

How do students construct issues of gender and sexual diversity at UCT?

Lailaa Parker

Department of Psychology, University of Cape Town

Student number: PRKLAI003

Supervisor: Dr FlorettaBoonzaier

Senior Lecturer, Psychology Department, University of Cape Town

24 October 2013

Word Count:

Abstract: 201

Main Body: 9996

Abstract

Young men and women's constructions of gender and sexual diversity are key in understanding transformation processes at The University of Cape Town (UCT); however, these processes focus primarily on race and socioeconomic status diversity, with research into gender and sexual diversity lacking. This study therefore aims to understand the ways in which young men and women who are students at UCT construct issues of gender and sexuality within the UCT context. Focus groups were conducted with male and female students aged 18-27 about their experiences of being a young man or woman in South Africa, and their views on diversity at UCT. A thematic analysis was done, and the findings suggest that gender and sexual diversity is constructed through stereotypes, where young men and women conform to stereotypes of gender and sexuality; and difference, such as contextual and religious differences. Students also feel pressures to accept other people's view even if they do not agree with it, due to the fear of being seen as discriminatory. This research contributes on practical, theoretical as well as methodological levels to research and practice on transformation processes, as well as the field of gender and sexuality.

Keywords: gender, sexuality, transformation, diversity, students, qualitative research.

Background

Since the beginning of the post apartheid period in South Africa, attempts have been made to improve the living conditions of those South Africans negatively affected by apartheid (Qobo & Lindani, 2013). Higher education institutions such as the University of Cape Town (UCT) have taken a particular interest in creating diverse environments which cater to the needs of all students, in order to effectively transform the institution (Kessi, 2013). The majority of these transformation processes focuses only on issues of race and class, and fails to recognize the importance of issues of gender and sexual diversity. The present study aims to address some of these issues, and the role it plays in diversity and transformation in higher education institutions, with a particular focus on UCT.

Diversity in higher education

During the apartheid period, the education sector, among others in South Africa had discriminated against certain groups of people such as Black people (people of Black race) (Butler *et al.* 2003). Higher education institutions such as UCT were made up of mainly white, middle-class, heterosexual students, with little or no opportunities given to Black people or people of low socio-economic status (Steyn & van Zyl, 2001). Presently, however, UCT has undergone processes of transformation in order to correct the inequalities of the past (Kessi, 2013). These processes involve changing the demographics of the institution to achieve an enrolment profile more representative of South Africa's population (Fraser, 1997), as well as providing financial and academic assistance to those students who most need it, in order to better their chances of being successful in the working world (Soudien & Price, 2013). Another major process of transformation involves the "institutional climate" at UCT (Fraser, 1997). UCT attempts to create an 'institutional climate' or environment which is diverse, accepting, and free from discrimination (Fraser, 1997).

According to Cross (2004), it is important to have an understanding of what diversity is, as the way in which an institution interprets diversity could affect the way in which they achieve diversity and effective transformation. Cross (2004, pp. 392) talks about diversity as “aimed at embracing, or accommodating or engaging differences” or as

“Opening up the university to different people, all interested in studying at this university. It means that all staff should be able to meet the needs of each individual. It means accommodating as many people as possible with their differences. It means wishing to know about the other. It means different things to different people and institutions”.

In a study by Hurtado *et al.* (1999), it was found that a diverse environment in educational institutions is crucial for the preparation of students to meet the demands of a highly diverse society outside the realms of their learning environment. South African education systems are now being transformed to create diverse environments that are inclusive, tolerant, and non-discriminatory (Butler *et al.* 2003).

Soudien and Price (2013) explore the ways in which UCT has changed in the last 10 years, and found that it had become increasingly more diverse in the proportion of white students to black students, as well as low, middle and high class socio-economic status students enrolled in the institution. UCT has attempted to address the needs of all students by providing students with academic assistance and introducing extended degree programs to students from disadvantaged backgrounds, as in the past, individuals of certain races were discriminated against in this regard (Soudien & Price, 2013). UCT also has a race-based admissions policy, in order to ensure racial diversity in admissions and enrolment processes (Kessi, 2013).

Arbor (2004) looked at the educational outcomes of an ethnically and racially diverse environment, and found that students had more positive learning outcomes when they felt accepted and supported in their learning environments. In a study by Gurin *et al.* (2002), it is argued that a diverse environment with ‘helping programmes’ that cater to students’ specific needs helps students to adapt. According to Qobo and Lindani (2013), privilege and under-privilege are continuously being defined by race, with Blacks being seen as people of ‘low class’, and Whites being seen as the more ‘privileged race’. This is in line with the argument by Kessi (2013) that transformation processes can have

negative effects when they stigmatise Black students as needing ‘extra help’ and academic assistance at UCT, such as stereotypes of underperformance or incompetence of black students.

As we have seen above, most transformation processes at UCT focus primarily on race, and to a lesser extent, issues of class diversity.

Constructions of Gender and sexuality in young people

During tertiary education, majority of young men and women are at a stage in their lives where their identities, including their gender and sexual identities are still being shaped by a process of redefinition started in adolescence. According to Salo (2002), there are many factors included in the construction of young people’s sexuality. Young men and women are not the only ones involved in the construction of their sexuality; community factors, social relationships and social influences all play a role and inform this construction. Pattman and Bhana (2009) speak about sexuality intersecting with race, and the important role of race in the construction of sexuality, as well as in how young people view themselves. A big factor, however, is gender, and the gendered meanings of sexuality (Salo, 2002).

Within all societies, men and women are expected to behave in certain ways (Marston & King, 2006). The roles of men and women in society portray men as controlling, dominant, violent, and in positions of power, and women as submissive (Jackson *et al.*, 2000; Salo, 2002). Young men and women are brought up in a society where gender inequality in relationships amongst men and women is practiced and normalised, with men being painted as having all the decision making power in a relationship, and women painted as weak and powerless (Shefer & Foster, 2009; RÚdólfssdóttir & Jolliffe, 2008; Bosch & Holland-Muter, 2011). These gender roles may lead to certain negative behaviours, such as dating violence within young people’s relationships being “taken for granted” and seen as the outcome of natural gendered behaviour (Pattman&Bhana, 2009). Men are expected to be heterosexual, and sexually active, whereas women are expected to be sexually passive (Marston & King, 2006). According to Hollway’s ‘male sexual drive discourse’, men have sexual needs which are

constructed as biological urges outside of their control (Shefer & Ruiters, 2011). Being heterosexual, sexually active and powerful are all associated with masculinity, and not adhering to these requirements means being inferior to other men (Shefer & Ruiters, 2011). In a study by Pleck, Sonenstein and Ku (1994), using data from a Male Role Attitude Scale (MRAS), it was found that having traditional beliefs about, and conforming to the male role lead to homophobic attitudes in young men. Masculinity is also constructed as 'superior' to femininity, leading to discrimination and inequality towards women (Thoreson *et al.* 1993). In a South African study by Morrel (2007), however, the lack of research into masculinity was identified, and the claim that 'men are also victims of gender domination' was explored. There are many different types of masculinity, and the distribution of power amongst these masculinities is not equal, (with Black men having less power than White men, placing pressures on young men), just as the distribution of power is unequal between the genders (Morrel, 2007). Many young men and women hold these beliefs due to being socialized into these roles. Consequently, young men and women get exposed to these expectations and gender roles portrayed by society, and it is conforming to these roles and norms which contribute to the creation of gender and sexuality stereotypes and discrimination.

