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ABSTRACT

After the 1994 elections South Africa had to undergo drastic changes for it to become a more just society to address past injustices experienced by various ethnic groups. Issues such as equality and social justice have frequently appeared on top of various organisations’ agenda. The South African Government realised legislation was of paramount importance to guide organisations in promoting justice in the workplace. These changes in the legislation have had several impacts on organisations operating in South Africa, namely turnover, recruitment and retention of employees in the workplace.

Attempting to preside over the promotion of social justice and eliminate inequalities experienced in the workplace, Government realised it had to intercede, not only to prevent additional discrimination, but also to promote the employment and advancement of individuals who were disadvantaged by previous policies. The Government therefore in 1998 implemented the Employment Equity Act to fulfil a constitutional mandate to prohibit discrimination in the workplace and encourage Affirmative Action (AA) measures.

Describing and explaining the role of fairness as a concern in the workplace, the term organisational justice was coined. Individuals will base fairness judgements by taking into consideration the actual decision or the procedures used to reach a decision. Organisational justice can be divided into distributive, procedural and interactional justice.

Organisations in South Africa face the challenge of finding ways to implement EE strategies to gain competitive advantages without creating negative employee attitudes; attention will focus on how to overcome the barriers that hinder the successful implementation of EE practices and procedures.

Mining organisations are seen to be the forerunners when it comes to abiding by the Employment Equity Act. A particular reason why EE is of importance in the Mining industry
is due to an industry dominated by male employees. The lower ranked positions are generally filled by black employees and higher rank ones by white males. Due to this composition of the workforce employees often view EE as not being affective and may impact on organisational justice.

The central objective of this study is to determine employees’ perceptions of fairness of the procedures used to implement employment equity within a mining organisation in South Africa.

Ninety (90) respondents completed a questionnaire to identify their views of EE, AA and Discrimination, Transformation and Diversity within the workplace. The study found that the organisation has made significant progress in terms of complying with the dictates of the EEA. It was also found that there was a large divide in terms of employees’ responses in terms of whether AA has been fair to both previously disadvantaged and advantaged groups in the past.
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CHAPTER 1

PROBLEM STATEMENT AND AIM OF RESEARCH

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The 1994 elections sanctions were lifted against South Africa and the country was able to compete and join global markets. The Government had realistic aspirations for the country wanting them to join the global markets and be successful by addressing societal and economic reforms by embarking on initiatives specifically aimed at eliminating discrimination. Various anti-discriminatory laws were passed which were aimed at redressing previous inequalities in the workplace and the country was guided towards progress and transformation. These laws included the Basic Conditions of Employment Act no 75 of 1997, the Employment Equity Act (EEA) no 55 of 1998 and the Skills Development Act no 97 of 1998. The most significant legislation in terms of redressing the past inequalities in the workplace is the EEA no 55 of 1998 (Greeff & Nel, 2003; Jafta, 1998; Portnoi, 2003). Adhering to this Act has become a critical component for the majority of South African organisations as the penalties for non-compliance can be significant (Employment Equity Report, 2003; Maritz, 2002; Pela, 2002; Wadula, 2004; cited Esterhuizen, 2008).

1.2 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Coal production began in South Africa in 1870 to supply energy to the Kimberly diamond fields. The mining industry within South Africa has placed the country on the global business map, mining industry directly impacted on migrants, foreign settlers and businesses investing in South Africa (Prevost, 2004). South Africa is currently the third largest exporter of coal in the world. According to Prevost (2004) coal has always been preferred to other energy
sources because it is seen as cheap energy source and the relative proximity from mines to end-users.

It has been several years since the promulgation of the EEA and there are indications organisations are continuously striving to achieve equitable representation of designated groups in all occupational categories and levels as set out by the EEA. Companies are achieving equitable representation in the workplace through numerical goal setting and the recruitment process which are implemented (Cilliers & Stone, 2005; Human, 1996; Mdladlana, 2000; Pandor, 2005; Employment Equity Report, 2003; cited Esterhuizen, 2008). However, even though organisations are continuously aiming to achieve equity in the workplace there are still ongoing debates surrounding the implementation of EE. On the one side of the debate there are those such as Vavi (2004) who states that EE in the workplace is essential for removing gender and class discrimination; as well Human (1996), Mdladlana (2003) and Thomas (2002) who states EE is of paramount importance to the stability, economic and global success of the country. On the opposite side of the debate, is the argument that EE practices are associated with damaging occurrences such as tokenism and reverse discrimination, stress for beneficiaries and the lowering of standards and production (Maritz, 2002; Motileng, Wagner and Cassimjee, 2006; Thomas, 2002; Twala, 2004).

Since the introduction of the EEA there have been numerous EE models which have been designed and implemented within organisations. The effectiveness of the various EE models is seen as the ratio of employees (from Historically Disadvantaged South African (HDSA) groups) that are hired or promoted within the organisation. However, organisations should not only focus on the number of individuals who are classified as being HDSA which are appointed, the perceived fairness of EE practices should also be focused on as a key indicator of effectiveness (Coetzee, 2005). When processes within an organisation are perceived to be
unfair by the workforce it can lead to negative outcomes such as frustration and lack of trust in management (Greenberg, 1990; cited Coetzee, 2005). It is therefore important that management understand the importance of justice within the company policies and processes as it may have an impact on the effective functioning of an organisation as well as employees themselves. The perceived injustices resulting from EE is likely to translate into negative outcomes which may impact the EE programmes successful implementation.

