

**CRITERIA FOR WORKPLACE-EFFECTIVE MOBILITY  
OF EMPLOYEES WITH DISABILITIES  
IN SOUTH AFRICA**

by

**KGOMOTSO WILLIAM KASONKOLA**

**Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree**

**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

in

**ORGANISATIONAL BEHAVIOUR**

in the

**FACULTY OF ECONOMIC AND MANAGEMENT SCIENCES**

at the

**UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA**

**PRETORIA**

**Promotor: Professor J. J. De Beer**

**SEPTEMBER 2011**

## DECLARATION OF AUTHENTICITY

I, Kgomoitso William Kasonkola, declare that the dissertation entitled *Criteria for workplace-effective mobility of employees with disabilities in South Africa* submitted by me for the degree PhD in Organisational Behaviour at the University of Pretoria is my own independent work and has not been submitted to any other Faculty or University prior to or concurrent with this submission.

---

**KGOMOTSO WILLIAM KASONKOLA**

**September 2011**

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I went through difficult times during my studies and have come to the end of this study because of God's grace and guiding hand. This work is thus produced to glorify His mighty name.

My heartfelt thanks go to my family for their undying support during the course of my studies. The sacrifices they made have not gone unnoticed. To the disability project coordinators, Directors and participants of both the focus group and Delphi phases, I say thank you for all the encouragement, your assistance and your participation in this work. At times it was not easy, but with your input, the work was completed.

To my employer, the Vaal University of Technology, my line manager and colleagues, I owe sincere gratitude for their sponsorship, material and other support, standing by me during the study period and offering their encouragement. These inputs have really made an impact. A special word of thanks goes to Professor Connie Mloi for being such a wonderful inspiration and support during the write-up period; the short electronic messages she sent have really encouraged me in this journey. Thanks also go to Idette Noomé for editing my work, to Elizabeth Archer for being a wonderful trainer on Atlas.ti, and Professor Dzvimbo for his words of encouragement.

Last, but not least, Professor de Beer, to whom I can say my figurative "marriage for life" is coming to an end. Thank you very much for being such an understanding, patient and devoted promotor. You did not give up when I revised the document over and over again to achieve a quality submission.

## ABSTRACT

This study highlighted the implications of the absence of well-delineated criteria for the workplace-effective mobility of employees with disabilities in South Africa for their employment, development and organisational mobility. In response to the dearth of research on workplace-effective mobility, and cognizant of the importance of well-delineated workplace criteria to oppose continuing workplace prejudice and discrimination against employees with disabilities, this two-phase sequential triangulation study aimed to identify and confirm criteria and compile a theoretical model for workplace-effective mobility of employees with disabilities. The study has significance for the achievement of greater workplace equity and redress, which will enhance the strategic human resources management and the productive image of employees with disabilities, as well as reduce welfare costs by enabling more people with disabilities to access paid employment opportunities.

To attain the study objectives, the study was done in two phases. The first was a qualitative phase during which focus group interviews with participants with disabilities were conducted. The second phase involved a five-point Likert scale-based Delphi process with industrial and organisational psychologists. Focus group participants were formally employed or self-employed in various organisations and were recruited from four disability categories (people who are blind or deaf, or have a physical or speech impairment) in four provinces in South Africa (the Free State, Gauteng, KwaZulu-Natal and the Western Cape). The industrial and organisational psychologists who participated in the Delphi

phase were used as experts with prior experience in the employee recruitment area.

The study found that workplace-effective mobility is (a) a multi-dimensional concept comprised of a positive self-concept, self-efficacy, workplace accessibility, a sense of coherence and a positive sense of independence, which form the crux of criteria for workplace-effective mobility; (b) a result of self-efficacy beliefs, enabling organisational practices and workplace accessibility; and (c) at the heart of the pursuit for workplace equity to redress prejudice and discrimination against employees with disabilities in the workplace. The participating experts also reached consensus in their understanding of the term workplace-effective mobility. Within-group differences were identified for a number of categories; and therefore it is recommended that future research should be conducted on distinct categories of disabilities. Using the identified dimensions (positive self-concept, self-efficacy, workplace accessibility, sense of coherence and a positive sense of independence) and outcomes (organisational and personal effectiveness), a theoretical model of workplace-effective mobility was compiled.

