. The policies
on recruitment and promotion had not been implemented leading to gender disparities in university management in public and private universities in Kenya.

iii. The study concluded that there were more women in management positions in public universities in comparison to private universities in Kenya.

iv. The study concluded that women faced insurmountable barriers as they navigated through their career ladder in public and private universities in Kenya. These included; male dominance in leadership, lack of mentors, lack of networks and cultural stereotypes.

v. The study concluded that women can overcome the challenges facing them in their career mobility in public and private universities in Kenya through realizing that gender inequalities exist and consciously working towards overcoming these inequalities that hinder their career mobility.

vi. The interventions put in place by public and private universities were not adequate in enhancing women career mobility in public and private universities.

5.4 Recommendations of the study

Based on the findings of the study and the study objectives, the research makes the following recommendations:

i. Men and women should be given equal opportunity during recruitment and promotion in public and private universities in Kenya by ensuring implementation of policies on recruitment and promotion to enhance women career mobility in educational management.
ii. Public and private universities should put in place checks and balances to ensure that policies on recruitment and promotion are adhered to, and implemented without discrimination to enhance gender equity and women career mobility in university management.

iii. Women should be aware of the gender inequalities and consciously make efforts to overcome the challenges hindering their career mobility in public and private universities in Kenya.

iv. A paradigm shift in dealing with the implementation of policies on recruitment and promotion in public and private universities in Kenya through reforming and changing the practices within the existing structures and policies of the university to enhance women career mobility in educational management.

5.5 Recommendations for further research

There is need to conduct further research on:

i. The challenges facing universities in implementing gender policies in Kenya.


iii. Interventions necessary to promote gender equity in university management

iv. Interventions that enhance women career mobility in university management.
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Dear Respondent,

Re: Participation in research

I am a postgraduate student pursuing a doctoral programme in Kenyatta University. I am conducting a research entitled “Factors Affecting Women Career Mobility in Educational Management: A comparative study of Public and Private Universities in Kenya” as one of the major requirements.

In this regard, you have been selected to take part in this study as a respondent. This interview will investigate your perception on the factors affecting women career mobility in university management in public universities in comparison to private universities in Kenya.

Kindly respond to all the items to reflect your opinion and experience. Please answer all the questions freely. You will not be identified from the information you provide and no information about individuals will be given to any organization. The data collected will be used for this academic research only.

Your participation is important for the success of this project and I greatly appreciate your contribution.

Yours Sincerely,

Janerose Mutegi Kibaara
I would like to ask you a few questions regarding women career mobility in university management. You will not be identified from the information you provide and no information about individuals will be given to any organization. The data collected will be used for this academic research only. Your participation is important for the success of this project and I greatly appreciate your contribution.

1. How did you get to the position you are holding? – (Probe on whether the position was advertised by the university, selection process and the length of time in that position).

2. Does your university have a gender equity policy? (Probe other policies on gender and on availability and the implementation of the policies).

3. Does the university have policies on recruitment and promotion of university managers? (Probe for existence and clarity of the policies on recruitment).

4. Kindly comment on the selection criteria for promotion. (Probe on the criteria for recruitment and promotion of staff and whether women apply for jobs when advertised, Probe for clarity and transparency of the criteria).

5. What challenges hinder women career mobility in university management in Kenya? (Probe on societal factors such as cultural stereotypes, institutional factors such as support systems, personal factors such as qualifications etc).

6. What interventions have been put in place by the university to address the challenges hindering women career mobility in universities in Kenya? (Probe on policies on gender equity and their implementation).
APPENDIX III: WOMEN CAREER MOBILITY QUESTIONNAIRE FOR UNIVERSITY MANAGERS

Introduction

I am a postgraduate student pursuing a doctoral programme in Kenyatta University, conducting a research on ‘Factors Affecting Women Career Mobility in Educational Management: a comparative study of Public and Private Universities in Kenya as one of the major requirements. In this regard, you have been selected to take part in this study as a respondent. This interview will investigate your perception on the factors affecting women career mobility in Public and Private Universities in Kenya.

Kindly respond to all items to reflect your opinion and experience. You will not be identified from the information you provide and no information about individuals will be given to any organization. The data collected will be used for this academic research only.

Your participation is important for the success of this project and I greatly appreciate your contribution.