Discrimination based on gender and sexuality in young people

In South Africa, non-discrimination, inclusion and tolerance are encouraged throughout society, including the education sector, and this, along with freedom of sexual orientation is considered as a basic human right in the constitution of South Africa (Butler *et al.* 2003). As mentioned previously, tertiary education institutions promote diversity and transformation for the betterment of students' lives. However, on certain levels, discrimination and intolerance still exists towards individuals based on their gender and sexuality (Butler *et al.* 2003).

In a South African study by Butler *et al.* (2003), the 'coming out' (admitting to homosexuality) experiences of youth in secondary or tertiary education between the ages of 16-21 years was examined. It was found that all the participants had experienced various forms of discrimination, intolerance and isolation in each of their educational

contexts. Participants reported that their educational environment was very stereotypical, and did not foster acceptance of homosexuality. These experiences of what has come to be known as ‘homophobia’ had negative effects on their psychosocial development as well as their educational outcomes. Although homophobia is anti-constitutional, and choice of sexual orientation is considered a human right, many people still have homophobic tendencies and attitudes (Butler *et al.* 2003).

A study by Petros *et al.* (2006) looked at the way in which individuals with HIV and AIDS are ‘othered’, and how certain groups of people are ‘blamed’ for the spread of HIV and AIDS. Focus groups were conducted with young people aged 18-24 years, as well as adults aged 25-49 years in South Africa, however the results of the 18-24 age category is particularly relevant to this research study. It was found that homosexuality is perceived as the source of AIDS, and women are blamed for HIV transmission. This shows discrimination and negative attitudes towards these two groups amongst young people in South Africa (Petros *et al.* 2006).

According to Meyer (2003), because of alienation, stigma, prejudice and discrimination towards homosexuality, homosexual individuals have a higher prevalence of mental illness than heterosexual individuals. The discrimination of those from the dominant social categories creates a stressful environment for those of the stigmatized minority social categories, which the researcher refers to as ‘minority stress’ (Meyer, 2003). As we have seen, stereotypes and discrimination of gender and sexuality could have negative impacts on the lives of students, and their educational as well as health outcomes. This makes it an important issue to explore and understand. It is therefore important to consider the way in which young people in tertiary education construct ideas about gender and sexuality, and how this affects diversity and transformation in higher education institutions such as UCT. Research into the effects of gender and sexual diversity on transformation processes does not exist, and this study therefore aims to explore these issues, and how young people construct gender and sexual diversity at UCT.

AIMS OF THE RESEARCH PROJECT

This study aims to explore the ways in which students at UCT construct issues of gender and sexual diversity at UCT, and how this may intersect with issues of race and class diversity as well as how it may shape transformation processes at UCT.

The research question for this study is “How do students construct gender and sexual diversity at UCT?”

METHODS AND DESIGN

Theoretical framework

The main theoretical concepts or topics being analysed in this research will be gender and sexuality, as well as diversity and transformation. This will be approached using a social constructionist theoretical framework. The social constructionist perspective is concerned with explaining the processes by which people come to describe, explain, or interpret the world in which they live (Gergen, 1985), or the way in which meaning is created (Freud, 1994). It involves the notion that people’s understanding of reality is socially situated (Butler, 1990). Language is an important focus as it holds that the human world is fundamentally constituted in language, or that language helps to construct reality (Wilson & Maclean, 2011).

Gender norms are socially created, meaning that certain behaviours or ways of being that society viewed as “what a boy does” and “what a girl does” became normalized, and individuals then internalize social expectations for these norms and behave accordingly (Butler, 1990). Lorber (1994) describes gender as being constantly created and recreated by society and human interaction. This in turn has led to the term ‘doing gender’, which refers to the way in which gender roles are fulfilled or socially practiced, instead of gender being naturally occurring (West & Zimmerman, 1987).

Categories of masculinity and femininity are created by society, and are seen as opposites to each other. This would mean that ‘gender’ is not an inherent property of the

individual, but the expression of socially constructed norms for masculinity and femininity (Butler, 1990; West & Zimmerman, 1987).

Gender has become such a familiar part of daily life that it has formed a part of our expectations of how a man and women should be, without us even realizing it (Lorber, 1994). Gender has also been linked to sexuality, in that “one’s perception of their sexuality is an extension to their perception of their gender” (Diamond & Butterworth, 2008, pp.366). It would therefore be useful to understand these two concepts together, as shaping each other.

Because gender has become so embedded in social aspects of life, and is seen as a concept which is socially constructed, the social constructionist perspective would be the appropriate framework to use for this study. In addition, this study aims to look at how young men and women themselves construct gender and sexuality, and the implications this has on diversity and transformation at UCT, which would also form a part of the social constructionist perspective.

An intersectionality theoretical approach will also be used in the analysis of this research. Intersectionality refers to the “interaction of categories of difference”, such as race, gender, class, sexuality and many others, and can have an effect on various aspects of social structures, such as equality and transformation (Hancock, 2007). Researchers have found that there are limitations to analyzing gender or sexuality as single categories, separate to other categories (McCall, 2005). Transformation processes, diversity, as well as gender and sexuality involves many different categories, which are not entirely separate from each other. The ways in which young people construct issues of gender and sexual diversity involves an intersection between race, class, gender and sexuality. In example, research shows that masculinity intersects with and is shaped by class and race factors, with men of certain class and race having more ‘dominant’ masculinities compared to others, and power associated with the masculine role can not be studied as separate to class and race (Morrel, 2007). In a study by (Vakulenko, 2011), it was argued that discrimination can not be explored without taking into consideration religious difference, which in her study intersected with the reasons why individuals discriminated

towards Muslim women wearing headscarves (Vakulenko, 2011). Since an intersectionality approach allows for the analyses of the interaction of these categories, it is important to look at these issues through a lens of intersectionality as well (McCall, 2005).

Qualitative research methods

According to Ospina (2004, pp. 1), qualitative research is defined as “a form of systematic empirical inquiry into meaning”. This type of research is grounded in the world of experience, and trying to understand the way in which individuals make sense of their experiences (Ospina, 2004). Qualitative research involves the interpretation of subjective experiences of individuals, and finding meanings behind these experiences (Wilson & Maclean, 2011), and consists of comparing ideas with observations (Stiles, 1999). Knowledge is constructed through meaning, with language being viewed as an important tool in creating meaning.

Qualitative research is able to tell one about different aspects of particular phenomena, and can address certain features which quantitative methods can not, such as the subjective experiences of individuals (Wilson & Maclean, 2011). In addition, qualitative research includes sensitivity to contextual factors, and increased flexibility to follow unexpected ideas which may arise in the data (Ospina, 2004). Qualitative researchers have a high degree of engagement with their data, aiming for a holistic picture of the phenomenon being researched (Seale, 1999; Ospina, 2004). The researcher is a tool in the research process; however, participants are important in the creation of meaning, as it is their subjective experiences that are interpreted (Wilson & Maclean, 2011).

Qualitative research was the most appropriate approach for this study because the aim was to investigate how young men and women construct issues of diversity of gender and sexuality. I was therefore interested in their subjective constructions of experience and how meaning is created in these experiences. Qualitative research also takes the

social context seriously, as meaning is understood as being shaped within the context. This research aimed to explore UCT students' constructions of gender and sexuality as well as diversity as it is shaped by the particular contexts of their lives (e.g. religious contexts), as well as the context of the university itself.