**KEYWORDS:** workplace-effective mobility, positive self-concept, self-efficacy, workplace equity and accessibility, emancipatory research, self-motivation, employees with disabilities

## CONTENTS

Declaration	i
Acknowledgements	ii
Abstract	iii
<b>CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 BACKGROUND	1
1.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	4
1.3 RESEARCH AIMS	7
1.4 THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS	7
1.5 RATIONALE AND MOTIVATION FOR THE STUDY	8
1.6 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY	11
1.7 THE RESEARCH ASSUMPTIONS	12
1.7.1 Ontological assumptions	13
1.7.2 Epistemological assumptions	13
1.7.3 Axiological assumptions	15
1.7.4 Rhetorical assumptions	15
1.7.5 Methodological assumptions	16
1.8 VISUAL PRESENTATION OF THE RESEARCH PROCESS AND METHODS	17
1.8.1 Phase 1: Focus group interviews	18
1.8.2 Phase 2: Delphi technique	19
1.8.3 Validity and reliability	19
1.8.4 Trustworthiness	20
1.8.5 Ethical measures	20
1.9 DEMARCATION OF THE STUDY	20
1.10 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	22
1.11 CLARIFICATION OF CONCEPTS	23
1.11.1 Disability	23
1.11.2 Workplace-effective mobility	25
1.12 OUTLINE OF THE STUDY	26

1.13	SUMMARY	28
<b>CHAPTER 2: EMPLOYEES WITH DISABILITIES</b>		<b>30</b>
2.1	INTRODUCTION	30
2.2	LOCATING THE LITERATURE FOR THE STUDY	30
2.2.1	Conducting literature searches for the study	31
2.2.2	Analysing the literature searches	33
2.3	UNDERSTANDING AND MANAGING DISABILITY	33
2.3.1	The medical model of disability	34
2.3.2	The functional model of disability	34
2.3.3	The social model of disability	35
2.3.4	The biopsychosocial model of disability	38
2.3.5	Salutogenesis	40
2.4	EMPLOYEES WITH DISABILITIES AND THE WORKPLACE	43
2.4.1	Unfair discrimination	43
2.4.2	Social neglect	47
2.4.3	Stigmatization	48
2.4.4	Slow progress towards achieving employment equity	50
2.4.5	Disincentive of disability grants and resultant growing dependence	51
2.4.6	Inequality and poverty	51
2.4.7	Over-protective families	53
2.5	NEED FOR WORKPLACE EQUITY	53
2.5.1	Progressive corporate culture	53
2.5.2	Welfare-to-work strategies	54
2.5.3	Sensitisation programmes	54
2.5.4	Sign language appreciation	55
2.5.5	Emancipatory research and strategies	55
2.6	SUMMARY	57

