

The SU Well-being, Culture and Climate at Work Survey 2019: Main Findings, Sharing of Results and Recommendations

The SU Well-being, Culture and Climate at Work Survey 2019: Main Findings, Sharing of Results and Recommendations

Background

The Stellenbosch University (SU) Well-being, Culture and Climate at Work Survey was launched on 28 October 2019. A total of 4230 staff members received invitations to participate in the survey via email. The survey was also marketed via the INFO@StellenboschUni newsletter. The survey closed on 15 November 2019.

A total of 1095 complete submissions were received. This is an increase of 52.1% compared to the 720 staff members who participated in the previous culture and climate survey that was conducted in 2017. The participation rate in 2019 was therefore 25.89%. The 2017 report claimed a 20% participation rate.

The Centre for Business Intelligence within the Division for Information Governance was responsible for the analysis of the results.

A working group with the following members was responsible for the compilation of the survey: Dr Alten du Plessis and Ms Carla Kroon (Information Governance), Mr Sello Molapo and Mr Jan Knight (Human Resources), Dr Michael-John Freeborough (Faculty of AgriSciences), Dr Monica Du Toit (Transformation Office) and Dr Samantha van Schalkwyk (Studies in Historical Trauma and Transformation). Valuable inputs were provided by Prof Amanda Gouws (Political Science). Prof Nico Koopman (Social Impact Transformation and Personnel), Mr Victor Mothobi (Human Resources), Prof Hester Klopper (Strategy and Internationalization) and Prof Ian Cloete (Information Governance) guided the process as members of the steering committee (SC).

The survey was available in Afrikaans, English and Xhosa. The appendix (to this document) provides an outline of the six main sections of the survey – information on how the ratings for the culture and climate items was calculated, and how these should be interpreted, are also included.

Goals

The goals of this summary document are fivefold:

- Firstly, to briefly explain exactly what was measured;
- Secondly, to provide the findings of this investigation;
- Thirdly, to compare the 2019 and 2017 results;
- Fourthly, to indicate how these results were communicated to the management teams of responsibility centres and faculties (list of sessions and what was shared); and
- Lastly, to make some recommendations on how to advance well-being and “happiness” levels at work, and to improve the overall culture and climate at work, addressing the main issues highlighted by participants.

Note: This document only refers to the results of the University as a whole. Separate presentations were made for the various responsibility centres and faculties, but these results are confidential – a decision was made not to explicitly compare the various environments. The results were, however, structured in such a way that each environment could still compare itself against the University as whole. The management teams of the various environments received their results - all presentations are also available to steering committee members.

What was measured?

The purpose of the SU Well-being, Culture and Climate at Work Survey was to determine quantitatively the well-being and "happiness-at-work" levels of staff, and to get the opinion of staff about the culture

and climate within the working environment (also quantitatively by rating items on a 1 to 4 scale). Open questions allowed the collection of qualitative data about the culture and climate at work. Participation was 100% anonymous. Biographical information about participants were collected. See the appendix for an outline of the six main sections of the survey, including the biographical categories. The links to the three language versions of the survey are listed at the end of the appendix - more detail about the various measures can be found there.

Well-being of staff (section 1)

The so-called PERMAH at Work Profiler (the components of this well-being measure is explained below – they make up the PERMAH acronym) was used to measure well-being levels at work. It generates an overall well-being score, as well as scores for each of the PERMAH dimensions, namely positive emotions (P), engagement (E), relationships (R), meaning (M), accomplishment (A) and health (H). It also provides a score for negative emotions. Scores range between 0 and 10.

Happy and unhappy climate at work (sections 2 and 3)

A Happy Climate at Work and an Unhappy Climate at Work score were calculated for each participant. For the Happy Climate at Work score participants had to rate to which extent ten specific evidence-based contributing factors to a happy working environment were present in their workplaces, and for the Unhappy Climate at Work score participants had to rate to which extent ten specific evidence-based contributing factors to an unhappy working environment were present in their workplaces. Scores range between 10 and 70. A high score indicate a high presence of either happy or unhappy factors in a specific working environment.

General culture and climate (section 4)

The PERMAH and the happy and unhappy climate sections were new additions to the survey, in comparison with the 2017 version that focused only on general culture and climate items. The general culture and climate items from 2017 were revised for the latest version and each item had to be rated on a four instead of a five point scale (a “no opinion” option was also available).

