

CHAPTER 3 MANAGING WORKFORCE DIVERSITY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The aim of the study in chapter 3 is to develop a theoretical model of workforce diversity that can be used to develop the correct research design in chapter 4. Such a model integrates second and first order change processes (figures 2.11 and 2.13). The result is a change model of workforce diversity that explains the roles of factors and dimensions of workforce diversity, i.e. the causes and effects of workforce diversity. This model is then used in the research design in chapter 4 to achieve the research objectives 1.4 (ii), (iii) and (iv). The management of workforce diversity is a pertinent issue in these objectives.

Managing workforce diversity is the management of diversity-related individual and organizational behaviour and its impact on organizational effectiveness. It is often construed as affirmative action or the valuing of workforce diversity. It is neither (Lynch, 1999:61).

Albertyn (1993:24) calls for a proper explanation of the concept, as it determines how policies and programmes can be implemented in an effective manner in South Africa.

To do this, requires that differences between affirmative action, valuing diversity and managing diversity be clarified. The intention of embracing diversity is not to replace affirmative action, but to build on the critical foundation laid by equity programmes.

3.2 MANAGING THE PARADIGM SHIFT FROM AFFIRMATIVE ACTION TO THE VALUING OF DIVERSITY

3.2.1 The role of affirmative action in the processes of workforce diversity

Managing workforce diversity is to make the paradigm shift from legalistic diversity (settings where affirmative action is employed amidst diversity-related problems), to valued diversity. Valuing differences in the organization requires the appreciation of differences and creating an environment in which everyone feels valued and accepted. Gardenswartz and Rowe (1996), asserts that valuing diversity brings with it a paradigm-shift, a new way of thinking about differences between people.

To make the required paradigm shift requires firstly the management of the impact of affirmative action in the first-order process of workforce diversity. Secondly, it requires the development of valuing diversity in the processes of workforce diversity.

Affirmative action emphasises achieving equality of opportunity in the work environment through the changing of organisational demographics.

An outcome of affirmative action in organizations is that workforce diversity is increased or if the workforce was homogeneous, diversity is introduced. When diversity increases, the components of workforce diversity (refer to 2.7.1(ii)(a-b): 87-90) may increase and change in varying ways. As new diverse employees are recruited, membership diversity in workgroups increases, and the diversity in member-task combinations may increase. The number of combinations in informal role-networks can increase. The nature of departments may change and functional work areas may also increase.

It can be concluded that when diversity increases, the components of diversity increase in varying ways, which can result in diversity-related problems, which need to be managed. Thus, the influence of affirmative action is felt mainly in the first-order process of diversity. For example, employment equity laws mandate reports on plans and statistical goals for designated groups. It is advisable that the goals are spread across different functional areas. Plans may require introduction of new members in the areas of purchasing, production-supervision, marketing, etc.

It is clear that such interventions as the latter introduces not only new members, but new and differing attributes of capabilities and cultural values. These changes also influence the components of projects and technology, so workforce diversity can become very complex [refer to 2.2.4.2 (par 5:40-41)]. Complexity is a function of the number of components involved and the degree of variability of the types of diversity (Thomas, 1996: 9-10). Put simpler, it relates to how many components one has to work with, and how different they are from one another. The number of components and their differences can be determined in terms of role-networks, the division of labour and job-structures. Figure 3.1 presents the diversity-complexity relationship.

Figure 3.1 The diversity-complexity relationship

Moderate complexity	High complexity South Africa
Low complexity	High complexity
Low	Moderate High

Variability among types of diversity

Source: Adapted from Thomas (1996:9-10)

If diversity-related problems exist in the organization prior to the introduction of affirmative action (as in South Africa), then one can anticipate an increase in diversity-related problems. In South Africa the complexity of workforce diversity is high.

It can be concluded that the increase of diversity that results from affirmative action in South Africa, will lead to the following organizational consequences if the ideal informal and structural integration is not realised through adaptive structuration:

An increase in inter-group conflict if the practice of not changing the membership characteristics to fit task and relationship requirements persists, e.g. dominant members should learn to value diversity, rather than engage in social category differentiation. Inter-group conflict can lead to solidarity amongst members with grievances to promote absenteeism and turnover, ignore creativity and problem-solving and do the minimum work required.

Further declines in productivity levels in South Africa, because of 'forced' membership-technology and membership-project matches that are inappropriate when the array of skills and relationship requirements are not met. Adaptive structuration has to include specific training and development programmes for members that match the technology and the projects.

It can thus be concluded that affirmative action, if not implemented and managed in the context of the management of diversity, can have consequences for organizational performance which are not necessarily managed in an organization. Thus, affirmative action is not synonymous with the management of workforce diversity.

The discussion of affirmative action above is in the context of the human behaviour that results from differences between employees in organizations. Many practitioners of human resource management view affirmative action and the management of diversity as administrative functions of human resource management.

In small and medium sized companies it may be sensible to have this view due to cost considerations, provided that the human resource practitioners understand where affirmative action and the management of workforce diversity fit in the big human behaviour picture.

The appropriate fit of affirmative action and the management of workforce diversity are in the area of organization development. Plans and strategies on the implementation of affirmative action and diversity management have to emerge from behavioural science research, practice research and practice theory. Human resource practices can then be translated from the latter.

Affirmative action is remedial. Specific target groups benefit as past wrongs are remedied. Previously excluded groups have an advantage. Affirmative action has not yet been analysed in the context of its implications for organizational behaviour.

This statement is based on the fact that from a management point of view, it is assumed that groups brought into an organizational system will adapt to existing organisational norms. From an organizational behaviour point of view, such an assumption leads in practice to assimilation of new groups into the organization culture. Assimilation in an undesirable diversity climate can lead to acculturation, i.e., conformance to the dominant culture in the organization that can in time present more diversity-related problems.