<b>CHAPTER 3: WORKPLACE-EFFECTIVE MOBILITY</b>	<b>59</b>
3.1	INTRODUCTION 59
3.2	ORIGINS AND NATURE OF WORKPLACE-EFFECTIVE MOBILITY 59
3.3	DIMENSIONS OF WORKPLACE-EFFECTIVE MOBILITY 64
3.3.1	Personal dimension 64
3.3.1.1	<i>Motivation and identity</i> 65
3.3.1.2	<i>Skills and expertise</i> 66
3.3.1.3	<i>Relationships</i> 67
3.3.2	Physical dimension 68
3.3.2.1	<i>Accessibility</i> 69
3.3.2.2	<i>Reasonable accommodation</i> 71
3.3.2.3	<i>Assistive devices</i> 73
3.3.3	Economic dimension 75
3.3.3.1	<i>Economic conditions</i> 76
3.3.3.2	<i>Good quality of life</i> 76
3.3.4	Social dimension 77
3.3.4.1	<i>Equal employment opportunities</i> 77
3.3.4.2	<i>Socialisation processes</i> 78
3.3.4.3	<i>Social support</i> 79
3.4	PREVIOUS RESEARCH ON IDENTIFYING CRITERIA FOR MOBILITY 79
3.4.1	Significance of previous studies on criteria development 81
3.5	NEED FOR WELL-DELINEATED CRITERIA 82
3.6	SUMMARY 84
<b>CHAPTER 4: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>86</b>
4.1	INTRODUCTION 86
4.2	THE KNOWLEDGE CLAIM 87
4.3	THE RESEARCH DESIGN 89
4.3.1	Interpretivist design 90



4.3.2	Grounded theory design	91
4.4	THE FOCUS OF THE RESEARCH DESIGN	93
4.4.1	Conditions	94
4.4.2	Orientations	94
4.4.3	Actions	94
4.4.4	The units of analysis	95
4.5	POTENTIAL SOURCES OF BIAS	95
4.6	RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	96
4.7	RESEARCH METHODS	97
4.7.1	Phase 1: Identifying criteria and compiling a theoretical model of the workplace-effective mobility of employees with disabilities	97
4.7.1.1	<i>Sampling</i>	98
4.7.1.2	<i>Sample size</i>	102
4.7.1.3	<i>Data collection</i>	105
4.7.1.4	<i>Data analysis</i>	116
4.7.1.5	<i>Measures to ensure trustworthiness</i>	124
4.7.1.6	<i>Ethical measures</i>	127
4.7.2	Phase 2: Confirmation of identified criteria using the Delphi technique	135
4.7.2.1	<i>Sampling</i>	137
4.7.2.2	<i>Sample size</i>	141
4.7.2.3	<i>Data collection</i>	142
4.7.2.4	<i>Data analysis</i>	147
4.7.2.5	<i>Ethical measures</i>	148
4.7.2.6	<i>Validity and reliability</i>	148
4.7.2.7	<i>Potential research bias</i>	148
4.7.2.8	<i>Measure to ensure trustworthiness of the findings</i>	149
4.8	SUMMARY	149
		151

## CHAPTER 5: PRESENTATION OF THE RESULTS FROM THE QUALITATIVE PHASE (FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEWS)

5.1	INTRODUCTION	151
5.2	THE RESEARCH SITE	151
5.3	PROFILE OF PARTICIPANTS	154
5.4	RESULTS FROM THE PILOT PHASE	156
5.4.1	Definition of workplace mobility	156
5.4.2	Enablers of workplace mobility	157
5.4.2.1	<i>Positive self-concept</i>	157
5.4.2.2	<i>Self-efficacy</i>	159
5.4.2.3	<i>Sense of Coherence</i>	162
5.4.2.4	<i>Positive sense of independence</i>	165
5.4.2.5	<i>Workplace accessibility</i>	165
5.4.2.6	<i>Workplace equity</i>	167
5.4.3	Inhibitors of workplace mobility	172
5.4.3.1	<i>Adverse economic conditions</i>	172
5.4.3.2	<i>Negative self-concept</i>	174
5.4.3.3	<i>Workplace prejudice</i>	176
5.4.4	Achieving goals of the pilot phase	178
5.4.4.1	<i>Determining the understanding of the terminology by participants</i>	178
5.4.4.2	<i>Interview schedule – duration</i>	179
5.4.4.3	<i>Refinement of the interview schedule</i>	179
5.4.5	Conclusion	179
5.5.	RESULTS FROM MAIN STUDY PARTICIPANTS	180
5.5.1	Definition of workplace-effective mobility	180
5.5.2	Enablers of workplace-effective mobility	182
5.5.2.1	<i>Positive self-concept</i>	182
5.5.2.2	<i>Self-efficacy</i>	188
5.5.2.3	<i>Sense of Coherence</i>	195
5.5.2.4	<i>Workplace accessibility</i>	200