Fifty-two culture and climate items had to be rated on a 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree scale). Some items were reverse scored (please see the appendix). An average rating for each item was calculated. Each score ranges between 1 and 4. A higher rating corresponds to a more healthy / desirable / positive culture and climate – also for the reverse scored items. The lower the score the more negative the perspective.

Items fell within the following broad categories: Wellness, employer of choice, management, personal growth, transformation, inclusion and diversity, discrimination and equality, “my future at SU”, vision 2040, the language policy, sexual harassment, bullying and innovation.

Open questions (section 5)

A mixed methods analysis was performed to analyse the feedback that participants provided to the open questions (section 5 in the survey). The results of the analysis of the first open question, namely “What improvements, if any, can be done to improve the sense of inclusivity at the University?” were taken into consideration in the findings reported below.

Important findings

The results for all the well-being measures (sections 1 in the survey), the happy and unhappy climate at work scores (sections 2 and 3 in the survey) plus 52 culture and climate ratings (section 4) are available for 67 different groups of participants, for example per faculty, race, gender, home language,

job type, age group and post level. Rankings for each of the scores and ratings were also compiled and provide interesting insights.

Some important findings from the survey are provided below. Readers are invited to consult with the analysts within the Division for Information Governance if they have a need for a specific analysis (almost an infinite number is possible!).

Here is a list of findings:

1. There is a significant difference between the overall well-being scores of various age groups. Participants above 60 and below 30 with scores of 6.95 and 6.87 respectively on a 0 to 10 scale are more “PERMAH well” in comparison with staff members between 50 and 60 (6.69), between 40 and 50 (6.21) and between 30 and 40 (6.08).
2. Men are significantly healthier than women according to their H scores on the PERMAH profiler. Men score themselves at 6.5 versus the 5.98 of women (on a 0 to 10 scale).
3. The top three evidence-based contributing factors to a happy working environment present within the SU workplace are:
 1. Feeling that your contribution truly makes a difference,
 2. Feeling that your work is worthwhile, and
 3. Friendly co-workers /good atmosphere.
4. The top three evidence-based contributing factors to an unhappy working environment present within the SU workplace are:
 1. Wages too low,
 2. Insufficient communication on the part of management, and
 3. Little or no recognition for achievements.
5. The average rating of the 52 main culture and climate items from section 4 of the survey is 2.78 (a rating of 1 is the most negative rating possible and a rating of 4 is the most positive rating possible). This average rating can be used to compare the other ratings against and to help make a judgement of whether these ratings are positive or negative (in comparison with the average).
6. The two lowest rated culture and climate items are (low rating implies a negative):
 1. Only selected individual benefit from opportunities at the University (1.99), and
 2. Promotion opportunities are available to all employees (2.01).
7. The average combined ratings of items related to bullying at SU (2.43) is below the average rating of all culture and climate items (2.78). This represents a slightly negative perspective.
8. There is a significant difference between the ratings of post levels 1-4 (2.79), 5-8 (2.11) and 9-12 (2.15) with reference to the item “People in senior positions gets away with workplace bullying at SU”. Staff in post levels 1 to 4 are not convinced that the statement is true while staff at the lower levels do agree to a larger extent (the low rating implies concern), and these differences are statistically significant.
9. The average combined ratings of items related to sexual harassment (3.22) are well above the average rating of all culture and climate items (2.78). Remember that some of these items are reverse-scored (see the appendix) so that a higher score indicates the more healthy

culture. This relative positive view indicates that the problem is not pervasive (although there certainly are people who are victims) and that overall participants feel that policies and support are in place.

10. The highest rated items (apart from questions pertaining to sexual harassment that had the highest (i.e. the most desirable or healthy) ratings overall -) are:
 1. My work is important (3.48),
 2. I support transformation at SU (3.47), and
 3. By doing my work efficiently I contribute towards a greater goal (3.43).
11. The item “I am aware of Vision 2040 and of the Strategic Framework 2019-2024 of the University” scored 3.16 (positive and well above the average).
12. The item related to a child care facility (“I would like to see a child care facility at SU”) has a high rating of 3.29.
13. The low ratings for “I believe there is a glass ceiling for women at SU” (2.38) and “Women are promoted at the same pace as men” (2.28) seem to indicate that women are not treated equally. Please note: The first item is reverse scored (see the appendix) and the resulting relative low rating (below the average) therefore indicates a negative or less desirable perspective.
14. The low ratings for “Black staff are well integrated into the institutional culture at SU” (2.37) and “Black staff feels isolated at SU” (2.28) send a strong message about the institutional culture. Please note: The last item is reverse scored (see the appendix) and the resulting relative low rating (below the average) therefore indicates a negative or less desirable perspective.
15. One item from the survey related to innovation is “The use of creativity in solving problems / addressing challenges are encouraged”. It has a relatively average to low rating of 2.67 (the average for all items is 2.78).
16. The survey was not designed to specifically measure to which extent staff members view SU as an employer of choice. It is, however, important, to somehow determine the view of staff on this concept. It can be argued that the following eight items can all be used as building blocks to calculate a combined rating for the concept of “employer of choice” – their individual ratings are given:
 1. I am proud to be an employee of SU (3.2),
 2. The promise of value including benefits and opportunities that the university offers its employees is competitive (2.38),
 3. I feel positive about my future at SU (2.6),
 4. I am positive that SU has a bright future as an academic institution (3.17),
 5. There is a career development path for all employees (2.11),
 6. I am concerned about my future at the University (2.3),
 7. I feel intimidated to raise issues around promotion (2.19), and
 8. My work is important (3.48).