Affirmative action affects hiring and promotion decisions. Dominant groups can have resistance to perceived limits to autonomy in decision making and perceived fears of reverse discrimination.

It can be concluded from the above that human resource management practices do not incorporate the acknowledgement of the components of diversity in workgroups and its complexity. It addresses the development of employees in traditional key-performance areas without cognisance of the impact of diversity on tasks and relationships. The training and development in workgroups do not take into consideration diversity in task and relationship values, which may influence work, learning and relational styles.

3.2.2 The influence of the valuing of diversity in the processes of workforce diversity

Valuing diversity is the antithesis of social category differentiation. Criggs and Louw (1995:6) state: “It is enlightened self-interest that constitutes the only sound reason why people value diversity. For many the main reasons for engaging in the valuing diversity process are to reverse past wrongs, to assuage guilt, to act affirmatively or ensure equal opportunity just because it is “fair”. The first differences to be valued are one’s own differences with others. It is critical to understand that valuing one’s own differences compared to valuing the differences of others does not mean is not based on perceptions of superiority or inferiority. Once people can do this, it becomes easy to recognise that someone else’s uniqueness also requires full expression.

Griggs and Louw further states: “Both democracy and free enterprise which are the most radically progressive and liberal systems on earth – are intended to be fully inclusive and participatory.”

To manage the transformation from a legalistic diversity paradigm to a valuing diversity paradigm, include the management of social boundaries of diverse groups, to reduce and possibly eliminate social category differentiation. Managing these boundaries, require the management of adaptive structuration through management procedures and systems [see figure 2.3(b)]. Leadership-based interventions are required to influence the development of the valuing diversity paradigm.

Thus, it can be concluded that the required paradigm shift is based on managing social category boundaries and leadership. It is reasonable then, to refer to the valuing diversity paradigm as the management of diversity paradigm.

Where organizations embark on change interventions to develop the valuing of diversity, dominant groups harbour resistances due to fear of change, discomfort with differences, and a desire for return to “good old days”.

How much diversity is valued can be monitored by organisational surveys focused on attitudes and perceptions. Moral and ethical imperatives drive this culture change. Valuing diversity is idealistic - everyone benefits. Everyone feels valued and accepted in an inclusive environment. Valuing diversity assumes that groups will retain their own characteristics and shape the organisation as well as be shaped by it, creating a common set of values. Valuing diversity is necessary to manage workforce diversity.

3.2.3 Variables of a process for the management of workforce diversity

The extent of diversity-related problems in an organization as a result of how it is managed largely determines how such an organization is described in diversity-terms, as organization types.

Undesirable diversity-related behaviour in organizations can lead to diversity-related problems that influence individual and organizational outcomes, which in turn result in organizations that are not effective.

Managing the influence of workforce diversity with special reference to affirmative action and valuing diversity determines the extent of diversity-related problems.

3.2.3.1 The diversity-related types of organizations as an outcome of the management of workforce diversity

Organizations can be classified as three types, as a result of the status quo of the management of diversity in an organization (Gardenswartz and Rowe, 1993). These types are also referred to as diversity-related organization forms (Cox, 1993); mono-cultural, non-discriminatory and multicultural (Gardenswartz and Rowe, 1993). Each organizational form is a reflection of the status quo of the management of diversity in an organization. The status quo of the management of workforce diversity includes the status of all diversity-related aspects of the organization:

(i) *Dimensions of diversity*

For the purposes of this research a distinction must be drawn between general dimensions of diversity and dimensions of workforce diversity.

Dimensions of diversity refer to differences and similarities between people in general, and in general settings. It is the dimensions that can describe any person anywhere at anytime. For example, the diversity or similarity of a person one meets for the first time at a foreign airport (e.g., a woman), will have the dimensions of age (39yrs old), ethnicity (Croatian), gender (female), physical and intellectual ability (mid-sized brunette with high IQ and low EQ), race (Caucasian). These are primary dimensions. The secondary dimensions of the woman's diversity or similarity are her geographic location, income, marital status, parental status, religious beliefs, and so forth.

Dimensions of workforce diversity refers to the dimensions of diversity (categories of effects) that results from the interaction of different (diverse) or/and similar people (homogeneous) in an organization with a specific organizational culture.

Thus, it can be concluded that the dimensions of workforce diversity are the outcome of the interaction of general diversity within groups and the organizational culture in an organization. For example, resistance to diversity in an organization can be viewed as a dimension of workforce diversity, that is the outcome of the interaction of the characteristics (e.g. prejudice) of the historical general dimensions and the organizational culture (e.g. managers also have the characteristics of prejudice which influence human resource systems).

On the basis of the above statements, it is reasonable to conclude that there can at any time exist many dimensions of workforce diversity. At the universal level there can be many. At the cultural specific (country) level there should be many more than at the universal level, and at the specific organizational level it can be countless, because the organizational culture influence of the founders of the organization are also relevant.

If one adds dimensions as components of workforce diversity to this study, then the workforce diversity in South Africa becomes very complex.

(ii) *The relationship between dimensions of workforce diversity and diversity related organization forms*

Dimensions of workforce diversity are useful in identifying an organization's diversity-related organization form. A significant aspect of the organization form, is that its identification in an organization is a powerful instrument for managing workforce diversity. However, there are inherent problems in using the dimensions in the Cox-model for predicting organization form. Cox's dimensions cannot be distinguished from contextual factors, and can therefore take on universal (etic), as well as cultural-specific (emic) characteristics. Such a situation may not be problematic when determining the emic or cultural-specific dimensions of an organization in a specific country, but then the results cannot be used for etic comparisons.