5.5.2.5	<i>Positive sense of independence</i>	205
5.5.2.6	<i>Workplace equity</i>	206
5.5.3	Inhibitors of workplace-effective mobility	211
5.5.3.1	<i>Accessibility issues</i>	211
5.5.3.2	<i>Negative self-concept</i>	213
5.5.3.3	<i>Unemployment rate</i>	215
5.5.3.4	<i>Workplace prejudice</i>	216
5.5.4	Differential treatment	221
5.5.5	General opinions	224
5.5.6	Comparing and contrasting the results from the pilot and the main study	225
5.6	TENTATIVE CRITERIA FOR WORKPLACE-EFFECTIVE MOBILITY	226
5.7	SUMMARY	228
 <b>CHAPTER 6: PRESENTATION OF THE RESULTS FROM THE QUANTITATIVE PHASE (CONFIRMATORY DELPHI PHASE)</b>		230
6.1	INTRODUCTION	230
6.2	PRESENTATION OF RESULTS	230
6.2.1	Pilot round of the Delphi process	231
6.2.1.1	<i>Problems with access to the Moodle webpage</i>	231
6.2.1.2	<i>Content and structural problems regarding the questionnaire</i>	233
6.2.1.3	<i>Conclusion</i>	236
6.2.2	Results from Round One of Delphi	237
6.2.2.1	<i>Consensus regarding the definition of workplace-effective mobility</i>	237
6.2.2.2	<i>Dimensions of workplace-effective mobility</i>	239
6.2.2.3	<i>Categorising indicators into criteria for workplace-effective mobility</i>	241
6.2.3	Results from Round Two	250
6.2.3.1	<i>Definition of workplace-effective mobility</i>	250

6.2.3.2.	<i>Dimensions of workplace-effective mobility</i>	251
6.2.3.3	<i>Categorising indicators into criteria for workplace-effective mobility</i>	252
6.3	SUMMARY	258
<b>CHAPTER 7: DISCUSSION OF RESULTS</b>		<b>259</b>
7.1	INTRODUCTION	259
7.2	NATURE OF WORKPLACE-EFFECTIVE MOBILITY	259
7.3	ENABLERS OF WORKPLACE-EFFECTIVE MOBILITY	261
7.4	INHIBITORS OF WORKPLACE-EFFECTIVE MOBILITY	262
7.5	DIFFERENTIAL TREATMENT OF EMPLOYEES WITH DISABILITIES	263
7.6	DIMENSIONS AND INDICATORS OF WORKPLACE-EFFECTIVE MOBILITY	263
7.6.1	Positive self-concept	265
7.6.2	Self-efficacy	267
7.6.3	Sense of coherence	269
7.6.4	Positive sense of independence	269
7.6.5	Workplace accessibility	270
7.7	GENERAL COMMENTS MADE BY PARTICIPANTS	271
7.7.1	Deafness and disability	271
7.7.2	Deafness and speech-impairment	272
7.7.3	Disability and quality of life	273
7.7.4	Disabilities are different in nature and extent	273
7.7.5	Effect of changing regimes	273
7.7.6	Contributions of the data to broader field of knowledge	274
7.7.6.1	<i>Ontology</i>	274
7.7.6.2	<i>Epistemology</i>	275
7.7.6.3	<i>Axiology</i>	276
7.7.6.4	<i>Methodology</i>	276
7.7.6.5	<i>Emancipatory research principles</i>	277