Sample and data collection

The sample for this study was recruited from the University of Cape Town. Nine male and 16 female students were recruited (sample characteristics detailed in Table 1) using posters advertising the study placed throughout the campus (see Appendix A). A meal voucher was offered to those willing to participate in order to help encourage students to participate in the study. Criteria for inclusion were that participants are full time students at UCT. The age range of participants was between 18 and 27. Five focus group discussions were held with the recruited participants. All the focus groups were composed of both male and female students, but varied in the amount of males and females in each group. The focus groups discussions were audio recorded and transcribed.

TABLE 1. Sample characteristics

Characteristic	Categories	n (N = 25)
Race	White	2
	Indian	9
	Coloured	3
	Black	9
Age	18-19yrs	6
	20-21yrs	12
	22-23yrs	6
	24-25yrs	0
	26-27yrs	1
Gender	Males	9
	Female	16

Focus groups

A focus group is a type of interview that attempts to study group interaction on a topic determined by the researcher. The participants in the group interact with one another and with the researcher (Wilson & Maclean, 2011). Focus groups are more dynamic than interviews, and have the advantage of creating joint meanings rather than meaning from just one individual. The role of the researcher is to facilitate the discussion (Wilson & Maclean, 2011). Focus groups encourage participants who are reluctant to be interviewed on their own, to actively participate in the discussion and could therefore be considered a method that might empower our research participants (Kitzinger, 1995). Since this study involved topics which may have been sensitive to some participants, participants might have been reluctant to share their experiences in an individual interview, whereas in a focus group, they were given the opportunity to exchange experiences and find other individuals with similar experiences. Focus group methods are particularly useful in examining *how* people think (Kitzinger, 1995), and considering that this study aimed to explore *how* young men and women construct issues of gender and sexual diversity, focus groups were appropriate for this aim. Focus groups are also deemed to be an appropriate tool to explore the question of how young men and women *collectively* construct meanings about gender, sexuality and diversity, as it allows for the construction of joint meaning.

In this study, the focus groups were semi-structured but flexible. The researcher introduced the topic of sexuality and gender and asked general questions to help feed the discussion. The discussion was elicited by asking general questions about gender and sexuality, such as “what does the word gender mean to you”. In all focus groups, the discussions lead to questions asked by the researcher around the participants’ understanding of gender and sexuality, and the way in which they experience gender, as well as how they experience gender and sexuality in the UCT context. Examples were:

“What do you think it means to be a man or a woman in today’s society?”

“Tell me about your lives as young men or young women?”

“What issues do you struggle with as young men or women?”

“What do you think of the diversity at UCT?”

Given the semi-structured design of the focus group, the discussion followed in the direction these questions took it. If further stimulus was needed for the discussion, a list of questions was drawn up to be used as probes (See Appendix B).

Reliability and validity

The criteria for evaluating qualitative research differ to that of quantitative research (Stiles, 1999). Issues of reliability and validity are more difficult to apply to qualitative research, as we are dealing with subjective data instead of objective data (Wilson & Maclean, 2011).

Reliability refers to a measure producing the same result from one time to another, meaning it can be generalizable from one population to another (Wilson & Maclean, 2011). Qualitative research is not too concerned with results being the same in different situations, however, as two individuals could interpret similar experiences in different ways. This type of research is more concerned with understanding a particular phenomenon relative to a certain context, or in a more common “everyday sense of the world” (Wilson & Maclean, 2011). Research is assessed within the context it takes place (Wilson & Maclean, 2011).

Validity is concerned with measures of psychological constructs, or the indication of the degree to which the study measures what it claims to measure (Wilson & Maclean, 2011). One way to address validity in qualitative research is to rely on a consensus of judgment between researchers. Interpretations are assessed and a conclusion is reached (Stiles, 1999). Another way could be the use of triangulation, or the assessment of the data using various standpoints or paradigms. This shows that the data can be approach in a number of ways in qualitative research, without being ‘incorrect’ (Wilson & Maclean, 2011). In this study, various sources of literature were consulted in order to check the credibility or plausibility of my interpretations. In addition, my supervisor served as a co-researcher in terms of checking my interpretations in order to see if there is a consensus of judgment between us.

ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

There are various ethical issues which were taken into consideration for this study:

Consent

An informed consent form had been developed, and was given to all participants partaking in the study at the beginning of the focus group (see attached Appendix C). The researcher went through the consent forms with the participants in order to ensure that they fully understood its contents before signing.

All participants were also informed that participation in the study was completely voluntary, and that they could withdraw from the study at any time, without any negative consequences or questions being asked. They were also informed that they may refuse to answer certain questions which they did not wish to answer or were not comfortable with. Since all the focus groups were audio recorded, the participants needed to be made aware of this, and give permission. Any information given by participants during the focus groups could later be requested by participants to be removed.

Confidentiality and anonymity

In order to keep the information given by participants confidential, only researchers were allowed access to any raw data (e.g. recordings of the focus groups), which were stored in a safe place in my supervisor's office. All names and identifying data were changed in transcripts. At the beginning of the focus group, a group contract was drawn up with the agreement that no participants would discuss information shared during the focus group with anyone else outside of the focus group. The limit to this, however, is that it cannot be guaranteed that participants will adhere to this agreement. Another limit to the attempt to preserve confidentiality and anonymity is that the data from the focus groups is being written up in the form of a research project and may be published in an academic journal. These possible threats to confidentiality were included in the consent forms as well as explained to all participants.

Debriefing

At the end of the focus group, participants were given the opportunity to ask any potential questions they may have had about the study, or any other concerns they may have had.

Harms and benefits

No direct harm came to participants during the study, and all disclosure from participants was dealt with in an ethically sensitive manner.

With regards to benefits, there were no tangible benefits to participation other than the fact that participants were given a meal voucher for their participation in the focus groups as well as an opportunity to share their opinions with a group of other young people

Reflexivity

When doing qualitative research, the role of the researcher needs to be acknowledged, as well as any important subjective and contextual factors that may have a potential influence on the construction of the data (Macbeth, 2001; Wilson & Maclean, 2011).

I (the researcher) am an Indian, middle class female. My identity as a female may have an impact on the data that was collected during the focus group discussions. Given that some of my participants were female, they may have reacted or responded towards me in a way that may be different to the way they would have reacted to a male. The same could apply to the male participants. They may have reacted or responded towards me in a way that may be different were they to have the same discussion with a male. The fact that I am Indian (both my race and culture) may have also influenced the way participants of different races and cultures reacted towards me, or the way we communicated and understood each other. The above mentioned in turn might have affected the type of discussion and data elicited. My own personal experiences and

investment in the area of research may impact the way in which I interpreted the data. In this research, I took on the ethos of critical constructionist research and attempted to be aware of how my various identities may have impacted upon my interactions with my research participants as well as my interpretations of their data.