This problem with dimensions of diversity is recognised by Buchner (1999:11), who asserts that dimensions of diversity is not always clear-cut or easily defined, because diversity means different things to different people. For example, skin colour is a common but unreliable indicator of race. A Brazilian may be viewed as a coloured person in South Africa. Outside South Africa this statement may not make any sense but inside the country it may have repercussions for the Brazilian if people he or she interacts with do not know of his or her origins. Thus, the concept of dimensions of diversity is in constant flux (Buchner, 1999), because of contingent changes in perceptions. This presents a problem.

This problem becomes a dilemma when one attempts to determine the organization form of an organization where affirmative action is being implemented. Because of affirmative action the components of workforce diversity may change, and therefore the dimensions need to be specified (Thomas, 1996).

Ideally, dimensions should transcend universal (etic) and cultural-specific (emic) influences. A resourceful way to achieve etic and emic “resistant” dimensions, is to identify a single dimension that fully predict diversity-related organization form in non-etic and non-emic terms. One can then identify the dimensions that lead to this “coherent” dimension. For the purposes of this research, it is reasonable to believe that such a dimension can be found in the status quo of the management of diversity in an organization.

Gardenswartz and Rowe (1993) identify several dimensions and isolate the status quo of the management of diversity as the coherent or super-ordinate dimension.

For the purposes of this research the following Gardenswartz dimensions are appropriate and adequate as determinants of the status quo of the management of workforce diversity:

- The extent of organizational change.
- How much diversity is valued in the organization.
- How diversity is managed in the organization.
- The extent of diversity-related problems in the organization.

3.2.3.2 Dimensions of diversity in the processes of workforce diversity

The four dimensions stated above that determine the status quo of the management of diversity can be reconciled with the impact of workforce diversity on organizational performance.

(i) Dimensions of diversity in the second order process of workforce diversity

The dimensions of diversity in this process consist of contextual factors of workforce diversity that impact on the tasks and relationships in the general organization and between groups in the organization. The relevant dimensions are the extents of organizational change, and how much diversity is valued in the organization.

Openness to change include the readiness of an organization to implement affirmative action and equal employment measures and to deal with the changes it can make to the components of diversity in workgroups. How much diversity is valued include estimation of interpersonal attitudes that can lead to adverse diversity effects or the diversity-climate. Together these two dimensions, through their contextual factors, “cause” the nature of ingroup-outgroup processes, which lead to social identities. The outcomes of these dimensions can be the diversity effects of prejudice, stereotypes, ethnocentricity and cultural differences, which constitute the diversity-climate. Cox refers to these as factors of the diversity-climate. The factors of the diversity climate influence the process of first-order impact in a causal way.

Thus, the diversity effects of the second-order process become causal factors of the first-order impact.

(ii) Dimensions of diversity in the first-order process of workforce diversity

The dimensions of diversity in this process consist of contextual factors that impact on tasks and relationships within groups in functional work areas. The relevant dimensions are the extent of diversity related problems and how diversity is managed in the organization.

Diversity-related problems are caused by the influence of factors of the diversity climate (prejudice, stereotypes and ethnocentricity), in the ways that components of workforce diversity combine within groups in functional work areas, i.e., areas where employees have to interact directly.

If diversity is not managed, sub-group differentiation within a workgroup can take place, with the concomitant differentiation of the factors of diversity-climate into discrimination on the grounds of negative stereotypes relating to task and relationship competencies. What this means is that in the absence of the management of diversity, the out-groups to the groups discriminated against (in-groups), has non-sanctioned ability to ignore certain employees (the formation of unhealthy role-networks), and assign employees similar to themselves to tasks and projects (unhealthy division of labour).

Such unmanaged workforce diversity can lead to diversity-related problems, like inter-group conflicts and assimilation, which have adverse consequences for individual career and organizational outcomes.

When managers knowingly match components of workforce diversity (wrongly or rightly), it amounts to adaptive structuration.

Table 3.1 has been adapted from the “Cox-model (1993), table 14.1:226.”

Table 3.1 The relationship between the diversity-related organization form and dimensions of diversity-climate

Status quo regarding the management of workforce diversity in the organization			
Dimension	Monolithic	Plural	Multicultural
Extent of organizational change	The organization is not adapting to change. It does not understand the value of change	The organization understands the reality of change, but needs to harness it and implement it quicker	The culture of the organization is open to change and the organization reacts and adapts quickly.
How much diversity is valued	Ignores or actively discourages diversity	Ignores or tolerates diversity	Values diversity
How diversity is Managed	Significant institutional bias in Human resource systems Minimal structural Integration Minimal informal integration	Institutional bias in Human resource systems is prevalent Partial structural integration Limited informal integration	Institutional bias in Human resource systems is minimised or eliminated Full structural integration Full informal integration
Extent of diversity-related problems	Assimilation Minimal inter-group conflict due to homogeneity	Assimilation Significant inter-group conflict	Pluralism Minimal inter-group conflict

Source: Adapted from Cox (1993:226) and Gardenswartz and Rowe (1993)

Table 3.1 represents an adaptation of Cox’s six-factor framework to describe the three organization types. For the purposes of this research the types of organizations based on the status quo of its management is studied in the context of the effects of Cox’s diversity climate, consisting of six factors that “cause” the different types of organization forms.

The discussion of the dimensions of workforce diversity above has to further include the complexity of workforce diversity discussed in 3.2.2 (figure 3.1). Some causes and effects of workforce diversity appear across dimensions, which have consequences for the management of workforce diversity. This characteristic of workforce diversity is referred to as the multi-dimensionality of workforce diversity.