1.3 MOTIVATION FOR THE STUDY

A mining organisation based in South Africa has been selected to support the infrastructure of the research environment. The focus will be on the organisation’s Corporate Centre (Head Office). Companies submit their EE plan and report per employer and the Corporate Centre is registered as a Limited (Ltd) company, whereas the actual business units (business sites) are registered under a different name. The total number of employees at the Corporate Centre is 827 (this excludes tenants, contractors and consultants). The organisation has employment policies in place aimed at fulfilling the EE targets which have been set for each occupational level.

After the 1994 elections South Africa had to undergo drastic changes for it to become a more just society to address past injustices experienced by various ethnic groups. Issues such as equality and social justice have frequently appeared on top of various organisations’ agenda. The South African Government realised legislation was of paramount importance to guide organisations in promoting justice in the workplace. These changes in the legislation have had several impacts on organisations operating in South Africa, namely turnover, recruitment and retention of employees in the workplace.

Attempting to preside over the promotion of social justice and eliminate inequalities experienced in the workplace, Government realised it had to intercede, not only to prevent
additional discrimination, but also to promote the employment and advancement of individuals who were disadvantaged by previous policies. The Government therefore in 1998 implemented the Employment Equity Act to fulfil a constitutional mandate to prohibit discrimination in the workplace and encourage Affirmative Action (AA) measures.

Describing and explaining the role of fairness as a concern in the workplace, the term organisational justice was coined. Organisational justice refers to people’s perceptions of fairness in an organisational setting. Individuals will base fairness judgements by taking into consideration the actual decision or the procedures used to reach a decision. Organisational justice can thus be divided into distributive, procedural and interactional justice (Coetzee, 2005).

Van Wyk (2002) stated as soon as employees regard something to be unfair, they tend to reject it and any further interventions an employee may have planned will be destined to failure. Van Wyk (2002) further state if South Africa wants to make a success of EE, organisations should understand how perceptions of it influence employees’ attitudes and behaviour and as a result impact on the success of the company. Although South Africa has made significant progress in restructuring and transforming societies and its institutions since the apartheid era, inequalities and unfair discrimination remain deeply entrenched in social structures, practices and attitudes thereby undermining the good intentions of the country’s constitutional democracy (Van Wyk, 2002). Organisations should therefore make a special attempt to eliminate discrimination and manage those employees displaying resistance to change.

Negative feelings (about resistance to change) experienced by employees can be conquered by applying fairness principles in the workplace. These principles present an opportunity to alleviate some of the unfavourable organisational consequences of individuals’ resentment-
based resistance to change. However, an organisation’s obligation to employees involves
more than fair treatment with regards to the salaries and benefits given in exchange for
labour, (known as distributive justice) and regarding the implementation of policies and
procedures that determine the levels of compensation, (known as procedural justice).
Additionally, organisations have an ethical obligation to treat all employees with sufficient
dignity as a person (known as interactional justice) (Folger & Skarlicki, 1999).

Organisations in South Africa face the challenge of finding ways to implement EE strategies
to gain competitive advantages without creating negative employee attitudes; attention will
focus on how to overcome the barriers that hinder the successful implementation of EE
practices and procedures.

Mining organisations are seen to be the forerunners when it comes to abiding by the
Employment Equity Act. A particular reason why EE is of importance in the Mining industry
is due to an industry dominated by male employees. The lower ranked positions are generally
filled by black employees and higher rank ones by white males. Due to this composition of
the workforce employees often view EE as not being affective and may impact on
organisational justice.

1.4 RESEARCH QUESTION

The following research question was developed with regard to determining whether
employees experience fairness and non-discrimination with regard to practices and
procedures in the workplace due to Employment Equity (EE): What are the barriers to the
effective implementation of EE programmes in a mining organisation in South Africa?
1.5 OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

The central objective of this study is to determine employees’ perceptions of fairness of the procedures used to implement employment equity within a mining organisation in South Africa. To achieve the central objective, the derived objectives are:

- To measure employee’s responses to employment equity practices within a particular Mining organisation in South Africa.
- To determine whether there are differences in the responses/perceptions of EE based on biographical characteristics.
- To identify the barriers (areas of concern) to achieving EE success and where organisational procedures or group behaviour can be improved to increase employees’ perceptions of fairness of EE practices and procedures.
- To establish the factors influencing employee’s perceptions of EE practices in a mining company in South Africa?
- To provide recommendations to the organisation enabling them to contribute towards solving the proposed formulated problem.

1.6 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research will be of value when a framework is provided of the parameters within which the investigation will take place.