Data Analysis

The data for this study was analyzed using thematic analysis. Thematic analysis refers to a method identifying themes or patterns in the data (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Wilson & Maclean, 2011), and offers an accessible and theoretically flexible approach to the analysis of qualitative data (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Because of the flexibility of thematic analysis, it is not associated with a specific framework (Braun & Clarke, 2006). It can therefore be applied to the social constructionist and intersectionality framework used for this study. Meanings are considered across a set of data, and can be flexible, although an important issue to consider is that the finished product or study contains an account of how this analysis was done (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

Thematic analysis can be done using a series of steps (Braun & Clarke, 2006). These steps may not occur in a linear process, as the researcher may move back and forth between these steps (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Wilson & Maclean, 2011). Firstly, data collection needs to occur, which is usually done in the form of written text or prescribed speech (Wilson & Maclean, 2011). Secondly, the researcher needs to familiarize themselves with the data, so that the researcher can begin coding the data. Next, the researcher searches for themes and sub-themes. Once this is done, the final stage of analysis, reviewing and refining the themes can be done. In the end, these themes were interpreted for the final write up (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

RESULTS/ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

In the thematic analysis on the transcripts following these steps by Braun and Clarke (2006), three main themes were identified: Diversity at UCT: real or a show?; Stereotypical constructions; and the construction of difference (with sub-themes of

contextual difference and religious differences). It is acknowledged that due to the social constructionist perspective used in this research, these transcripts may be interpreted differently as themes may not represent an objective reality, but the researcher's interpretation of the data. This makes this research both inductive and deductive, as theory has been taken into account, but the researcher's own interpretation is used as well. Pseudonyms have been used for all names mentioned in the analysis.

Diversity at UCT: real or a show?

UCT has been trying to undergo efficient transformation processes since the post-apartheid era, and has been trying to create a more diverse and accepting environment (Kessi, 2013). In line with this, some students constructed UCT as very diverse, and described the environment at UCT as open and free, especially when compared to other contexts:

Jessica: I did my degree at UWC so I came here this year...and what I noticed is that UCT promotes almost a diversity of cultures and people can be free here and be who they want to be...where at UWC [...] I find that there uhm, you cant necessarily be what, its not like, like there people are still very like...its not like here[...] And uhm, still like, with regards to sexuality you don't see as much homosexuals there [...] (FG 1)

In the extract above, Jessica compares UCT and UWC, and constructs UCT as successfully promoting diversity, or at least creating a platform to foster acceptance and diversity, including sexual diversity, in comparison to UWC. This indicates that Jessica constructs issues of diversity at UCT by comparing it to other environments. Compared to other institutions, UCT seems more diverse because of the intolerant or discriminatory environments of other institutions such as UWC in Jessica's construction. Jessica's statement however refers more to the institutional environment, and not necessarily to the students within the institution. When looking at the opinions and views of the students themselves, the data was contradictory and produced contrasting views:

***Carol:** I think it's (homosexuality) a personal choice and its got nothing to do with anybody its like...its like choices that I make by myself that shouldn't bother other people (FG 3)*

***Junaid:** I don't think there's anything wrong with being gay or being lesbian...(FG 5)*

Carol and Junaid both show acceptance of homosexuality, by saying that there is 'nothing wrong' with it. This is in line with past research supporting UCT's transformation processes being successful (Soudien & Price, 2013). However, this is not always the case. In contrast to the view that UCT is accepting and truly diverse, students expressed the view that UCT only seems diverse on the outside, but when looked at more closely, seems to just be 'putting on a show':

***Jeremy:** I feel like UCT is putting on a little show, that, they like 'oh we LOOK so diverse' and yes we accept everyone but...there's a homophobic undertone [...], people, gay people just don't feel comfortable like being as expressive as they should be allowed to be [...] but I definitely think UCT has like, wants to be seen as 'oh we're so free' but it has a definite undertone of, its...(FG 1)*

Jeremy above describes UCT as only looking diverse on the outside, but when looking closely to the inside, there are underlying discriminations and intolerance, or a 'homophobic undertone' as Jeremy suggests. The notion of diversity at UCT as a 'show' was brought up repeatedly by participants. There is a sense that many students within the university are not actually accepting, even though they 'seem' to be, which would mean that the university is not actually as diverse as it claims to be, or the issue of diversity can be seen in terms of numbers (eg. number of black people has increased compared to the past), so it looks diverse but there is still a climate of intolerance. Similarly, Butler *et al.* (2003) suggests that even though non-discrimination and acceptance is encouraged in the education sector, certain levels of discrimination and intolerance still exists. In line with

this, UCT as an institution encourages diversity and acceptance; however certain levels of discrimination and intolerance exist within the UCT context. This could lead to the assumption that perhaps the transformation processes at UCT need to focus more on gender and sexual diversity, as these areas of difference are not successfully transformed.

In a different focus group, a similar view was given, that UCT as an institution may be diverse in numbers, but the students within the institution are not as accepting and diverse with regards to who they choose as friends or who they choose to associate themselves with:

Danyaal: Well I was thinking, if you look at UCT in general, its very diverse but, if you go inside, you'll still see cliques of the same type of people together, so there's no...there isn't much interaction between the different diverse groups

Facilitator: Where do you see the cliques?

Danyaal: We a clique (referring to group of Muslims/Indians sitting together in a group) (FG 2)

Danyaal speaks of UCT being very diverse in general with regards to the diversity of races found within the university, which is in line with the racial transformation processes UCT tries to achieve (Soudien & Price, 2013). However, Danyaal says that even though there is a mixture of races within the university, these students still don't interact with each other, which according to Danyaal does not reflect true acceptance or diversity between the groups. Similarly, patterns of racial segregation have been found at UCT in dining halls and friendship circles in past literature (Schrieff, *et al.* 2005; Zuma, 2013). Therefore, according to some students, diversity is related to the interaction between different groups, which is a sign that the groups accept each other and get along. As (Morrel, 2007) argues, race and culture intersects with sexuality, and the racial

segregation of Black and White students could show an intersection between race and sexual diversity, as young men of different races do not really interact with each other, which could indicate 'differences' in masculinity, and the way in which young men perceive and judge each other.

Although some students construct UCT as having a climate of intolerance, the 'image' of diversity at UCT is still upheld. This is brought up by participants, who provide reasons why UCT may still 'seem' diverse:

***Sarah:** I really do think people are not really strong enough to say 'Nooo we don't want this' I think they will just sit in the shadows [...](FG 1)*

Sarah above suggests that students are not accepting, but are not confident enough to go against what other people believe in, and constructs this as the reason why UCT is still portrayed as diverse, even though there are students within the university who oppose this. This leads us to another way in which students construct diversity and acceptance at UCT, which is that they are 'pressured to accept'. Many students construct themselves as people who do not discriminate against others, but this may not necessarily be because they truly accept difference. Participants suggest that they feel 'forced' to accept certain things, because of the fear of being seen as discriminatory if they speak up against views they don't agree with:

***Isabel:** Well I think of how uhm, society has forced, somehow, forced everyone to accept uhm, gay marriages and lesbian marriages and to accept that, okay not only to accept, but to go beyond just accepting it, and being comfortable when seeing it...so even though, I can say not be comfortable with it, but I'm forced to, because that's what's around me*

and if I'm not, then it would be seen as discrimination...which I wont be discriminating but ya[...] (FG 2)

As Isabel suggests, students construct themselves as 'obligated' in a sense to accept views which they may not even agree with, for if they speak up against these views they will be seen as discriminatory. Based on this, it may be this fear of being seen as discriminatory which leads to students accepting difference, as acceptance is now seen as the 'norm'.