The combined average rating is 2.68 (it is open for interpretation).

17. The combined preliminary findings of the quantitative and mixed methods studies (on the one open question mentioned earlier) indicate that four of the top major challenges for the institution are, in no particular order:
1. Well-being development of staff,
 2. The transformation of the institution,
 3. Recognition, appreciation and providing promotion opportunities, and
 4. Equal treatment of staff (including women and black staff).

Raw Ratings

The table below lists the 52 main culture and climate items from the survey, with their ratings. Items are sorted from least favourable / desired to most positively rated. The ten culture and climate items with the worst ratings are therefore listed in positions 1 to 10, and the ten most positive ones in positions 43 to 52 (items that needed to be reverse scored are already represented as such). The table complements what was already reported on in the previous section, and is provided as additional insight.

| Ranking | Culture and Climate Item | Rating |
|---------|---|--------|
| 1 | Only selected individual benefit from opportunities at the University | 1.99 |
| 2 | Promotion opportunities are available to all employees | 2.01 |
| 3 | There is a career development path for all employees | 2.11 |
| 4 | I feel intimidated to raise issues around promotion | 2.19 |
| 5 | People in senior positions gets away with workplace bullying at SU | 2.20 |
| 6 | Women are promoted at the same pace as men | 2.28 |
| 7 | Black staff feels isolated at SU | 2.28 |
| 8 | I am concerned about my future at the University | 2.30 |
| 9 | Black staff are well integrated into the institutional culture at SU | 2.37 |
| 0 | The promise of value including benefits and opportunities that the university offers its employees is competitive | 2.38 |
| 11 | Employees are treated fairly | 2.38 |
| 12 | I believe there is a glass ceiling for women at SU | 2.38 |
| 13 | The University cares about employee health and wellness | 2.39 |
| 14 | The University recognises the importance of employee health in the performance of the institution | 2.42 |
| 15 | I know where to report workplace bullying | 2.44 |
| 16 | Communication about wellness is transparent | 2.48 |
| 17 | I feel positive about my future at SU | 2.60 |
| 18 | My opinions are asked when decisions have to be made | 2.64 |
| 19 | Leadership shows through their actions that transformation and inclusion are important | 2.64 |
| 20 | I have experienced workplace bullying | 2.65 |
| 21 | The complaints procedures for sexual harassment at SU are effective | 2.66 |
| 22 | I am valued for my contributions | 2.67 |
| 23 | The use of creativity in solving problems / addressing challenges are encouraged | 2.67 |
| 24 | I have a sense of belonging in my work environment | 2.70 |
| 25 | The stance of the University on managing transformation is clear | 2.76 |
| 26 | The University has a clear plan on transformation | 2.79 |
| 27 | Transformation and inclusion are promoted in the work environment | 2.80 |
| 28 | Student activism plays a positive role on campus | 2.81 |
| 29 | My supervisor treats all staff members equal | 2.83 |