Section A: Background Information

Kindly tick (√) the appropriate answer.

1. Which type of University do you work in?
   a) Private [ ]         b) Public [ ]

2. Please indicate your Faculty
   a) Arts [ ]           b) Science [ ]        c) Education [ ]          d) Medicine [ ]
   e) Others (Specify) ________________________________

3. Age: (Please tick the appropriate age)
   a) 25yrs & below [ ]   b) 26-30 years [ ]    c) 31-35 [ ]          d) 36-40 [ ]
   e) 41-45 [ ]          f) 46-50 [ ]        g) Over 50 [ ]
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4). Gender: Please tick the appropriate gender

    Male [    ] Female [    ]

5. Marital status: (Please indicate your marital status)

    a) Married [    ] b) Single [    ] c) Divorced [    ] d) Widowed [    ]

6. How many years have you been in University?

    a) 0-5 years [    ] b) 6-10 years [    ] c) 11-15 years [    ] d) 16-20 [    ]
    e) Any other.................................................................

7. Indicate your years of experience in University Management?

    a) 0-5 years [    ] b) 6-10 years [    ] c) 11-15 years [    ] d) 16-19 years [    ]
    e) 20 years& above [    ]

8. Indicate your highest academic qualification?

    a) Ph. D [    ] b) Masters [    ] c) Bachelors [    ] d) Any other.................................................................

9. a) Indicate Current position in the University

    a) Vice-chancellor [    ] b) DVC [    ] c) Dean of Faculty [    ]
    d) Head of Department [    ]
    e) Any Other .................................................................................................

    b) How did you assume your current position?

    a) Appointment [    ] b) Promotion [    ] c) Recruitment [    ]
    d) Any other.................

10. How many years have you been at your current institution?

    a) 0-5 years [    ] b) 6-10 years [    ] c) 11-15 years [    ] d) 16-20

11. a) Have you ever worked in any other University in a management position?

    Yes [    ] No [    ]

    b) If yes for how many years? 0-5 years [    ] b) 6-10 years [    ]
c) 11-15 years [ ] d) 16-20 [ ]

**Section B: Establishment of management positions by gender**

13.a) How many men and women are in management positions in your university?

b) In your opinion, who hold more management positions in this university?

   Men [ ]       Women [ ]

c) If your answer to C above is yes, please give reasons……………………………………

**Section C: Policies on recruitment and promotion of university managers.**

14.a) Do you know of any policies governing recruitment of university managers?

   Yes [ ]       No [ ]

b) If yes, on a scale of 1-5, please rate these factors on the extent to which they are used by the university to recruit people for available management positions in your university, Where 1= not at all, 2 = to some extent, 3 = Not sure, 4 = Certain extent 5 = Large extent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors for recruitment</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Academic qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hard-work/Competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Intelligence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Good human relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Years of Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Personality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Any other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. a) Is there a criteria for promotion in your University?

   Yes [ ]       No [ ]
b) If yes, to what extent does your university use the following criteria for promotion, on a scale of 1-5, Where 1= not at all, 2 to some extent, 3 Not sure, 4 = Certain extent  5 = Large extent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria for promotion</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.Competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.Past Performance appraisal ratings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.Political influence (patronage)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.Years of Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Any other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. a). Which of the following best describes the promotion process in your university?  a) Transparent   [  ]  b) Fair   [  ]  c) Unfair   [  ]  d) Equality   [  ]  e) arbitrary   [  ]  f) Any other..............................................................

b). Have you ever been promoted in the University?

  Yes   [  ]  No   [  ]

c) If yes, in your opinion what factors led to your Promotion?