3.2.3.3 The multidimensionality of diversity

To understand the concept of the multi-dimensionality of diversity, requires acknowledging the uniqueness of each dimension of diversity, while also identifying effects and relationships that occur across many dimensions (McGrath, Berdahl and Arrow (in Ruderman and Jackson et al., 1996). They point out that diversity is more than demographic differences and that not all effects of diversity are generic.

Their discussion of the distinctions among the clusters of diversity immediately leads us into the difficulty of dealing adequately with the overlap among the dimensions. For example, they treat organisational status, culture and demography as separate dimensions of diversity, yet there is considerable evidence to suggest that demographic categories (such as gender and national origin) also differentiate people in terms of status and culture within specific social contexts.

The importance of the interrelationships among diversity dimensions is also explicitly addressed by Northcraft, Polzer, Neale and Kramer (in Ruderman and Jackson et al., 1996). These authors argue that the effect of cognitive diversity on the performance of work teams is more potent than the effect of demographic diversity, but at the same time they note that the latter often acts as a surrogate for the former.

One way in which this surrogate effect occurs is that members assume or expect certain qualities to be present in others on the basis of these physical or other types of differences (e.g., female, Asian, an accountant). These

expectations become determinants of the effects of diversity, regardless of the extent to which they are accurate.

Northcraft et al (in Ruderman and Jackson et al, 1996), illustrated this point in their discussion of the potential effects of diversity on the process of negotiation. For example, they pointed out that the quality of negotiations is often impaired because stereotypic thinking leads each party to exaggerate the extent to which the other party's interests are in conflict with their own (i.e., there is a false presumption of distributiveness).

The fact that diversity has many overlapping dimensions, raises the following question:

Which types of diversity have effects on which organisational outcomes?

There is some indication that many "diversity effects" have wide application.

For example, McLeod, Lobel and Cox (in Ruderman and Jackson et. al., 1996,) found that ethnic diversity could enhance creative performance by teams, at least for identity-relevant tasks such as developing marketing strategies in a global context.

Likewise, creativity and innovation have been shown to be positively related to diversity of cognition (Amabile, 1983), age, organisational tenure, functional area and education (e.g., Bantel & Jackson, 1989; Murray, 1989).

From table 3.1 it is inferred that the dimensions can be interrelated, as it appears that some effects occur across dimensions.

(i) Cross-cutting of dimensions

It can thus be concluded that the variables in a process of diversity-management are the dimensions of openness to change and the valuing of diversity (second-order), and diversity-related problems and how diversity is managed (first-order). The effects of the interaction of all these, is reflected in the organization form.

Each of the above dimensions consists of contextual factors discussed in 2.7.4.3(ii):128-129.

(ii) *The status quo of the management of diversity as the coherent or super-ordinate dimension of workforce diversity*

The status quo of the management of diversity in an organization reflects the leadership of the organization in the context of the second-order impact of workforce diversity, as well as the management of diversity in the first-order impact.

The cause-and-effect dynamics of the second-order and first-order dimensions lead to the status quo of the management of diversity, which in turn is reflective of the diversity-related organization form.

Thus, it can be concluded that the organization form reflects the leadership and management of workforce diversity in an organization. Gardenswartz and Rowe (1993) states that managing workforce diversity emphasizes the building of specific skills and creating policies, which get the best from every employee. The latter is synonymous with the activity modes discussed in chapter 2.

Gardenswartz and Rowe (1993), uses aggregate evaluations of management-opinions gathered on the status quo of diversity-management in their organizations as predictors and indicators of the diversity-related organization form of their companies.

3.2.4 Operationalizing the new management of diversity paradigm

To arrive at recommendations on how to manage workforce diversity requires that the new paradigm of workforce diversity developed be operationalized. This requires translation of the theory contained in this behavioural science research into practice research. Such translation requires two stages:

- (i) Empirical *identification* of the following in South Africa:
 - (a) The typical diversity-related organization form.
 - (b) Dimensions of workforce diversity.
 - (c) Specific factors of workforce diversity (contextual).
 - (d) A statistical model of workforce diversity.

This stage is accomplished in the research design (chapter 4), and the results reported in chapter 5. The research design is based on the method for determining dimensions of workforce diversity as espoused by Gardenswartz and Rowe (1993).

In sub-section 3.2.4.1 a second South African pilot study is discussed that illustrates the appropriateness of using the method of Gardenswartz and Rowe to determine relevant dimensions of workforce diversity.

- (ii) Comparison of the theoretical change-model and the statistical model for the purposes of:
 - (a) More specific determination of the dimensions and contextual factors of workforce diversity in South Africa. This is to be achieved from comparisons drawn between the theoretical change-model and the statistical model.
 - (b) An intermediate scale for the determination of variables (factors) of workforce diversity in South Africa.

3.2.4.1 Research perspectives of workforce diversity in South Africa

To date, the most relevant research with respect to the work of Cox (diversity-climate) and Gardenswartz (dimensions of workforce diversity), have been captured in two studies that can be viewed as pilot-studies. The first study was discussed in 2.7.4.2:108-114 in the context of adaptive structuration in South Africa.

The second pilot-study (on diversity management at a South African university) examines the applicability of the dimensions of diversity as espoused by Gardenswartz and Rowe (1993), against the background of results produced by their diversity opinion survey in Australia. This study is useful for validating the applicability of the Gardenswartz dimensions in the revised IMCD in South Africa. This exercise is vital, as the research design for determining factors in South Africa uses covariance patterns of the dimensions identified in this study.

A Pilot-study to determine the progress in the management of workforce diversity at a South African university

A study was done by Strydom and Erwee (1997a) on diversity management at a South African university.