1.6.1 Descriptive Study

According to Sekaran (2003) the aim of a descriptive study is to determine and describe the characteristics of the variables of interest in a given situation. Sekaran (2003, p.125) elaborates by stating “descriptive studies are undertaken in organisations in order to learn about and describe the characteristics of a group of employees, as for example, the age,
educational level, job status, and length of service of Hispanics or Asians working in the system”. However, descriptive studies may also be undertaken to understand the characteristics of businesses that follow certain common practices. The aim of this approach is therefore to describe applicable aspects of the subject matter to the researcher from an individual, organisational and industry perspective. This information is thus critical for organisations should they want to consider corrective steps (Sekaran, 2003).

1.6.2 Qualitative and quantitative research methods

There are two approaches which can be utilised to solve a problem known as quantitative and qualitative research methods. Quantitative research is based on positivist thought and can be verified by observation and experimentation (Ford & Gonzales, 2010). The quantitative method also allows for distribution of variables that can be generalized to the entire population. This method allows for less interaction between the researcher and respondents thus resulting in more objectivity. This method of research makes use of data collection methods such as questionnaires and experiments (Ford & Gonzales, 2010). Qualitative research investigates individual behaviours and characteristics to understand cause and solve problems. It is also an inductive process which is used to investigate new perspectives on previously studied information which is not completely understood (Ford & Gonzales, 2010). The qualitative research method is less generalizable to the greater population than the qualitative approach; however, provides a more accurate description of individuals and groups. Qualitative approaches contain various methods which can be implemented to gather information; such as interviews, focus groups and case studies (Ford & Gonzales, 2010). Tables 1.1 and 1.2 depict the advantages and disadvantages of the quantitative and qualitative research methods.
Table 1.1

**Quantitative Research: Advantages and Disadvantages**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Possibility to isolate variables in systems and discover causal relations (What?)</td>
<td>Threat of nonsense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High measure level and possibility for statistical analysis</td>
<td>Gap between conceptional approach and reality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly structured</td>
<td>N/A if no existing theory available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understandable methods (counting, scales)</td>
<td>Limited with complex questions (reasons, suggestions for improvement, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focused research questions</td>
<td>Lack of flexibility caused by the predetermination of the researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower effort (time, costs) compared to qualitative research methods</td>
<td>Acceptance problem in the qualitative research community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replicable results</td>
<td>Objective view</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fullenmann, Breitenmoser & Fischl, 2011

Table 1.2

**Qualitative Research: Advantages and Disadvantages**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Possibility to examine relations and structures in systems (How? For which purpose?)</td>
<td>Very difficult to generalize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility due to process orientation (e.g. possibility for sample extensions during the research process)</td>
<td>Danger of &quot;going native&quot; by too high identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty of involved person to mention all relevant aspects and create a holistic picture</td>
<td>Uncertainty and danger of inconsistent findings caused by the high flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Usability for new research fields without theories (explorative approach)</td>
<td>No information on statistics (distribution, frequencies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Chance on diversified and/or deepened illumination of the research field</td>
<td>Often low measure level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Subjective view</td>
<td>High effort (time, costs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acceptance problem in the quantitative research community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fullenmann, Breitenmoser & Fischl, 2011
The quantitative research method is the chosen direction to follow thus providing for high anonymity and confidentiality and this would be advantageous as people often do not want to express their perceptions of employment equity. This method would also provide generalizability and focused questions.

A mining organisation and specifically the Head Office based in South Africa will serve as host where the research will be conducted. The total employees therefore employed at their Head Office are 827 (this excludes tenants, contractors and consultants). The organisation has employment policies in place aimed at fulfilling the EE targets which have been set for each occupational level. The sample for this study will therefore comprise of 110 employees who will be selected across the various ethnicities, gender, departments and pay grades of the organisation. Online questionnaires will be distributed to the selected individuals consisting of two sections, the biographical one and then questions related to measuring the constructs.

1.7 HYPOTHESES

Sekaran (2003) defines hypotheses as a logically conjectured relationship between two or more variables expressed in the form of a testable statement. “Relationships are conjectured on the basis of the network of associations established in the theoretical framework formulated for the research study. By testing the hypotheses and confirming the conjectured relationships, it is expected that solutions can be found to correct the problem encountered” (Sekaran, 2003, p.108). Bless and Higson-Smith (2000) defines the term hypotheses as a research problem, it is a question about the nature of the relationship between variables and become tentative, actual and testable answers to the problem.

Hypothesis 1:

There is no statistically significant difference in perceptions of employment equity, affirmative action and discrimination based on race
**Hypothesis 2:**

There is no statistically significant difference in perceptions of employment equity, affirmative action and discrimination based on age.

**Hypothesis 3:**

There is no statistically significant difference in perceptions of employment equity, affirmative action and discrimination based on tenure.

**Hypothesis 4:**

There is no statistically significant difference in perceptions of employment equity, affirmative action and discrimination based on disability.

**Hypothesis 5:**

There is no statistically significant difference in perceptions of employment equity, affirmative action and discrimination based on job level.

**Hypothesis 6:**

There is no statistically significant difference in perceptions of employment equity, affirmative action and discrimination based on education.