On the one hand, some students in the UCT environment are accepting of differences, and describe UCT as diverse and having an environment which fosters freedom of expression. Other students, however, view UCT as only creating an image of being diverse, and that the people within the university are not in fact accepting, and still discriminate against others, which is in line with Butler *et al.* (2003), who argues that discrimination and intolerance still exist in the education sector even in environments where non-discrimination and acceptance is encouraged. Students suggest that one of the reasons UCT's image of diversity is upheld is because of the pressure to accept, due to the fear of being seen as discriminatory if they do not accept the views of others, or do not accept difference. The theme of views of diversity being real or a show shaped the opinions students may have about diversity at UCT. Many students clearly believe that there are still issues of discrimination and intolerance at UCT. This would have implications for transformation processes at UCT, since students construct these processes as ineffective, especially with regards to sexual diversity. There are various reasons why this may be the case, and based on the views and experiences of participants, some reasons are explored below.

Stereotypical constructions

Stereotypes refer to a "socially shared set of beliefs about traits that are characteristic of members of a social category" (Greenwald & Banaji, 1995).

Stereotyping was evident across the entire data set, and students continuously drew on stereotypes to describe their views and opinions. The way in which students construct and view stereotypes of gender and sexuality influences the way in which they believe men and women are *supposed* to behave, and based on this, they construct issues of diversity and acceptance of men and women's behaviour in the context of UCT.

Conforming to stereotypes

Although most students opposed stereotypical views of how men and women should behave, at times they still seemed to conform to these stereotypes, either unconsciously or consciously. Both male and female students conformed to the typical role of men being 'strong and masculine' and women taking the more submissive role in dating relationships:

Rose: I personally like a strong masculine guy, I don't want to lie...

Carol: I second that

(laughter)

Rose: I...I mean you [the man] obviously have to pay for the first date and you have to ask me out...uh I don't know, I don't know what society's point of view is about that, (other girls: that's what it is) but like that's my personal preference...you know, and I know that girls are asking guys out and stuff like that, but you have to hunt me down

(laughter)

That's what I prefer, that's what I'm attracted to

Sandy: And I think also that's what we've gotten used to coz I know, if you like try and ask a guy out, like my guy friends always tell me, never ever approach a guy, he will not appreciate you because he never had to climb the wall

Ruth: Yeah

Sandy: He didn't chase you, he doesn't know what that feels like so he won't appreciate you, so I think that's what we've gotten used to now that you must just wait...and then ya...he will come

(Laughter)

Chris: some guys will think like 'oh, she came to ask me out, she must be desperate or something so I'm not going to go for it' (FG 3)

In the extract above, the participants conform to the ideas of men being the dominant 'provider' that has to pay, and females position themselves as submissive, who have to wait for the men to 'hunt' them, and would be seen as desperate if they tried to act in the way that a male is stereotypically supposed to behave, by 'asking a boy out'. This is in line with previous research about the roles of men and women, with men being constructed as dominant, and the females as submissive within dating relationships (Jackson *et al.*, 2000; Salo, 2002). This links to the theme of how conforming to stereotypes may lead to a lack of acceptance, and how students may 'judge' other students for acting in a way that is different to the norm, just as girls would be judged or seen as 'desperate' for asking a boy out, as Chris says above. Rose and the other girls in the extract above acknowledge that they are conforming to stereotypes, but describe it as a choice or preference. Rose refers to the type of partner she wants as a "strong masculine guy", showing that she associates masculinity with strength and power. This could reinforce stereotypes of young men and women, leading to harsher judgment of deviance from these stereotypes. In line with intersectionality research, this would show an interaction between gender stereotypes and transformation, and how youth use gender stereotypes to construct issues of gender diversity and acceptance (McCall, 2005).

According to previous research, young men and woman are exposed to stereotypical gender roles and expectations within society (Shefer & Foster, 2009), which has become so ingrained in the minds of youth growing up with these messages from society (Pattman&Bhana, 2009) that this may be why majority of the time, conforming to

stereotypes may be unconscious, as they have become a 'norm'. However, in line with previous research, young men and women sometimes feel under pressure to act in a certain way because of the messages they receive from society about how they should behave (Salo, 2002). Based on these stereotypes of how to be a man and how to be a woman, students are judged on how much or how 'well' they carry out these roles:

Kyle: [...] I mean guys are pretty much allowed to do whatever they want to do, but uhm obviously if you do something a bit feminine you seen as inferior to another guy (FG 2)

In the above extract, young men are seen as 'inferior' if they do something 'meant for the other role'. According to Thoreson *et al.* (1993), the male role is defined as having status, being tough, and not engaging in 'traditionally feminine' activities, and if a man does not fulfill these three requirements, he loses his 'masculine' status. Similarly, Kyle speaks of a guy being 'inferior' to other guys if they do something meant for the other role. In a study by Pleck, Sonenstein and Ku (1994), it was found that having traditional beliefs about the male role lead to homophobic attitudes in young men. Another key factor of the masculine role is that it is heterosexual, therefore painting homosexual men as 'inferior' and 'non-masculine' (Shefer & Ruiters, 2011). This could be how non-acceptance or prejudice of homosexuality develops in the UCT context, as homosexuality is associated with males acting in female roles, and going against the traditional male role. The risk of adhering to the masculine role includes being 'anti-feminine', where women are seen as 'the opposing side' (Thoreson *et al.* 1993). In connection to this, men and women are also judged differently on their sexuality, with women being judged more harshly:

Rina: [...] There's still like women are like judged more heavily based on their actions, I'm speaking about like now as a young adult, like if you had to dress in a certain way or behave in a certain way compared to guys [...] Just like a general example that, if a guy had to go out with an x amount of people and a girl had to go out with the same amount

of people, like the girl would be like seen as more like, like she would maybe be called a slut or whatever whereas a guy wouldn't get that label.

Kyle: *...But I'm just saying like it goes back to the animal nature of a guy I mean you know the hunters kind of thing you know, prey...I mean I'm not trying to generalize here (laughter), I'm just saying that is kind of how its seen in uhm..[...] its how we are...it's not like you can control it (FG 2)*

With regards to the way woman dress as well as their sexuality, woman are expected to be more 'chaste' (Marston & King, 2006). Similarly, Rina describes how women are judged more if they dress in a way that is not 'normal' for the female role. Kyle describes men as having an 'animal nature' which can not be controlled. This is in line with Hollway's 'male sexual drive discourse' (Shefer & Ruiters, 2011), which includes the notion that men have sexual needs which are biological urges outside of their control (Shefer & Ruiters, 2011). The fact that Kyle and many other male participants hold the belief that it is 'not something they can control', shows how young men and women conform to these stereotypes. Men and women who behave in ways other than what is expected are judged harshly by their peers. In line with intersectionality research, this would show an interaction between stereotypes of sexuality, and transformation and intolerance, and how youth use these stereotypes to construct issues of sexual diversity (McCall, 2005). Students also assume things about homosexual relationships, while at the same time reinforcing stereotypically gendered ideas:

Jessica: *But isn't it also like, in a relationship with two guys or two females there's also still the dominant [...]no I'm just, I know, like, I've heard like there is still the 'dominant' one and the one that's like female (FG 1)*

Jessica in the extract above associates male with the 'dominant' role, and also assumes there has to be a male and female even in a same sex relationship. This points to conforming to traditional stereotypes of male and female roles, and could also indicate that young men and women construct relationships as needing to have both of these roles.