| | | |
|----|--|------|
| 30 | Diversity is promoted in the work environment | 2.84 |
| 31 | The University aims to correct inequalities | 2.85 |
| 32 | I have been a victim of discrimination at the University | 2.86 |
| 33 | The University is committed to transformation and inclusion | 2.87 |
| 34 | My supervisor is supportive of my career development | 2.89 |
| 35 | I know where to report complaints of sexual harassment | 2.89 |
| 36 | The language policy is implemented correctly (as stated in the policy) | 2.92 |
| 37 | I do not think that SU is serious about dealing with sexual harassment | 2.92 |
| 38 | My manager(immediate supervisor) is competent | 3.09 |
| 39 | The language policy promotes transformation and inclusion | 3.10 |
| 40 | Transformation and inclusion can enhance the quality of core academic activities | 3.13 |
| 41 | I support the language policy of the University | 3.13 |
| 42 | I am aware of Vision 2040 and of the Strategic Framework 2019-2024 of the University | 3.16 |
| 43 | I am positive that SU has a bright future as an academic institution | 3.17 |
| 44 | I am proud to be an employee of SU | 3.20 |
| 45 | I would like to see a child care facility at SU | 3.29 |
| 46 | Effective transformation will ensure long term sustainability for SU | 3.35 |
| 47 | By doing my work efficiently I contribute towards a greater goal | 3.43 |
| 48 | I support transformation at SU | 3.47 |
| 49 | My work is important | 3.48 |
| 50 | I have experienced sexual harassment at work | 3.59 |
| 51 | Sexual harassment has created at hostile environment for me at work | 3.63 |
| 52 | I have suffered psychological trauma because of sexual harassment at work | 3.63 |

Table 1: Ratings of the 52 main culture and climate items.

Comparison

The survey working group completely revised the 2017 version of the culture and climate items. It is therefore difficult to confidently compare the findings of 2019 with that of 2017. It is, however, possible to make the following three observations:

1. 2019 participants rated items referring to the **language policy** at 3.05. The average for all culture and climate items is 2.78. The overall sentiment is therefore above the SU average for all items. In 2017, the rating was below that year's average rating of all culture and climate items.
2. In both 2017 and 2019, participants rated **supervisory relations** and **SU's approach towards transformation** above the respective SU averages.
3. In both 2017 and 2019, **wellness promotion** received a lower rating than the SU average rating for all culture and climate items.

Sessions with Responsibility Centres and Faculties: Schedule, Format and Video Showcases

Schedule

Feedback sessions were held with the management teams of all six responsibility centres and eight of the ten faculties – AgriSciences and Military Sciences are the exceptions. **Clarification:** The management team of AgriSciences watched a video presentation of their results (see below the table) and decided that it was sufficient to understand and act upon their results without further inputs. Too

few staff members of Military Sciences completed the survey, and consequently no report was prepared for them.

The following table lists the dates on which these sessions took place. The length of the sessions varied between 45 and 90 minutes. All sessions were conducted by Dr Alten du Plessis, Ms Carla Kroon (both from the Centre for Business Intelligence within the Information Governance Division) and Mr Jan Knight from Human Resources. The presentations were made to the management teams of the various environments and were done virtually via Microsoft Teams Meetings.

| Management Group | Date |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| AgriSciences | Internal, March, studied videos only |
| Social Impact, Transformation and Personnel Responsibility Centre | 2020/04/20 |
| Operations and Finance Responsibility Centre | 2020/04/28 |
| Strategy and Internationalisation Responsibility Centre | 2020/05/07 |
| Research, Innovation and Postgraduate Studies Responsibility Centre | 2020/05/08 |
| Rectorate Responsibility Centre | 2020/06/03 |
| Learning and Teaching Responsibility Centre | 2020/06/04 |
| Law | 2020/06/10 |
| Engineering | 2020/06/17 |
| Arts and Social Sciences | 2020/06/19 |
| Medicine and Health Sciences | 2020/07/02 |
| Education | 2020/07/07 |
| Economic and Management Sciences | 2020/07/10 |
| Science | 2020/07/10 |
| Theology | 2020/08/19 |

Table 2: Schedule of Feedback Sessions.

Slideshow presentations were utilised during these sessions to present the results of each environment – these simultaneously serve as the official documentation of the results per environment. The presentations were distributed to the various management teams beforehand.

Video Presentations

Video showcases were initially prepared to present the results of the SU Well-being, Culture & Climate at Work Survey for the following environments:

1. Faculty of AgriSciences;
2. Social Impact, Transformation and Personnel; and
3. Strategy and Internationalisation.

Each showcase contains the following 19 videos:

1. Outline and background;
2. Thinking Hats Overview;
3. PERMAH Model of Well-being at Work;
4. Signaling system for PERMAH Scores;
5. PERMAH Score Interpretation with Signals;
6. Signaling system for happy and unhappy factors;
7. Happy and Unhappy Factors Most Present;
8. Signaling System for Culture and Climate Items;

9. 5 F Factor Culture Audit Explanation;
10. Results of 5 F Factors Culture Audit;
11. Defining Psychological Safety;
12. Psychological Safety Application;
13. Why SU is not an employer of choice;
14. Yellow hat thoughts on why SU is an employer of choice;
15. Introducing Dedoose;
16. Dedoose results on how to improve a sense of inclusivity;
17. Why I am proud of SU - Dedoose results;
18. Green hat thinking needed for solutions; and
19. Composition of the survey.