**1.8 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS**

The compelling premise in conducting research is accepting the responsibility for all procedures and ethical issues related to the practice. The integrity of the research project should be maintained and the choice should benefit participants and society at large. The researcher should self-assess and ensure the research is conducted as competently as possible and be in compliance and awareness of local customs, standards, laws, regulations and should not intrude in people’s lives or the communities of their study. The Health Professions
Council of South Africa’s (HCPSA)’s Ethical Code of Professional Conduct for Psychologists is the regulatory framework within which the researcher adhered to for this study.

During the data collection of a study it is of importance that each respondent voluntarily participate and provide informed consent to be a participant. The questionnaire utilised for the study was investigated for reliability and validity, in order to prevent harm to the employees participating. The human rights as well as welfare of all employees taking part in the study were acknowledged and protected at all times during the study. The confidentiality and anonymity of all participants remained a priority throughout the study. The research for this study was conducted according to the ethical code of psychologists, as specified by the Professional Board for Psychology.

1.9 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

A research project cannot accommodate all eventualities and therefore an outline of the limitations provides an outline of the framework.

- The first limitation is employing a non-probability sampling method in the form of convenience sampling. This resulted in certain groups being under-represented in the study and as an outcome selection bias has been introduced, which reduces the degree to which the results of the study may be generalised to the entire population.
- The study relates to the confinement of the sample to employees of one mining organisation only. Therefore, the results cannot be extrapolated to the general population in the mining sector; study therefore lacks external validity.
- Another limitation is the sample size a larger one would have resulted in an increase in the generalizability of the research findings.
• The unmatched gender ratio that was encountered is another limitation as there are more males employed in the mining industry as there are females, findings can therefore not be generalized to the entire female workforce.

• The method of data gathering is quantitative therefore not having used qualitative methods of gathering data would be a limitation. It is also possible that the data collected from the questionnaires do not capture the complexity of employees’ perceptions of employment equity as they were not able to make any comments as the questions were forced answers. If a qualitative method such as interviewing was used respondents would have been able to give comments and not be forced to pick a answer (as in the case of the questionnaire) that might not be as applicable to them but the closest to what they felt/experienced; and by conducting interviews respondents would have been able to also ask the researcher questions concerning questions that they did not understand.

• A further limitation is language and literacy levels were not anticipated as the questionnaire is available in English.

1.10 STRUCTURE OF THE STUDY

- Chapter 2: Literature review of the implementation of EE in South Africa; barriers to and critical success factors in implanting EE successfully; and Organisational Justice and employment equity practises
- Chapter 3: Research methodology and measuring instrument
- Chapter 4: Reporting and interpretation of results
- Chapter 5: Findings, limitations and recommendations
1.11 CONCLUSION

An overview of the background, reason for this research as well as the problem statement, research questions, objectives of the study, hypothesis and the limitations of the study has place the project within a framework to accommodate the following chapters.

The background to and rationale for the implementation of employment equity practices in South Africa; barriers to and critical success factors in implanting EE successfully; and Organisational Justice and employment equity practices provides an appreciation of the complexity of the problem under consideration.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE SURVEY

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Several years have passed since the Employment Equity Act 55 of 1998 was promulgated and at present there is still a debate surrounding its implementation in the workplace. Equity is an essential part of removing gender and class discrimination in the workplace and level the playing field for all concerned. EE is viewed as a critical success factor to the stability, economic and global success of South Africa (Vavi, 2004; Human, 1996; Mdladlana, 2004; Thomas, 2002; cited Esterhuizen & Martins, 2008). However, EE has also been linked to negative outcomes such as tokenism and reverse discrimination (Maritz, 2002; Motileng, Wagner & Cassimjee, 2006; Thomas, 2002; Twala, 2004; cited Esterhuizen & Martins, 2008) and this may be viewed as unfair practices which could lead to a negative outcome. The inadequacy of the implementation of EE practices in South Africa will result in negative effects on the overall transformation goals of South Africa. Should employees view practices within the organisation as being unjust due to EE it is likely these programmes will not be implemented successful implementation.

Focusing on the background and the underlying principles for the implementation of the EEA in South Africa will provide a foundation and the EE legislation such as the Codes of good practice places the concept in the workplace together with the allowed limits of freedom. The consultation requirements of the EEA, barriers to EE, critical success factors, best practices for the effective implementation of EE as well models which may contribute to the successful implementation of EE in the workplace. This chapter will then define and elaborate on the forms of organisational justice. It will also discuss the impact of perceived injustice on organisational outcomes and continue to discuss the role of justice perceptions in EE practices and focus on an integrated model to implement and manage EE fairly.
2.2 BACKGROUND AND UNDERLYING PRINCIPLE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF EE

South Africa’s past of oppression, discrimination and racism is documented and known throughout the world and provides an understanding of the historical background. The oppression, discrimination and racism experienced throughout the country was not merely a societal racism, but was implemented by the Government, which resulted in an institutionalized racial system established and enforced by a variety of laws. There was a heartless disregard of the concept of equality for all citizens of the country and all was deprived of opportunities to enhance their future. Legislation was specifically implemented with the purpose of creating a society that favoured white males and gave them ample opportunity to succeed, while at the same time, destroying the hopes and ambitions of black people and all women of South Africa (Laher, 2007).