Conforming to stereotypes of what is typical female and male behaviour is an important contributor to prejudice and intolerance, as students become intolerant of homosexuals who behave in ways contradictory to their gendered expectations:

***Rose:** Uhm, I'm not a homophobe, please don't get me wrong, but I get confused sometimes...you know you get people that say, okay well girls for instance, they say I'm a lesbian and stuff like that, and then you date a girl, and then you start acting like a guy...so what are you saying, are you saying that to be in a relationship, there must be a female, or a person that plays a female role and a male you know...and you find gays, and then they...o.m.g they, okay, and then there will be a guy that starts acting like a girl, and cross-dressing so what are you saying, coz for me its like you contradicting yourself, you saying, I'm a guy, I like other guys but then, in a relationship there must be one of us who plays, who has a female role that sort of thing, you know, which basically it takes us back to uhm the fact that in a relationship okay, I'm not saying that's how it should be I'm just, well its my opinion, it should be a male and a female...you know so it confuses me (FG 3)*

Rose has almost exactly the same view as Carl when talking about his views on gay people:

***Carl:** Uhm it becomes a bit of an issue when guys try to be like girls...so it's like they become very...like feminine and dramatic and stuff like that and I just personally can't take that... (FG 5)*

Rosa and Carl above associate homosexuality with men and women trying to 'go against' their traditional roles, which is when homosexuality becomes a problem for them. According to Shefer and Potgieter (2006), because heterosexuality has been normalized, homosexuality becomes problematised in South African society. This is seen in the extract above, where Rose says "it should be a male and a female", so to her, heterosexuality is what is normal and accepted, and this is what leads to the intolerance of homosexuality. Rose further explains that it is because of the fact that it is "supposed" to

be a male and female relationship, which is what leads to her confusion about men and women going against their traditional gender roles. This again indicates that Heteronormativity is what leads to students being intolerant of homosexuality, in line with Shefer and Potgieter (2006), where heterosexuality is seen as the correct and ideal sexual orientation. Students rely on stereotypes of gender, and then apply them to sexuality, especially homosexuality, where they become intolerant when males start behaving in ways that are 'meant' for females, and females start acting in ways that are 'meant' for males. This indicates that young men and women conflate sexual orientation with gender roles, which is how discrimination and intolerance towards certain sexualities develop. Evidently, conforming to stereotypes of gender affects students' views about acceptance, as they judge others according to these stereotypes.

Although the conformity of stereotypes is one way in which non-acceptance and discrimination is increased, it is not the only way. Students at UCT are very different, in many ways, and these differences have an effect on diversity and acceptance at UCT.

The construction of difference

Young men and women come from different contexts, cultures, backgrounds and religions, and these differences affect the way in which they view the world. They then come into a particular context such as UCT with these views, which then affects how they construct ideas of acceptance and diversity, as well as whether or not they discriminate or are prejudiced towards certain groups of people.

Contextual difference

Students come into UCT from different contexts, and construct their home contexts as different to the UCT context in terms of values and cultures. They then construct ideas of gender and sexual diversity by comparing their home context to UCT.

Carla: [...] Ya and I think like in the townships, people are more...private or secretive about their sexuality, like ...like everyone is free here (UCT) about their sexuality ...and like in the townships people get beaten for (agreement in the background) their sexuality and they get killed (FG 1)

Carla compares the township context to the UCT context, where homosexuality is severely punished. In South African townships, lesbian women are ‘punished’ for their sexual orientation (Mieses, 2009). Homosexuality is seen as a punishable offense in these townships, and lesbian women are raped (known as corrective rape) or even killed (Gontek, 2007). Carla refers to this when she speaks about people getting beaten for their sexuality in the townships. Young men and women come from these backgrounds where corrective rape occurs, and homosexuality is seen as something needing to be fixed. Coming to UCT with past exposure to negative attitudes towards homosexuality could be why some students construct homosexuality as a ‘bad’ thing, leading to lack of acceptance and discrimination.

Isabel: Okay for me, I come from Zim (Zimbabwe), so back in Zim, I’ve never experienced uhm, gays and lesbians and stuff like that...and coming here to UCT was like a big change... you not used to it, you see guys kissing or you see girls kissing [...] uhm I’ve never seen that in Zim before, uhm, so it’s a very different change and how they uhm...okay I’m not going to be saying no I’m not comfortable with seeing you guys kissing so, don’t do it in my face but, its something that I’m not used to so I probably don’t know how to react to it and I’m forced to be okay with it and not say anything...which is...I don’t know hard.. (FG 2)

In the extract above, Isabel talks about coming to UCT as an adjustment, and becoming accepting of homosexuality as something she is ‘forced’ to be used to. This plays into what was said earlier about students feeling that they are forced to accept. Isabel may not really be accepting but constructs homosexuality as something she is forced to accept and act comfortable with.

As mentioned above, in other contexts, homosexuality is not accepted, and students coming from these backgrounds bring these beliefs with them, which may influence the way in which they construct issues of acceptance and diversity, such as Isabel in the extract above, who explains how she was not used to seeing homosexuality, which influenced how open and accepting she was to it at first. Students may view UCT as more diverse as expression of sexuality is allowed, and homosexuality is not necessarily 'punished' the way it is in other contexts, like in the township where as Carla mentions, people are beaten or killed for their sexuality.

Aside from contextual differences, religion also plays an important role in student's beliefs

Religious difference

Religion plays a vital role in whether students are accepting of certain views or not. An individual's religious views inform them about what is right and wrong (Adamczyk & Pitt, 2009), and this then affects the way that they construct diversity and how open or accepting they are to different groups of people. This is in line with intersectionality theory, which argues that discrimination can not be explored without taking into consideration issues of religious difference (Vakulenko, 2011). Similarly, students use their religious values and principles to construct what is acceptable or not in the university context:

***Danyaal:** Okay and another issue is like obviously religion...where...okay like in Islam a man and a woman are not seen as equal...they are seen as equal in a sense that one isn't better than the other one, but its not seen as equal in the sense that they have the same duties and responsibilities (FG 2)*

In the above extract, it seems that religion affects views on the roles of men and women. As Danyaal suggests, in certain religions, like Islam as Danyaal mentions, men and women have different roles and are not seen as 'the same'.

Carl: Okay well from a religious point of view its (homosexuality) wrong uhm...because God created men for women and vice versa (FG 5)

According to past literature, religion is an important factor in attitudes about homosexuality (Adamczyk & Pitt, 2009). In line with this, in the present study we can see that certain religious groups believe that homosexuality is wrong, and these beliefs may foster intolerance and lack of acceptance. In the above extract, Carl looks at homosexuality from a religious point of view and describes it as “wrong”. Jeremy draws on this same idea in the extract below ‘blames’ religion for the intolerance and discrimination against homosexuality:

Jeremy: There’s a homophobic undertone, there’s definitely and I, I blame it on the amount of religious groups in this entire university because homosexuality and religion have never ever gotten along... (FG 1)

Jeremy above draws on the intersection of religion and discrimination, and constructs sexual diversity and lack of acceptance as being influenced by religion.