The intent was initially to prepare showcases for each environment (responsibility centre and faculty) and to use the scheduled virtual meeting sessions for discussion (since all the results and frameworks are already presented in the video showcases). A lower than expected number of views were, however, recorded and it was therefore decided to stop the production of these video showcases and to use the scheduled feedback sessions to make these presentations “in person” (instead of providing video recordings beforehand). All environments received documentation before these sessions, including access to a video showcase with explanations of the main theoretical models that were applied (but without videos explaining their results specifically).

This general video showcase included short videos providing background information about the survey, its composition and the theoretical models that underpin its development. The goal was to help managers to interpret the results and to help identify interventions that could possibly be useful to address specific issues pointed out by their results. This video showcase is available at <https://vimeo.com/showcase/7022993> - use **suwellatwork** as the password to access it. Environments were invited and encouraged to study these videos before their scheduled sessions. The showcase contains the following nine videos:

1. Thinking Hats Overview;
2. Composition of the survey;
3. PERMAH Model of Well-being at Work;
4. Signaling system for PERMAH Scores;
5. Signaling system for happy and unhappy factors;
6. Signaling System for Culture and Climate Items;
7. 5 F Factor Culture Audit Explanation;
8. Defining Psychological Safety; and
9. Introducing Dedoose.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of the survey, and the discussions in all university environments, we offer some recommendations. The combined findings of the **quantitative and mixed methods analysis**, as was indicated earlier, indicate that five of the top major challenges for the institution as a whole are, in no particular order, outlined here-under:

1. Well-being development of staff;
2. The transformation of the institution;
3. Recognition and appreciation for all staff;
4. Promotion opportunities for all staff;
5. Equal treatment of staff (especially women, and Black, Coloured, Indian and Asian staff, and also addressing the issue of bullying in the workplace).

It is recommended that the Rectorate intensifies and further invests in the work that is being done on the 5 themes already in different responsibility areas.

1.The Wellbeing Development of Staff:

Finalise the Plan for Staff Health and Wellbeing.

Upgrade structures for Staff Health and Wellbeing.

Ensure that sufficient resources are available for Staff Health and Wellbeing.

2.Transformation of the Institution:

Prioritise both the quantitative and qualitative transformation of the Institution.

Support and strengthen existing initiatives and structures for transformation on institutional and environment levels.

3.Recognition and appreciation of all staff:

The Task Team for Incentivising should complete their mandate, and recommendations should be seriously considered.

4.Promotion opportunities for all staff

The Task Team for the Upward Mobility of Pass Staff should complete their mandate, and their recommendations should be seriously considered.

Environments should ensure the affordability of academic promotions.

5.Equality of all staff

All existing structures and initiatives at the Institution that focus on equality, which includes bullying etc, should be strengthened, amongst others the Equality Unit.

6.Next Survey

It is recommended that the next survey is done in 2022. With the next survey reliable comparisons can be made with regard to progress with the previous survey.

7.Communication

A communique on the findings and recommendations of the staff survey should be sent to all staff.

Concluding note

It is important to note that every responsibility centre and faculty has its own list of challenges and that some, but not all, of these challenges must be addressed at institutional level first. Others might be more environment-specific, and in that case the management teams are responsible for addressing these creatively and effectively. The Division of Information Governance is available to assist these environments with more detail about their situation, which can help us to develop appropriate interventions. The findings regarding specific environments are treated as confidential.

Appendix: Outline of Survey

Section 1: The PERMAH at Work Profiler

The following scores are calculated:

1. Overall well-being score
2. Positive emotions (P)
3. Engagement (E)
4. Relationships (R)
5. Meaning (M)
6. Accomplishment (A)
7. Health (H)
8. Negative emotions

High scores are better than low scores, except for negative emotions. The negative emotions score should be low, but not zero since negative emotions are also important. Scores range between 0 and 10.

Section 2: Evidence-based Contributing Factors to a Happy Working Environment

Participants rated to which extent each of the following ten factors are present in their working environment:

1. Enjoyable tasks
2. Good management
3. Recognition of your achievements
4. Being part of a successful team
5. Variety of work
6. Friendly co-workers /good atmosphere.
7. Good pay
8. Feeling that your work is worthwhile
9. Good balance between your work life and personal life
10. Feeling that your contribution truly makes a difference

These ratings were used to calculate a “Happy Climate at Work” score (between 10 and 70) and to rank the factors.