After winning the 1948 elections, the National Party realised it had to establish itself in the hearts and minds of South African voters. The voting public at that period consisted mainly of the white working class and Afrikaner business owners. The National Party to not only secure, but essentially increase its support base, it decided to construct the economy in such a way their support base would benefit financially (Joseph, 2006). The National Party’s effort to increase their support base included, employment for white workers on the railways, in the post office and in civil service in general; providing social benefits for whites (included free education), subsidies on basic services such as water and electricity and state housing; setting up enterprises to provide the infrastructure needed by a developing local industry. This included setting up new state owned enterprises represented by Iscor and Sasol and expanding public sector companies such as Eskom (van Niekerk, Pape, Xali and Newman, 1999; cited Joseph, 2006).
Racial discrimination was gradually institutionalised and South Africa adopted a number of related employment policies that entrenched power in the hands of a few, but restricted others (Laher, 2007). Some of these policies included the Industrial Conciliation Act of 1924 that was passed as affirmative action for whites against cheap black labour, legislation for job reservation and the Native Building Workers Act of 1951 which prohibited blacks from doing skilled construction work in white urban areas (Sonn, 1993). It can be deduced the policies put in place by the National Party favoured only a segment of the South African population, particularly in terms of occupying the higher positions in organisations. The result was a large majority of the workforce, consisting mostly of black South Africans, remained unskilled and subsequently moderately uneducated. The low levels of education and skills among black workers, attached to racially discriminative legislation at the time, allowed the Government, state owned enterprises and privately owned firms to neglect these workers in terms of affording them rights and opportunities for up-skilling and advancement (Joseph, 2006).

As a response to the harsh laws that was inflicted on black citizens, there was a continuous struggle to oppose apartheid. The struggle was spearheaded by the African National Congress which fought mainly a political campaign. A defining moment arose after an ANC campaign to gather mass input on freedom demands, the Freedom Charter, was signed on 26 June 1955 at the Congress of the People in Soweto. White South Africa eventually yielded to world pressure and to domestic violence experienced throughout the country in 1990, by repealing most of the apartheid laws which were being practiced at the time. Three years later a new constitution gave people of all races the right to vote and in 1994 South Africans elected its first black president, Nelson Mandela (Laher, 2007).
Under the new democratic constitution of South Africa (Post 1994) all citizens had an equal opportunity and enjoyed equal status. However, even though all individuals received the right to equality, not all of them were necessarily equal. Still under the new democratic ruling of the country individuals were still disadvantaged as a result of the long term effects of previous racial and gender discrimination experienced (Laher, 2007). This was a major hindrance for the progress of the country that required some investigation and a solution to this problem was Employment Equity.

2.3 EMPLOYMENT EQUITY INTRODUCED

An attempt was made to promote social justice and eliminate the inequalities experienced by those individuals seen as the minority (pre-democracy) the Government introduced the Employment Equity Act 55 of 1998 bringing about a change in the structure and management of the labour force. The President of South Africa, Mr Nelson Mandela on 12th October 1998 signed the EEA (Coetzee, 2005).

The aims of the Act were, *inter alia*:

- “Promote the constitutional right of equality and the exercise of true democracy;
- Eliminate unfair discrimination in employment;
- Ensure the implementation of employment equity to redress the effects of discrimination;” (Coetzee, 2005);
- “Achieve a diverse workforce broadly representative of our people; and
- Promote economic development and efficiency in the workforce” (Employment Equity Act No.55 of 1998).

Nevin (2008) further stated the purpose of the Act was and is to achieve equity in the place of work by endorsing equal opportunities and fair treatment in employment through the elimination of unfair discrimination; also by putting into practice affirmative action measures
to redress the disadvantages in employment experienced by designated groups; is done to ensure there is equitable representation in all occupational categories and levels in the workforce. Every employer has to ensure measures are put in place to promote equal opportunities within the workplace and that no individual is unfairly discriminated against; therefore forbids medical testing unless specifically required for the job. The employer is responsible for proving an accusation of unfair discrimination in the workplace is fair.

It is clearly visible from the aims of the Act there was no intention to not only correct the past wrongs with regard to representatives of various racial groups in the workplace, but also to ensure economic growth of organisations and therefore the country. The Act further recognises as a result of apartheid and other discriminatory laws and practices, there are disparities in employment, occupation and income within the labour market of SA and those create such distinct disadvantages for certain categories of people that they cannot be rectified simply by revoking the laws of the past (Employment Equity Act No.55 of 1998). If organisations have a workforce that is representative of the society it operates in organisations should be in a position to better serve the differing needs of a diverse market (Habana, 2007). Smit and Cronje (2002) support this view and state valuing diversity is a bottom-line issue about increasing productivity and profitability. Businesses that understand and are able to utilise its understanding of a diverse workforce to its advantage have found they have a competitive edge in the marketplace (Smit & Cronje, 2002).