7.7.6.6	<i>Theoretical models of disability</i>	279
7.7.6.7	<i>The biopsychosocial model</i>	279
7.7.6.8	<i>Salutogenesis</i>	280
7.7.6.9	<i>Welfare-to-work strategies</i>	280
7.7.6.10	<i>Sensitivity training and awareness programmes</i>	281
7.7.6.11	<i>Sign language appreciation</i>	281
7.7.6.12	<i>Contribution to practice</i>	281
7.7.6.13	<i>Contribution of data to international literature</i>	281
7.8	SUMMARY	282
<b>CHAPTER 8: A THEORETICAL MODEL OF WORKPLACE-EFFECTIVE MOBILITY</b>		<b>284</b>
8.1	INTRODUCTION	284
8.2	CAUSAL CONDITIONS	284
8.3	CONTEXT-INTERVENING CONDITIONS	288
8.4	ACTIONS AND INTERACTION STRATEGIES	289
8.5	CONSEQUENCES	290
8.6	SUMMARY	293
<b>CHAPTER 9: REFLECTION AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>		<b>294</b>
9.1	INTRODUCTION	294
9.2	REFLECTION ON THE RESEARCH PROCESS	294
9.2.1	Objectives of the study	294
9.2.2	The trustworthiness of the study	295
9.2.2.1	<i>Reflexivity</i>	295
9.2.2.2	<i>Peer debriefing</i>	298
9.2.2.3	<i>Auditability</i>	298
9.2.2.4	<i>Credibility and dependability</i>	299
9.2.2.5	<i>Authenticity</i>	299
9.2.2.6	<i>Transferability</i>	300

9.2.3	Weaknesses of the study	300
9.3	PERSONAL REFLECTIONS	301
9.3.1	Researching people with disabilities	301
9.3.2	Doing qualitative research	302
9.3.3	My study leader	303
9.4	IMPLICATIONS AND WIDER CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE STUDY	304
9.4.1	Human Resources Management implications	304
9.4.2	Implications for national policy	304
9.4.3	Implications for research	305
9.5	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPLEMENTATION AND FUTURE RESEARCH	306
9.5.1	Policy recommendations	306
9.5.2	Practice recommendations	306
9.5.3	Recommendations for research	307
9.6	CONCLUDING REMARKS	307
	REFERENCES	309
	ANNEXURES	
	Annexure A Informed Consent Agreement	342
	Annexure B Memorandum of Understanding	343
	Annexure C Interview Schedule for focus group interviews	350
	Annexure D Delphi questionnaire	352

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1	Summary of the research process and methods	17
Table 2.1	Percentage of the total population of people with disabilities employed by race and gender	45
Table 2.2	Composition of employees with disabilities by gender and race	45
Table 4.1	Profile of participants by province	104
Table 4.2	Number of participants in the pilot phase by race and gender	112
Table 5.1	Participants by disability groups, age category, qualification range and typical occupations	155
Table 5.2	Tentative criteria for workplace-effective mobility	226
Table 5.3	Dimensions of workplace-effective mobility by indicator	227
Table 6.1	Definition of workplace-effective mobility	238
Table 6.2	Dimensions of workplace-effective mobility	239
Table 6.3	Indicators of positive self-concept	241
Table 6.4	Indicators of self-efficacy	243
Table 6.5	Indicators of sense of coherence	246
Table 6.6	Indicators of workplace accessibility	247
Table 6.7	Indicators of positive sense of independence	249
Table 6.8	Consensus reached on the definition of workplace-effective mobility	250
Table 6.9	Consensus reached on the dimensionalisation of workplace-effective mobility	251
Table 6.10	Consensus reached on the indicators of positive self-concept	253
Table 6.11	Consensus reached on the indicators of self-efficacy	254
Table 6.12	Consensus reached on the indicators of sense of coherence	256
Table 6.13	Consensus reached on the indicators of workplace accessibility	256
Table 6.14	Consensus reached on the indicators of positive sense of independence	257

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 8.1	A theoretical model of workplace-effective mobility	291
------------	---	-----