The purpose of the analysis of this pilot-study is to:

- Validate the applicability of the Gardenswartz dimensions in the revised Cox-paradigm of workforce diversity in South Africa.
- Identify the possible dimensions of workforce diversity in South Africa and the organizational form it leads to.
- Validate the applicability of the research method employed in the research design of this study.

A sample of 25 employees, selected to reflect gender, race and hierarchical level in the largest residential university in South Africa completed a diversity audit. A high number of symptoms of diversity-related problems are perceived and respondents believed that the university is relatively unresponsive to the need to change.

The university was believed to be in a monocultural stage of development and barriers to developing into a multicultural organisation were identified.

Respondents did report a very positive attitude towards diversity, but perceived that certain procedures are not supportive.

Due to the case study approach and small size of sample, the findings could not be generalised to the country at large. Similar trends were noted in a sample of 25 public and private sector companies in the first pilot-study. Tertiary institutions in South Africa and especially universities are facing a transformation wave as they are influenced by society, the business community and government.

The University has approximately 27000 students and a personnel corps of 5445. Education and training are the main tasks of the university with research second, and community service third.

At the time this study was conducted, some important developments at the university were: a) two black councillors were appointed; b) a black deputy for the Dean of students was appointed; c) a Centre for Reconstruction and Development was founded with a black female as director; d) a student profile of approximately 27000 of whom 5310 are black, e) a Broad Transformation Forum was established in July 1996, whose powers include participation in the selection process of vice chancellors and vice rectors. The university has decided not to formulate official policy on affirmative action regarding personnel.

A draft and final copy of the questionnaire (Diversity Audit) was developed by adapting existing questionnaires of Gardenswartz and Rowe. The diversity audit include the aim of the survey, definitions of concepts, biographical data, perceptions on symptoms of diversity related problems; openness to change of the university; the status quo regarding diversity management; organisational barriers to diversity; the valuing of diversity; and the management of diversity by managers or supervisors.

A four point Likert scale was used and the values are changed continuously to avoid response set.

Data collection

A case approach using 25 respondents representative of the organisational level, gender, race and line versus staff ratios in the university, was developed to complete the questionnaire.

The sample consisted of 55% males and 45% females; 80% whites and 20% blacks; 80% Afrikaans speakers and 20% black language speakers; 20% senior managers 50% middle managers and 30% lower level staff respondents; 80% married and 20% unmarried or divorced respondents; 60% with post graduate degrees, 20 % with first degrees and 20% with diploma or school certificates.

(i) Results

Symptoms of diversity related problems

The respondents are requested to indicate whether a specific symptom is applicable or present in their working environment. Of the 16 symptoms that are associated with diversity problems, the following are present in the university, reflecting 63% of symptoms: a) a lack of diverse staff at all levels; b) difficulty in communicating due to heavily accented language; c) ethnic, racial or gender jokes; d) complaints about discrimination in promotion, pay and performance reviews; e) lack of social interaction between members of diverse groups and f) increase in grievances by members of minority groups.

Openness of the university culture to change

The arithmetic means of the respondents' score on this dimension were obtained: the highest score is 52 and the lowest score is with a means of $X = 38$ ($38/60 = 63\%$). Given the smallness of the sample, it seems as if the respondents perceive the university culture as not sensitive enough to the fact that change does exist.

- *Gender*

The relevant means for gender groups are as follows: Female: $X = 38.5$; Male $X = 37.7$, indicating no significant difference between the scores of men and women regarding the university's openness to change.

- *Race*

The means for racial groups are: Black: $X = 31.8$; White: $X = 39.7$, which suggests a relatively significant difference between the scores of whites and blacks. Where the means for blacks lies at the bottom end of the category, implying perception that the university understands the value of change, but does not accept its reality, whites feel that the university is almost in the category in which change is being seen as a reality that has to be accepted.

- *Hierarchy*

The relevant means for different levels of the hierarchy are: Higher level managers: $X = 38.6$; Lower level workers: $X = 40.27$, indicating that there is no significant difference between the scores.

Status quo at the university regarding diversity management

The arithmetic means of the respondents for each of the stages were translated to a percentage: 41.2% of the respondents indicated that the university is in the monocultural stage; 32.3% of the respondents indicated that the university is in the non-discriminatory stage; and 26.54% of the respondents indicated that the university is in the multicultural stage.

These results support the findings of the first pilot-study.

- *Gender*

Both the male and female respondents believe that the university is primarily in the monocultural phase. Firstly, female respondents felt very strongly about it (45% of females versus males 37%) and secondly where less males feel that the university is non-discriminating (males 31%; females 34%), less females felt that the university does not have a multicultural orientation (females 23%; males 33%).

- *Race*

Both the white and black respondents indicate that the university is primarily in the monocultural phase. The black respondents (blacks 54%; whites 38%), felt strongly about this dimension and both groups argue that the university does not have a multicultural orientation (blacks 15%; whites 29%).

- *Hierarchy*

A total of 48% of the higher level manager's think that the university is already in the non-discriminatory phase. The lower level worker group is ambivalent about which phase the university's is in can be seen in the equal distribution of responses across the categories.

Identifying organisational barriers to diversity

Respondents were asked to rank-order eight potential organisational barriers to diversity with 1 being the most important obstacle and 8 being the least important obstacle. The arithmetic means of the respondents' results, with a weight being added to it for statistical purposes, for each of the barriers, are calculated.

The three most important barriers as prioritised by the respondents are: No perceived need to dismantle existing systems to accommodate diversity; strong belief in a system that favours merit; annoyance at reverse discrimination. No significant differences occurred among the gender, race and hierarchical groups.