2.3.1 Employment Equity (EE)

The Employment Equity Act (no 55 of 1998, Chapter 2) defines EE as the prohibition of unfair discrimination in the working environment. The Act further stipulates EE involves the elimination of unfair discrimination, whether it is fair or unfair discrimination, against
employees on one or more grounds (this may include race, gender, sex, HIV status, pregnancy, culture, political opinion, sexual orientation, disability and many more ways in which people differ). The Report of the Presidential Commission investigating Labour Market Policy (1996) further defines EE is a broad expression intending to communicate a representation of a labour market that is both non-discriminatory and socially equitable. The term equal opportunity is synonymous with non-discrimination and social equity in the labour market means the benefits of employment are largely and equitable distributed. According to Luhabe (1993) employment equity is the assumption of equal access for all individuals to participate in the empowerment process and to progress on the basis of merit, ability and potential. Employment equity aspires to create fair outcomes for employees through the provision of equal opportunities.

The amendments to the EEA became effective from 1 August 2014. The amendments were related to the definition of the term ‘designated group’, the definition would be limited to citizens of SA by birth or descent. Psychometric evaluations which organisations utilized would also require certification by Health Professions Council of SA. With the amendments of the EEA coming into Act discrimination disputes can be arbitrated by the CCMA if unfair discrimination based on sexual harassment; the employee earns below the earnings threshold of R205 433.30; and/or by agreement by both parties (Sonnenbergs, 2014).

2.3.2 Affirmative Action (AA)

Human (1996) defines affirmative action as the process of creating employment equity within the workplace. Affirmative action is not just a process of recruiting a larger numbers of historically disadvantaged individuals, but rather a holistic system of human resource management and development. Human (1996) further stated affirmative action impacts on all
of the processes, policies and procedures relating to selection, recruitment, induction, development, promotion and severance of people (the hire to retire process). Bendix (2001) says affirmative action is the purposeful and intended placement or development of competent or potentially competent individuals into positions from which they were previously debarred in an attempt to rectify past disadvantages and to make the workforce more representative of the population. Esterhuizen (2008) concluded affirmative action measures are put into practice as an approach for achieving equity in the workplace. When employees’ perceptions of employment equity is measured it is not just to determine whether the overall objectives has been accomplished but rather it is an evaluation of the individuals response to the particular affirmative action measures and practices implemented by an organisation to achieve the desired end result (Esterhuizen, 2008).

2.3.3 Diversity

Affirmative action measures are implanted with the purpose of achieving employment equity which results in increased diversity within the workplace (Uys, 2003). Daft and Marcic (2004) define workforce diversity as an all-encompassing workforce that is made up of individuals with various and different human qualities or who belongs to a range of cultural groups. Diversity means including individuals who are from oneself, in dimensions such as age, ethnicity, gender, or race, in the workplace. Smit and Cronje (2002) further define diversity as a mixture of people who bring a assortment of backgrounds, styles, perspectives, values and beliefs to the organisations in which they work.

Organisations usually follow one of two approaches to diversity management. The first is awareness and valuing of diversity in the workplace this is by which organisations implement initiatives to create awareness in order to assist in the understanding and tolerance of
differences. This form of diversity management is culturally orientated and therefore is seen as a narrow approach as it implies other individual differences, *inter alia*, such as gender, age, race, socioeconomic background does not matter (Human, 1996; Uys, 2003). The second approach to diversity management insinuates it is a method which aims to create a supportive working environment where every individual has the opportunity to contribute to the strategic and competitive advantage of the organisation and where no one is excluded based on factors unrelated to performance and productivity in the workplace (Uys, 2003). In this approach an individual’s race, gender, religion, disability or age does not play a part in the management of the workforce. Uys (2003) is of the opinion if organisations make use of the second approach, diversity management will be seen as a competency and therefore it could be defined as grouping individual differences and contributions in such a way to enhance morale, productivity and the achievement of the workplace goals.

Effective management of diversity within the workplace according to Sammartino, O’Flynn and Nicholas (2002) will result in substantial payoffs. Figure 2.1 indicates the effects of successfully managed diversity within workplace and ineffective management of diversity within the workplace.
The impact of management on the performance of diverse work teams

2.3.4 Discrimination

EEA does not legislate against discrimination but rather against it in an unfair state; this would then imply not all discrimination is unfair (Tinarelli, 2000).

2.3.4.1 Direct Unfair Discrimination

When an employee is treated less favourably on irrelevant ground it can be viewed as direct unfair discrimination, unless the employer can validate that certain requirements are based on the inherent requirements of the job, or is based on affirmative action; this is often intentional. Excluding an applicant on one the following grounds listed during the recruitment process could amount to direct unfair discrimination:

- Family responsibility (mother of small children who may interfere with job responsibilities);
- Marital status (must or must not be married, single, divorced);
- Age (must be younger than 25);
● Multilingualism (must be fluent in more than one language);
● Sex (must be male or female);
● Race (must be white);
● Disability (diabetes, HIV positive, dyslexia, handicapped);
● Religion (must be Christian);

2.3.4.2 Indirect Unfair Discrimination

According to Grogan (2005) indirect discrimination is when objective or neutral barriers are used to keep out members of a particular group merely because they are part of that particular group. An example of this would be a height or weight prerequisite that would prohibit all but a minority of women. Indirect unfair discrimination will in some instances be required to prove employees did not unintentionally discriminate. The following are some examples of indirect discrimination:

● The requirement “uninterrupted job continuity” for a period of 1 year, may discriminated against pregnant women who will be going on maternity leave, unless it can be shown that continuity of employment is critical in the circumstances;
● Setting unrealistic selection criteria;
● Inconsistency in questions asked during the interview;
● Restricted media selection in advertising for applicants;
● Not considering or inviting internal applications;

According to the employment equity Act (Section 5, 1998) employers have to remove unfair discrimination from all policies and procedures of the organisation. However, the Act states it is not unfair to discriminate when affirmative action measures are applied to exclude or prefer people based on the inherent requirements of the job (Section 6, 1998). An example of this
would be it is not unfair to discriminate against individuals who do not have their license for a delivery truck driver position. Maritz (2002) further states when two applicants have the same merit for a job the individual who was previously seen as disadvantaged could be chosen over the white person without being seen as unfair discrimination if this is part of the company’s employment equity strategy.

### 2.3.5 Employment Policy or Practices

All organisational employment policies or practices as defined in the Employment Equity Act these include but are not limited to the following:

- Recruitment procedures, advertising and selection criteria
- Appointments
- Job classification and grading
- Remuneration, employment benefits, terms and conditions of employment
- Job assignments
- The physical working environment and equipment
- Training and development
- Performance evaluation and management systems
- Promotion
- Transfer
- Demotion
- Disciplinary measures other than dismissal
- Dismissal

### 2.3.6 Suitably qualified
2.3.7 Designated groups and employers

According to the Act (Section 1) designated groups mean black people, women and people classified with particular disabilities. Black people are a generic term that can be defined as Africans, Coloureds and Indians. The EEA defines a designated employer as a company which employees 50 or more employees; or an organisation which has a total annual turnover that is equal to or above the applicable annual turnover of a small business (in terms of Schedule 4 of the EEA). A designated employer could also be an organisation of the state, municipality, or an employer who is bound by a collective agreement to comply with legislation.

2.4 EMPLOYMENT EQUITY ACT 55 OF 1998

In order for businesses in South Africa to understand what the implementation of the employment equity Act implies, it is essential they review the EEA and its requirements. Chapter I of the Act states the main purpose is to achieve equity in the workplace. The second chapter determines the prohibition of unfair discrimination. The third chapter highlights the duties of designated employers, this would focus on workplace analysis, consultation, compiling an EE plan and reporting to the Department of Labour. The Act continues with Chapter IV which focusses on the establishment, composition and functions of the Commission for Employment Equity. Chapter V follows by prescribing the procedures for monitoring and enforcing the provisions of the Act. Chapter VI concludes by outlining the general provisions in terms of Codes of Good Practice and the liability of employers. Companies also need to be aware four schedules form part of the Act, namely maximum
possible fines that may be forced for contravening the act, laws that have been repealed, transitional arrangements and the turnover threshold applicable to designated employers.

2.4.1 Codes of Good Practice

According to Section 54 of the EEA (55 of 1998) the Minister of Labour may issue a code of good practice in terms of the provisions of the Act. The purpose for issuing codes of good practice is to complement the Act in correcting past imbalances. The Minister of Labour issued the following codes of good practice, on the advice of the Commission for EE in terms of the provisions of the EEA:

- Disability in the workplace (This code of good practice provides guidelines for employers as well as employees in promoting equal and fair opportunities for those individuals who have a disability);
- Preparation, implementation and monitoring of employment equity plans (guidelines for good practice in the preparation, implementation and monitoring of employment equity plans of the business);
- Integration of employment equity into human resource policies and practices (guidelines to allow employers to ensure that their human resources policies and procedures are not based on discrimination but rather reflect the EE philosophy);
- Key aspects of HIV/AIDS and employment (guidelines for employers, employees, and if there is a recognized trade union at that place of work, to ensure that people infected with HIV are not unfairly discriminated against in the workplace);
- Handling of sexual harassment cases in the workplace (guidelines on how to deal with and eliminate sexual harassment in the place of work. This code also further aims to promote the implementation of policies and procedures that will guide to
organisations that are free of sexual harassment; and where employers and employees respect each other’s integrity, dignity, privacy and right to equity).

2.4.2 Implementing the requirements of the EEA (55 of 1998)

Chapter III of the Act focuses on the implications of the implementation for the requirements of organisations, specifically the designated employer. According to Section 13 of the Act designated employers have to implement affirmative action measures for individuals from designated groups. Employers have to consult with employees, conduct workplace analysis, formulate an employment equity plan and report to the Department of Labour on the progress made in achieving equity within the workplace.

2.4.3 Consultation process

The act stipulates employers have the duty to consult with employees regarding employment equity and affirmative action practices. Consultation has to take place with a representative of the trade union and/or representatives of the employees nominated by their colleagues of the organisation. Nominated representatives of the workforce must reflect the interests of employees across all occupational categories and levels (top management, senior management, etc.) those from designated groups (black, Indian, etc.) and groups who are not from designated groups (white males). The consultation is vital for the eventual realisation of the employment equity goals that have been set out (Deane, 2006).