Religion was brought up repeatedly across the data, and the way in which it influences acceptance at UCT. Religion intersects with diversity and acceptance, as young men and women draw on their religious principles to decide if they are tolerant of certain things or not (Vakulenko, 2011), which is why it was important to explore as a theme

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The findings suggest that issues of gender and sexuality diversity at UCT are constructed through stereotypical constructions, and difference. Students have different views about the diversity at UCT. Some students feel that UCT is very diverse, and promotes acceptance and tolerance. Many students are accepting of different groups of people and different view points. There are other students, however, who feel that UCT is not really diverse, and only seems diverse from the outside and that when looking closely

within the institution, students are not really accepting. Many students feel that they are 'forced' to accept certain things, because of the fear of being seen as discriminatory if they speak up against views they do not agree with.

These issues of acceptance and diversity are influenced by various things. Stereotypes play a big role in how students construct issues of diversity at UCT. The way in which students conform to stereotypes of gender and sexuality affects their beliefs about how men and women should behave and based on this, they construct issues of diversity and acceptance of men and women's behaviour in the context of UCT.

Another factor which influences young men and women's views of acceptance and diversity is the way in which they construct difference. Young men and women come from different contexts, cultures, backgrounds and religions, and these differences affect the ways in which they view the world. They then come into a particular context such as UCT with these views, which then affects how they construct ideas of acceptance and diversity, as well as whether or not they discriminate or are prejudice towards certain groups of people.

The current study contributes to the literature on diversity and transformation in many ways. Firstly, the present study has begun to address the gap in the literature by looking at issues of gender and sexual diversity, and not just racial diversity. Secondly, we now know that although UCT has been successful at creating a diverse environment which caters to many different student needs (Fraser, 1997), many students still do not accept difference, or do not feel accepted within the UCT context. This has many implications for UCT transformation policies, such as, in example, UCT as an institution would need to reconsider the effectiveness of their transformation processes, and whether or not an environment which fosters acceptance has been achieved. Since many students feel that they are being forced to accept views which they do not agree with or are not comfortable with, the institution would need to find ways to give all students a sense that they are free to express their views, without it leading to discrimination towards others. Thirdly, the present study has generated an in-depth understanding of why young men and women may not be tolerant or accepting of certain gender or sexual differences, through the use of qualitative methodology and focus groups. Fourthly, beyond the UCT context, the findings of this study are significant in terms of diversity and discrimination

in the education sector in South Africa, which is meant to be a country free from discrimination and prejudice. The study suggests that young men and women in the education sector are still intolerant of difference, such as homosexuality, despite the rights of individuals with regards to sexual orientation, which confirms the findings of Butler *et al.* (2003). This would have implications for South African transformation and intervention processes, as they would need to find ways to increase acceptance and decrease discrimination towards different gender and sexual groups.

There were several limitations to this study. Firstly, there were fewer participants in each focus group than expected, which affected the amount of data collected as well as the type of data collected. In some of the focus groups, only three participants were present, limiting the discussion and influencing the group dynamic. Secondly, it was intended to have one group of only young men and one group of only young women, however all the groups were mixed, as indicated in the methods section. This may have influenced the type of data received from participants, as participants may have been more comfortable and open to share in same-sex groups. Lastly, it is important to acknowledge the language and cultural differences in this study. Participants were of different cultures and spoke different languages, and this may have influenced the groups dynamic as well as the type of data collected, as participants may not have been able to identify with each other and provide collective experiences in each focus group.

This study focused specifically on students, and did not look at the way in which members of staff or admin within UCT construct issues of gender and sexuality diversity at UCT. Since the views of staff and admin member are also an important contributor to transformation processes at UCT, future research should look at how they construct these issues. In addition, as discovered in the present study, there are many implications for transformation processes at UCT, and there still seems to be issues of intolerance and discrimination within the institution, future research should focus on ways to improve and increase acceptance amongst students at UCT.

References

- Adamczyk, A., & Pitt, C. (2009). Shaping attitudes about homosexuality: The role of religion and cultural context, *Social Science Research*, 38(1), 338-351.
- Arbor, A.(2004, March). *Diversity in higher education*. Paper presented at the meeting of The University of Michigan, Michigan.
- Bosch, T., & Holland-Muter, S. (2011). Profile: Women crossing the line: Exploring the politics of gender and sexuality at the University of Cape Town. *Feminist Africa*, 17, 82- 90.
- Braun, V., & Clarke V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(1), 77-101.
- Butler, A.H., Alpaslan, A.H., Strumpher, J., & Astbury, G. (2003). Gay and lesbian youth experiences of homophobia in South African secondary education. *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Issues in Education*, 1(2), 3-28. doi: 10.1300/J367v01n02_02
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. London: Routledge.
- Cross, M. (2004). Institutionalising campus diversity in South African higher education: Review of diversity scholarship and diversity education. *Higher Education*, 47(1), 387-410.
- Diamond, L. M., & Butterworth, M. (2008). Questioning gender and sexual identity: Dynamic links over time. *Sex Roles*, 59, 365-376.
- Fraser, N. (1997). Transformation and student life at UCT: Overview of surveys of student climate. *Justice Interrupts: Critical Reflections on the 'Postsocialist' Condition*, 1-23.
- Freud, S. (1994). The social construction of gender. *Journal of Adult Development*, 1(1) .

- Gergen, K.J. (1985). The social constructionist movement in modern psychology. *American Psychologist*, 40(3), 266-275.
- Gontek, I. (2007). Sexual violence against lesbian women in South Africa. *Masters Thesis in African Studies*, 1-4.
- Greenwald A.G., & Banaji, M.R. (1995). Implicit social cognition: Attitudes, self-esteem, and stereotypes. *Psychological Review*, 102(1), 4-27.
- Gurin, P., Dey, E.L., Hurtado, S., & Gurin, G. (2002). Diversity and higher education: Theory and impact on educational outcomes. *Harvard Educational Review*, 72(3), 330-366
- Hancock, A. (2007). When multiplication doesn't equal quick addition: Examining intersectionality as a research paradigm, *Perspectives on Politics*, 5(1), 63-79. DOI: 10.1017/S1537592707070065
- Hurtado, S., Milem, J., Clayton, P., & Alma-Allen, W. (1999). Enacting diverse learning environments: Improving the climate for racial/ethnic diversity in higher education. *ERIC Digest*, 1-5.
- Jackson, S.M., Cram, F., & Seymour, F.W. (2000). Violence and sexual coercion in high school students' dating relationships. *Journal of Family Violence*, 15 (1), 23-36.
- Kessi, S. (2013). Transforming historically white universities: Students and the politics of racial representation. *New Agenda: South African Journal of Social and Economic Policy*, 50, 53-56.
- Kitzinger, J. (1995). Qualitative research: Introducing focus groups. *British Medical Journal*, 311, 299-302.
- Lorber, J. (1994). 'Night to his Day': The social construction of gender. *Paradoxes of Gender*, 1, 1-8.
- Macbeth, D. (2001). "Reflexivity" in qualitative research: Two readings, and a third. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 7(1), 35-68. doi: 10.1177/107780040100700103