How much is diversity valued at the university

Multicultural view	:	32.8/40 (82.0%)
Monocultural view	:	- 24.3/40 (60.7%)
Aggregate: is diversity valued:	:	+ 8.5 (21.3%)

The score of multicultural items seems to suggest that the respondents perceive the university to have a culture which value diversity. A dissenting

view is evident in the high score on the monocultural items. A truly diverse culture will (ideally) score 0 (nil) on the monocultural items which will mean that the score below the line, reflecting the diversity valuing culture, totals 40 (in this case 32.8). In the gender, race groups and hierarchical levels, the monocultural views still received very high scores in relation to the ideal 0 (nil).

How is diversity managed in your environment

The way in which diversity is actually managed, as perceived by respondents is assessed by analysing three sub-components, which add-up to an aggregate score, indicating the organisation's overall level of diversity management.

Individual attitudes and beliefs	:	12.56
Organisational values and norms	:	6.92
Management and policies	:	<u>7.64</u>
Total aggregate score	:	<u>27.12</u>

Out of a possible 56, the score achieved indicates that the university is only 48% effective in managing diversity – “Only when all three of the levels of organisation functioning work in concert, diversity is effectively managed as a corporate asset”.

Males and females perceive individual attitudes and beliefs to be the strongest developed of the diversity components. Organisational values and norms are significantly underdeveloped and management practices and policies are also very low, with males scoring these slightly higher.

The total in both cases, expressed as effectiveness percentages, are 47.93% and 48.92% respectively, both gender groups show that diversity as corporate asset is not being managed optimally. These results also apply to hierarchical levels and race groups, except for the fact that blacks consistently scored

lower. The low score of blacks regarding management practices (21% effectivity) is significant.

The findings in this section have to be interpreted against the background of the extent to which diversity is valued and status quo regarding the management of diversity. It must also account for the findings of the results below.

(ii) Findings

These results as well as those on the 'status quo', to a large degree present the picture of monocultural organizational forms at individual and inter-group levels.

The findings cannot be generalised in terms of table 3.1, but possible trends on workforce diversity in South Africa can be made on the basis of the small sample.

The perceptions of organizations being monolithic, lead to the following conclusions:

- (a) It appears that diversity may be ignored, and that diversity may not be valued as it can be.
- (b) Negative diversity effects may be characteristic of the diversity climate. It cannot be concluded that forms of discrimination may be prevalent at inter-group level.
- (c) There is a minimal level of structural and informal integration.

The information presented above reflect respondents' subjective perceptions regarding specific questions. The following proportions, relative to a total of 5445 employees, emerged: Gender: Men: n=3048 (59.95%); Women: n=2397 (44.02%); Race: Blacks: n=1068 (19.61%); Coloureds: n=12 (0.22%); Indians: n=4 (0.07%); Whites n=4351 (80.01%). The distribution of people of colour along organisational level was not available.

- (d) There appears to be institutional bias in human resource systems.
- (e) It seems as though inter-group conflict is present. It is reasonable for one to attribute this to the fact that blacks anticipate future increases in diversity due to statutory affirmative action, reducing fear levels that may have been present prior to the country's transition to democracy in 1994.

Within the context of socio-political changes currently being experienced and managed in South Africa, it is expected of all tertiary institutions to become multicultural. The largest residential university has only recently embarked on this journey towards creating a diverse workforce.

A frequency distribution of the potential symptoms of diversity-related problems shows that 11 of the symptoms are applicable. Due to this high number of symptoms being present at the university, the issue of diversity should receive serious attention.

The results suggested that the university is relatively unresponsive towards the necessity for change and the barriers that are preventing the university from changing into a multicultural organisation are:

A belief that no need exists to accommodate diversity.

A strong belief in a system that favours merit and

Annoyance at reverse discrimination.

These barriers are possibly symptoms of the strongly embedded monocultural stage at the university, exacerbated by its unresponsiveness regarding change.

Almost half of the respondents indicated that the university is still in the *monocultural* stage.

The conclusion from the valuing diversity section of the results is that employees' personal attitudes are supportive of the concept of affirmative action, equal employment opportunity and diversity management.

The concepts which drive procedures and policies are values and norms and in that respect the respondents' score is extremely low, signifying a vacuum in the base structure required for establishing a multicultural organisation, i.e. a diverse workforce. This statement is supported by the test of the university's structural integration.

(iv) Conclusions on the South African research perspectives

(a) The first pilot-study

The findings show that Cox's Interactional model of cultural diversity can be used in South Africa. By inference, the revised Cox-paradigm should also be applicable in South Africa, as well as change-models that can be derived from it.

The mono-cultural organization form would be indicated by any diversity climate. This suggests that it would also be indicated by a diversity climate constituted of the dimensions of Gardenswartz and Rowe.

(b) The second pilot-study

The Gardenswartz dimensions are applicable in the revised Cox-paradigm of workforce diversity in South Africa. The findings of this pilot-study coincide with that of the first pilot-study.

It can also be assumed that the research method pertaining to the research instrument, i.e., the diversity audit questionnaire of this pilot-study is applicable in the research design of this research.

3.2.4.2 Conclusions on the extent to which the findings can be integrated with the revised Cox-paradigm of workforce diversity

It is reasonable to conclude that the dimensions of workforce diversity identified in the second pilot-study and the contextual factors of workforce diversity identified in 2.7.4.2:108-117, can be integrated into the second and first-order processes of workforce diversity.

Figure 3.2 outlines the relationship between dimensions and processes of workforce diversity.