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
17. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding the application of university policies on recruitment and promotion on a scale of 1-5, where, 1 = not at all, 2 = to some extent, 3 = not sure, 4 = certain extent and 5 = large extent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Universities use the policies in place regarding recruitment and promotion of university managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Appointment and promotion of university managers is done according to the university policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. There exist a gender policy on recruitment, appointment and promotion of university managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The University has a clearly defined policy on staff career progression from one grade to another.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. All employees in the university stand a better chance of promotion to the next grade.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Affirmative action has been used and is permitted in the university to help increase the recruitment of all staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The university has considered “gender mainstreaming” in its programmes to enhance women career mobility.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section D: Policies on Women Career Mobility**

18. The following policies enhance women career mobility, in your opinion, state their effectiveness on a scale of 1-5, where 1 = not effective, 2 = less effective, 3 = fairly effective, 4 = effective and 5 = very effective.
1. Equal Opportunity Rule
2. Affirmative Action strategy
3. Legislation in Favour of Women
4. National Gender policy
5. Strategic implementation framework for gender policy
6. Any Other

19. a) What is the percentage of management positions occupied by women in your university? a) Less than 25% [ ] b) More than 25% [ ] c) Less than 50% d) More than 50% e) Less than 75% [ ] f) More than 75% b). What factors would you attribute to this ____________________________

20. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following as some of the factors that influence the recruitment and promotion of staff in the university. On a scale of 1 – 5, where 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral/undecided, 4 = agree and 5 = strongly agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Attaining a number of years in Teaching experience</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. High qualifications or strong academic background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Previous work experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Attaining a certain Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Attaining an extra qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Favour with an immediate supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 People are automatically moved to the next job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. It is not clearly defined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section E: Women Career mobility in University management.

21a) What opportunities are there in your university to progress in your career?
   b) What are some of the factors that enhance your mobility?
22. In your opinion, please rate these factors according to the extent in which they lead to career mobility of women in university Management, on a scale of 1-5, where, 1= not at all, 2 = to some extent, 3 = Not sure 4 = certain extent and 5 = large extent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Producing high quality work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Availability of Opportunity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Support from the university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Hard work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Any Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23.a In your opinion, what are the factors that enhance women career mobility?

____________________________________________________________________________________

**Section F: Women career planning**

24. a) Do women have a career development plan? Yes [ ] No [ ]

b) What strategies do women put in place to enhance their career mobility?

____________________________________________________________________________________

25. What is your career development plan for the next five years?

____________________________________________________________________________________

**Section G: Challenges that hinder Women Career Mobility in university Management**

26 a) In your opinion, are there factors that inhibit women career mobility in universities in Kenya?

Yes [ ] No [ ]
b) Please elaborate on your answer in 25a

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

27 a). Are these challenges unique to women only in their career progression in your institution?

Yes [   ]   No [   ]

b). Please elaborate on your answer in 26a

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

28. Please indicate the extent to which the following factors have hindered women career mobility in the university on a scale of 1-5, where, 1= not at all, 2 = limited extent, 3 = Not sure 4 = certain extent and 5 = Large extent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lack of recognition at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lack of exposure to right experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Family Obligations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Lack of mentors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Male dominance in Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Any Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. In your opinion, what efforts have women put to overcome some of these challenges hindering their career mobility?

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Section H: Interventions put in place to address the Challenges hindering Women Career Mobility in universities in Kenya.

30. Below are policies that help in addressing the challenges hindering women career mobility. On a scale of 1-5, please rate their level of effectiveness in addressing the challenges, where 1= not effective, 2= less effective, 3= moderately effective, 4= effective and 5=very effective.
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31. Which of these programmes does the university use to enhance women career mobility in your university? Kindly tick (✓) the appropriate answer to indicate your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>May be</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Equal Employment Opportunity Programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gender Mainstreaming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Establishment of Affirmative Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Gender Monitoring Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Government policy on Gender equality and equity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Any Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) University based quality mentoring programmes
b) Benchmark the actions of other organizations that have facilitated the career advancement of women to senior-management positions.
c) Provide in-service training and development programmes for women in senior-management.
d) Conduct critical self-evaluations for possible overt and/or covert discrimination policies and/or attitudes in the university.

32. What interventions has the university put in place to enhance women career mobility?

_____________________________________________________________________

33. In your opinion, are the strategies put in place by the universities effective in enhancing Women Career Mobility?........................................................................................................................................................................................................
APPENDIX IV: DOCUMENT ANALYSIS GUIDE

1. University management by gender in the selected university by the time of data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Total no. M / F</th>
<th>VC M/F</th>
<th>DVC M/F</th>
<th>Deans M/F</th>
<th>Registrars M/F</th>
<th>HODs M/F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. University policies put in place on gender balance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. University Policies on gender equity by the time of research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. University guidelines on gender equity by the time of research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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