- Marston, C., & King, E. (2006). Factors that shape young people's sexual behaviour: a systematic review. *Lancet*, *368*(4), 1581-1586
- McCall, L. (2005). The complexity of intersectionality. *Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, *30*(3), 1771-1800.
- Meyer, I.H. (2003). Prejudice, social stress, and mental health in lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations: Conceptual issues and research evidence. *Psychological Bulletin*, *129*(5), 674-697. DOI: 10.1037/0033-2909.129.5.674
- Mieses, A. (2009, December). Gender inequality and corrective rape of women who have sex with women. *Gay Men's Health Crisis: Treatment Issues*, 1-5.
- Morrel, R. (2007). Of boys and men: masculinity and gender in Southern African studies. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, *24*(4), 605-630.
- Ospina, S. (2004). *Qualitative Research*. London: Sage.
- Pattman, R., & Bhana, D. (2009). Colouring sexualities: How some black South African schoolgirls respond to 'racial' and gendered inequalities. *The Prize and The Price*, *1*, 21-38.
- Petros, G., Airhihenbuwa, C.O., Simbayi, L., Ramlagan, S., & Brown, B. (2006). HIV/AIDS and 'othering' in South Africa: The blame goes on. *Culture, Health and Sexuality: An International Journal for Research, Intervention and Care*, *8*(1), 67-77. doi: 10.1080/13691050500391489
- Pleck, J.H., Sonenstein, F.L., & Ku, L.C. (1994). Attitude toward male roles among adolescent males: A discriminant validity analysis. *Sex Roles*, *30*(7), 481-501.
- Qobo, M., & Lindani, N.Z. (2013). The "problem" of black youth and race relations in South Africa. *New Agena: South African Journal of Social and Economic Policy*, *50*, 38-41.
- Rúðólfssdóttir, A.G., & Jolliffe, R. (2008). 'I don't think people really talk about it that much': Young women discuss feminism. *Feminism and Psychology*, *18*, 268-274. doi: 10.1177/0959353507083098

- Salo, E. (2002). Condoms are for spares, not the besties: Negotiating adolescent sexuality in post-apartheid Manenberg. *Society in Transition*, 33(3), 403-419.
- Schrieff, L., Tredoux, C., Dixon, J., & Finchilescu, G. (2005). Patterns of racial segregation in university residence dining-halls. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 35(3), 433-443.
- Seale, C. (1999). Quality in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 5(1), 465-478. doi: 10.1177/107780049900500402
- Shefer, T., & Foster, D. (2009). Heterosex among young South Africans: Research reflections. *The Prize and The Price*, 1, 267-289.
- Shefer, T., & Potgieter, C. (2006). Sexualities. In Shefer, T., Boonzaier, F., & Kiguwa, P. (Eds.), *The gender of psychology* (pp.103-120). Cape Town: UCT Press.
- Shefer, T., & Ruiters, K. (2011). The masculine construct in heterosex. *Agenda: Empowering Women for Gender Equity*, 14(37), 39-45.
- Soudien, C., & Price, M. (2013). Responding to changing student needs at UCT. *New Agenda: South African Journal of Social and Economic Policy*, 50, 10-13.
- Steyn, M., & van Zyl, M. (2001). "Like that statue at Jammie stairs..." Some student perceptions and experiences of institutional culture at the University of Cape Town in 1999. *Institute for Intercultural and Diversity Studies of Southern Africa*
- Stiles, W.B. (1999). Evaluating qualitative research. *Evidence Based Mental Health*, 2(1), 99-101. doi: 10.1136/ebmh.2.4.99
- Thoreson, R.W., Shaugnessy, P., Cook, S.W., & Moore, D. (1993). Behavioural and attitudinal correlates of masculinity: A national survey of male counselors. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 71(1), 337-342.
- Vakulenko, A. (2011). Islamic headscarves and the European convention on human rights: An intersectional perspective. *Social and Legal Studies*, 16(2), 183-199. doi: 10.1177/0964663907076527

West, C, & Zimmerman, D.H. (1987). Doing Gender. *Gender and Society*, 1(2), 125-151.

Wilson, S., & Maclean, R. (2011). *Research methods and data analysis for psychology*.
London: McGraw-Hill.

Zuma, B. (2013). *The social psychology of self-segregation: The case of university student friendship groups*. (Unpublished doctoral thesis). University of Cape Town, South Africa.

Appendix

Appendix A: Poster

WANTED: RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

For a study on gender and sexuality

 **ARE YOU:** 

➤ A UCT RES STUDENT?

➤ INTERESTED IN A FREE R30 STEERS VOUCHER?

You are invited to participate in a research study titled **young men and women's constructions of gender and sexuality**, which will take the form of focus groups, conducted at UCT.

For more information, or to sign up for participation, please email genderresearch2013@gmail.com

Appendix B

Further questions for focus groups

[These questions can be used as probes if further stimulus is needed to elicit discussion]

Tell me what it means to be a young woman(man) in South Africa today?

What messages have you been given about how to be a woman/man?

How do these messages affect the way you view yourself?

Do you feel pressured to be a certain way or do certain things because you are a woman or man?

How do your ideas about how to be a woman and how to be a man affect relationships between men and women?

How do stereotypes of gender and sexuality affect your relationships within the context of UCT?

What are your perceptions of gender and sexuality diversity at UCT?

Appendix C

Participant assent form:

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE TOWN



Department of Psychology

1. Invitation and purpose

You are invited to take part in a research study about what it means to be a young woman or man in South Africa today. I am a researcher from the Department of Psychology at University of Cape Town.

2. Procedures

If you decide to take part in this study, I will ask you to take part in a focus group discussion with me.

The focus group will be a discussion about what it means to you to be a young woman or man. The focus group should take no more than one and a half hours. It will also be audio recorded

3. Inconveniences

Certain topics may be brought up which are sensitive or uncomfortable for you, and in this case you may choose at any point in time to stop your participation in the group discussion without any negative consequences.

The groups will be conducted at the University of Cape Town. The most convenient time for you and the researcher will be arranged.

4. Benefits

You will be given a R30 Steers voucher for your participation in the study. You are also given an opportunity to share your views and experiences and your information will contribute to the larger purpose of understanding what it means to be a young man or woman.

5. Privacy and confidentiality

The researcher will take strict precautions to safeguard your personal information throughout the study. Your name and any other information will be kept in a locked file cabinet, and your name will not be used when writing up the study. Only the researchers will have access to the recordings of the focus groups. Although this research will be used for educational purposes, your name and other information will still be kept out of this report in order to keep it confidential and anonymous.

6. Contact details

If you have questions or concerns please feel free to contact:

- Lailaa Parker (student researcher): 0729861901
- Dr Floretta Boonzaier (my supervisor) at the Department of Psychology, University of Cape Town: 021 6503429
- If you have any issues or problems regarding this research or your rights as a research participant and would like to speak to the Chair of the Ethics committee, please contact Mrs Rosalind Adams at the Department of Psychology, University of Cape Town (UCT), 021 650 3417.

7. Signatures

I (Participant's name) agree to be a participant in this research study. I have been informed about and understand the purpose of the study, and all the possible risks, benefits, and inconveniences. I am aware that I can withdraw from this study at anytime without any negative consequence.

Your signature: _____ Date: _____

Researcher's signature: _____ Date: _____

I agree that this discussion can be tape recorded and I am free to stop this recording at any time.

Your signature: _____ Date: _____

Researcher's signature: _____ Date: _____

Author Note

Lailaa Parker is a student at the University of Cape Town studying Honours in Psychology. This research project forms a part of her requirements for the Honours curriculum.

I would like to acknowledge and thank the following people:

I would firstly like to thank my supervisor, Dr .Floretta Boonzaier for her financial contribution towards this research project, as well as her continued help, support, and advice given throughout the research process. I would also like to thank all those who participated in the focus groups, and shared their opinions and experiences.