Figure 3.2 Dimensions in the processes of workforce diversity in South Africa

SECOND-ORDER PROCESS			FIRST-ORDER PROCESS	
Dimensions: Openness to change Valuing diversity Leadership			Dimensions: Diversity-related problems Status quo of the management of diversity How diversity is managed	
1 Demographic diversity	2 Individual differences in cognition, values, and behaviour.	3 Diversity - Effects. Inter-personal and role relations.	4 Interaction of diversity components of workgroups. Job-structuring.	5 Individual career outcomes
Organizational diversity.	Stereotype and status expectancies.	Task performance	Activity modes Role-networks Informal integration.	Organizational effectiveness.
Personal identity structures.	Ingroup-Outgroup Processes.	Inter-group attitudes and perceptions.	Division of labour. Structural integration.	Organizational performance.

Source: Adaptation of the incorporation of table 3.1:132 into figure 2.13:91.

The detail of the dimensions and organization form in this chapter, and that of the factors of diversity-climate and contextual factors in chapter 2, can now be integrated into the relevant columns of figure 3.2, to construct a change-model of workforce diversity.

The first stage of the operationalization of the new paradigm of workforce diversity can now be completed. In section 3.3 a change-model of workforce diversity is constructed, based on the construct validity of the constructs in South Africa, as found in the first and second pilot-studies.

3.2.5 Conclusion: A change model of workforce diversity

The results of the theoretical model building that progressed through chapters 2 and 3, can now be consolidated into a *Change- model of workforce diversity* (see figure 3.3:156).

- (i) The diversity-climate that was determined in the first pilot-study, as manifested in first, second and third level factors of diversity-climate. The diversity climate is therefore represented by column 3 in figure 3.2.
- (ii) Dimensions identified in the second pilot-study are placed (in the model as described in 3.2.4.2) in the context of the first and second-order processes. Second-order dimensions are openness to change, and how much diversity is valued in the organization. First-order dimensions are diversity-related problems, and how is diversity managed in the organization.
- (iii) The coherent dimension is the status quo regarding the management of diversity in the organization (refer to 3.2.3.2:131-133). It reflects the type of diversity-related organization form of the organization, e.g. whether it is mono-cultural (characteristics of homogeneity), or non-discriminatory (characteristic of organization in transition from mono-cultural to multicultural), or multicultural (characteristics of heterogeneity).
- (iv) The contextual factors that constitute the dimensions of workforce diversity are assigned on the basis of the process in which the dimensions are most dynamic.

In the second-order process the factors of openness to change are workforce composition, the types of diversity, and the organizational types of diversity.

The factors for how much diversity is valued are organizational culture, identity structures, power relationships and social identities. In the first-order process the factors of diversity-related problems are the individual-level factors of diversity-climate, the group-level diversity-climate and the organizational-level climate. The factors of how is diversity managed, are issues pertaining to adaptive structuration. These are job-structuring, social category boundaries, informal integration through role-networks, and structural integration through division of labour.

Source: Adapted from the description of figure 3.2 and table 3.1 into figure 3.2

Individual-level	Group-level	Organizational-level	Adaptive structuration
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual-level diversity-climate Attitudes and intentions, e.g. discrimination, exclusion, etc. Adaptability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Group-level diversity-climate Team processes, e.g. social identity, norms, etc. Team structure, e.g. composition, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organizational-level diversity-climate Organizational culture, identity, etc. Organizational structure, e.g. division of labour, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Job-structuring Social category boundaries Informal integration through role-networks Structural integration through division of labour
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual-level diversity-climate Attitudes and intentions, e.g. discrimination, exclusion, etc. Adaptability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Group-level diversity-climate Team processes, e.g. social identity, norms, etc. Team structure, e.g. composition, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organizational-level diversity-climate Organizational culture, identity, etc. Organizational structure, e.g. division of labour, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Job-structuring Social category boundaries Informal integration through role-networks Structural integration through division of labour
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual-level diversity-climate Attitudes and intentions, e.g. discrimination, exclusion, etc. Adaptability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Group-level diversity-climate Team processes, e.g. social identity, norms, etc. Team structure, e.g. composition, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organizational-level diversity-climate Organizational culture, identity, etc. Organizational structure, e.g. division of labour, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Job-structuring Social category boundaries Informal integration through role-networks Structural integration through division of labour

Figure 3.3 A Change- Model of workforce diversity

SECOND ORDER TRANSFORMATIONAL FACTORS OF CHANGE <u>DIMENSIONS</u> <i>Openness to change.</i> <i>How much diversity is valued.</i>			FIRST ORDER TRANSACTIONAL FACTORS OF CHANGE <u>DIMENSIONS</u> <i>Diversity-related problems.</i> <i>How diversity is managed</i>		
1 Environmental factors	2 Social categorization	3 Diversity-climate	4 Adaptive structuration	5 Organizational outcomes	Organizational form
Individual level <i>Workforce composition</i> <i>Types of diversity</i> Demographic diversity. Knowledge, skills, abilities Values, beliefs, attitudes Personality, cognition	Identity structures	Diversity-related individual attitudes and perceptions, e.g., prejudice, stereotypes.	Tasks, technology <i>Job-structuring</i> Activity mode issues <i>Social categories</i> Boundaries	<u>First level factors</u> Individual career outcomes Attendance Turnover Productivity Work Quality Recruiting success	Multi-cultural or
Group level <i>Organizational culture</i> <i>Organizational types of diversity in tasks and relationships.</i> Status in embedded org.	Ingroup/outgroup processes <i>Power relationships</i>	Diversity-related inter-personal attitudes and perceptions, e.g., discrimination, ethnocentricity, cultural differences <i>Inter-group conflict</i> <i>assimilation</i>	Tasks, relationships <i>Informal integration through informal networks</i> Activity mode issues Social category differentiation.	Creativity/innovation Problem solving Workgroup-cohesiveness and communication.	Non-discriminatory or
<u>Organizational level</u> <i>Organizational diversity</i>	Social identities	<i>Acculturation</i> <i>Bias in Human resource systems</i>	Projects, tasks <i>Structural integration through division of labour</i> Activity mode issues Social category differentiation.	<u>Second level factors</u> Market share Profitability Achievement of formal organization goals	Monocultural