Section 3

Participants rated to which extent each of the following ten factors are present in their working environment:

1. Little or no recognition for achievements
2. Not enough freedom for personal development
3. Wages too low
4. No attention paid to new ideas
5. Feeling that your contribution doesn't really matter
6. Poor management
7. Lack of fringe benefits
8. Too few opportunities for high performers
9. Insufficient communication on the part of management
10. Work is no fun

These ratings were used to calculate an “Unhappy Climate at Work” score (between 10 and 70) and to rank the factors.

Section 4: General Culture and Climate Items

Fifty-two culture and climate items had to be rated on a 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree scale). The items marked with a * and in bold below were reverse scored. An average rating for each item was calculated. Each score ranges between 1 and 4. A higher rating corresponds to a more healthy / desirable / positive culture and climate – also for the reverse scored items. The lower the score the more negative the perspective. The average for all items is 2.78. The fifty-two items are:

1. My work is important
2. My opinions are asked when decisions have to be made
3. By doing my work efficiently I contribute towards a greater goal
- 4. * Only selected individual benefit from opportunities at the University**
5. I am valued for my contributions
6. I have a sense of belonging in my work environment
7. The University cares about employee health and wellness
8. The University recognises the importance of employee health in the performance of the institution
9. Communication about wellness is transparent
10. I am proud to be an employee of SU
11. The promise of value including benefits and opportunities that the university offers its employees is competitive
12. I feel positive about my future at SU
13. I am positive that SU has a bright future as an academic institution
14. The use of creativity in solving problems / addressing challenges are encouraged
15. Diversity is promoted in the work environment
16. The stance of the University on managing transformation is clear
17. The University aims to correct inequalities
18. Leadership shows through their actions that transformation and inclusion are important
- 19. * I have been a victim of discrimination at the University**
20. The University is committed to transformation and inclusion
21. Employees are treated fairly
22. Promotion opportunities are available to all employees
23. There is a career development path for all employees
24. Transformation and inclusion can enhance the quality of core academic activities
25. The University has a clear plan on transformation
- 26. * I am concerned about my future at the University**
27. I support transformation at SU
28. Transformation and inclusion are promoted in the work environment
29. Effective transformation will ensure long term sustainability for SU
30. I am aware of Vision 2040 and of the Strategic Framework 2019-2024 of the University
31. My manager(immediate supervisor) is competent
32. I support the language policy of the University
33. The language policy promotes transformation and inclusion
34. The language policy is implemented correctly (as stated in the policy)
35. My supervisor treats all staff members equal
36. My supervisor is supportive of my career development
37. Student activism plays a positive role on campus

- 38. * I have experienced sexual harassment at work**
- 39. * Sexual harassment has created at hostile environment for me at work**
- 40. I know where to report complaints of sexual harassment
- 41. * I do not think that SU is serious about dealing with sexual harassment**
- 42. The complaints procedures for sexual harassment at SU are effective
- 43. * I have suffered psychological trauma because of sexual harassment at work**
- 44. * I have experienced workplace bullying**
- 45. * People in senior positions gets away with workplace bullying at SU**
- 46. I know where to report workplace bullying
- 47. I would like to see a child care facility at SU
- 48. * I believe there is a glass ceiling for women at SU**
- 49. Women are promoted at the same pace as men
- 50. * I feel intimidated to raise issues around promotion**
- 51. Black staff are well integrated into the institutional culture at SU
- 52. * Black staff feels isolated at SU**

Section 5: Open Questions

Open questions gave participants the opportunity to expand on their opinions and to make suggestions for improvements. The open question “What improvements, if any, can be done to improve the sense of inclusivity at the University?” is the only one that has been analysed in detail at this stage.

Section 6: Biographical Information

The survey also collected information about the following from each participant:

1. Faculty or Responsibility Centre
2. Job type
3. Post level
4. Experience at SU (years)
5. Race
6. Gender
7. Home language
8. Age group

Link to the survey

The three language versions of the survey are available from the links below:

1. English: <https://fw4l.novisurvey.net/ns/n/suwellatwordenglish.aspx>
2. Xhosa: <https://fw4l.novisurvey.net/ns/n/suwellatworkxhosa.aspx>
3. Afrikaans: <https://fw4l.novisurvey.net/ns/n/suwellatworkafrikaans.aspx>