Source: Adapted from the incorporation of figure 2.2 and table 3.1 into figure 3.2

Thus, against the background of the dimensions of workforce diversity in this chapter, it can be concluded that nature of current adaptive structuration in South Africa is characterised by:

- (i) Changes in the division of labour that is to the advantage of dominant employees, when non-dominant employees do not have the required task-relationship attributes. Very seldom does one find change-interventions that are aimed at developing the required attributes in the context of workforce diversity.
- (ii) The role requirements remain the same or change, but the nature of membership relationship skills does not change for employees that are prejudiced. Mentorship seldom achieves the objectives of socialization to help members share the vision of the organization.

The diversity issues (at personal, inter-personal and organizational level) raised by Rosmarin (2.2.4:37-38), can be viewed in three contexts. Firstly, the influence of diversity on teams; secondly, adaptive structuration; and thirdly, in the context of diversity related problems. The issues of workforce diversity in South Africa can now be dealt with against the background of the first and second-order processes of workforce diversity as outlined in figure 3.3.

(a) *Personal level organizational behaviour*

Traits are based on value judgements and as a result regarded as positive or negative demographic or organizational diversity. Figure 2.8 shows the traits that are based on value judgements, and are interpreted as positive or negative in the development of stereotypes and status expectancies.

Messages and judgements received about others, particularly those who are different racially and culturally, can be interpreted within the framework of the second-order contextual factors of workforce diversity. Messages are received which help define

a person's worth and self-esteem, both as an individual and as part of a group (however the group may be defined).

The in-group in this case is the dominant group. They internalise erroneous perceptions about out-groups, developing stereotypes, and status expectancies.

These perceptions impact on inter-personal and role relations, creating us them distinctions and when it has emotional significance for an individual's self-concept, motivational components of ingroup-outgroup distinctions are engaged. These include ingroup loyalties and favouritism, implicit inter-group rivalries, negative stereotypes and distrust of outgroup (dominant) members.

The latter dissertation explains mistrust that is salient in the National Productivity Institute's thesis on value-systems and participation. Mistrust is a significant diversity-related issue in South Africa (Schuitema, 1995) that accompanies it.

Feldman (1993) found that in South Africa the attribute of legitimacy was central to the issue of trust between employees and management in the geographic area of Gauteng, in South Africa. He found that the attribute of legitimacy is earned when the perception of 'manager-genuineness' is created and communicated by employees.

(b) Inter-personal / Group level organizational behaviour

The prejudice and stereotyping that are the diversity effects of inter-group attitudes and perceptions evolve into ethnocentricity and discrimination are the inputs to the component-matching processes.

At this stage one can observe the dynamics of the second-order diversity-related team process of component matching (see figure 2.13:85). At this level component matching is centred mainly around job-structuring and role-networking.

Cultural differences, ethnocentricity and discrimination control the dynamics of the role-network, which can be very potent in generating many diversity-related problems.

When and with whom there is tension and fear in a work-relationship and the causes for it, can be inferred to the use of differences in power. Differences in power may be sanctioned by management through organizational policies, systems and practices.

(c) *Organizational level organizational behaviour*

The dynamics at organizational level, in terms of the questions of Rosmarin, consist mainly of adaptive structuration, which can be positive or negative.

The types of diversity identified in South Africa would most likely lead to negative adaptive structuration if:

- There is no genuine commitment from management towards empowerment, participation and valuing of diversity. If the outcomes of the exchange of ingroup-outgroup messages result in inter-group conflict and mistrust, then these are products of the lack of participation, valuing of diversity and empowerment.
- The potential of the total work-force is not being used. This can be the case if messages from the dominant group are communicated by biased human resource programmes with limited integration, resulting in partial utilization of the total workforce.
- Biased human resource systems do not use the appropriate criteria for the measurement of performance. Human resource programmes are not aligned with strategic business objectives. It can be, but discrimination would exclude most members of the non-dominant group.
- Negative adaptive structuration results in diversity-related organizational behaviour problems, which in turn have consequences for organizational outcomes. Inter-group perceptions and attitudes emerge from the adaptive structuration, and serve as organizational category diversity-inputs to the first-order diversity-related team-process, creating a cause – effect loop.

CHAPTER 4 THE RESEARCH DESIGN

Cox (1995), states that in organizations in which diversity is not valued, the cultural norms, values, work practices and interpersonal relations hinder the full participation of all organizational members. Furthermore he emphasises that if the status quo is not reversed over a reasonable time-period, current as well as increasing diversity will affect work-team and organizational performance adversely. It is evident at this point, that to understand the conclusions on adaptive structuration in South Africa, we have to study the legacy of prior interactions of work-groups in South Africa. This entails then a study of South Africa's history of inter-group relations.

Following this stage of the operationalization of the new paradigm of workforce diversity, is the research design in chapter 4, for the empirical determination of the following in South Africa:

- (a) The typical diversity-related organization form.
- (b) Dimensions of workforce diversity.
- (c) Specific factors of workforce diversity (contextual).

A Statistical model of workforce diversity.

The research procedures in chapter 4 are designed to test the model in figure 3.3 and to provide the factors of workforce diversity that are relevant in South Africa.