2.4.4 The analysis requirement

According to the Act designated employers are required to analyse employment practices, policies, procedures and working environment in order to identify any potential barriers facing those individuals who form part of the designated group. The analysis has to include a
profile of the workforce according to each occupational category and level to determine the representation or under representation in each category and level in the organisation, this forms part of the EEA2. This analysis is not only a legal requirement (forms part of the EEA2 that is submitted to the Department of Labour) but also supplies the information required to formulate effective employment equity plan (Deane, 2006). The numerical targets that are identified in the employment equity plan can be achieved by implementing affirmative action measures and by appointing suitably qualified individuals from designated groups (Section 15). The employment equity act does not provide a quota of what percentage the designated groups should hold of the entire workforce but rather the act allows for employers to set their own targets without being constrained by externally set numerical goals (Deane, 2006).

2.4.4.1 The employment equity plan requirements

Section 20 of the Act specifies the requirements for compiling an employment equity plan. The purpose of having an employment equity plan is to outline the practical steps the employer will implement to achieve reasonable progress towards equity (Deane, 2006). According to Chapter III – Section 20 of the Act the employment equity plan has to include:

- Objectives for each year of the plan;
- The affirmative action measures what will be implemented;
- The numerical goals and strategies to achieve equitable representation from designated groups;
- A timelines for achievement of goals;
- The duration of the plan, which may not be less than one year and not more than five years;
- The procedures that will be followed to monitor and evaluate achievement of the plan;
- The internal dispute resolution procedures that will be implemented; and
• The people responsible, including managers, for monitoring and implementing the plan.

2.4.4.2 Affirmative action measures requirement

According to Deane (2006) it is essential to elaborate on the affirmative action measures that need to be included in an organisation employment equity plan as this will help achieve the targets. The purpose of affirmative action measures according to the Act is to ensure suitably qualified individuals from designated groups have equal opportunities and are equally represented in the workplace. The Act further describes the types of measures of affirmative action that may be included in the equity plan. Affirmative action measures the employer needs to be aware is identifying and eliminating employment barriers that could affect designated groups negatively; measures that are designed to further diversity initiatives in the workplace; reasonable accommodation for those who form part of designated groups; and measures to keep and develop people from designated groups.

Deane (2006) states it is important to keep in mind affirmative action measures are not designed to ensure the automatic advancement of unqualified individuals from designated groups. The provisions of the Act is not to promote positive/reverse discrimination of those who were previously disadvantaged but rather to encourage the positive uplifting of those who were previously negatively affected (Deane, 2006). Deane (2006) continues by stating it is compulsory for employers to recognise diversity and promote tolerance of diversity amongst employees.
2.4.4.3 The reporting requirement

The Employment Equity Act clearly states how often designated employers need to submit reports to the Department of Labour. Section 21 indicates if an organisation has fewer than 150 employees they have to submit a report within 12 months of becoming an employer and after that they will be required to submit reports once every two years. If designated employers have more than 150 individuals working in their business, they will be required to submit a report within the first 6 months of becoming an employer and thereafter they will be expected to submit a report on a yearly basis.

2.5 BARRIERS TO EMPLOYMENT EQUITY

There is adequate evidence barriers have been identified to the implementation of employment equity (Human, 1993; Thomas, 2002; Twala, 2004). Barriers to employment equity are evident at national, organisational and the individual level (table 2.1). These levels of barriers (table2.1) should not be viewed in isolation but as a set of interrelated factors that have an effect on the implementation of employment equity (Coetzee, 2005; Human, 1993; Leonard & Grobler, 2005; Thomas, 2002; Twala, 2004).

Table 2.1
Barriers to Employment Equity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Barrier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>• Skills shortages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational</td>
<td>• Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Focus on numbers vs. transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Incompatible organisational culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• High job requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Management resistance and leadership style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceptions of reverse discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unrealistic expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative stereotypes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Esterhuizen and Martins (2008)

### 2.5.1 Barriers to EE at National Level

According to Van Dyk, Nel, van Zyl Loedolff and Haasbroek (2001) South Africa generally has a poor skills profile and this is largely attributed to the poor quality of general education available to the majority of the South African population. This has resulted in the pool of previously disadvantaged individuals who are able to fill high-level positions in organisations to be undersized (Coetzee, 2005) this has contributed to majority of high level positions in organisations not being filled by individuals who form part of the designated group. “In the National Remuneration Guide released by the accounting firm Deloitte and Touche, 81% of organisations indicated they experience difficulty in recruiting employees because of skills shortages” (Sapa, 2007; cited Esterhuizen & Martins, 2008, p68). The report released by Deloitte and Touche also found 61% of respondents indicated they were experiencing a scarcity of employment equity candidates (Sapa, 2007; cited Esterhuizen & Martins, 2008).

### 2.5.2 Barriers to EE at an Organisational Level

Organisations might go outside their pay scales for certain positions in order to offer equity candidates a higher salary to attract them, this results in added costs for the organisation (Thomas, 2002). This results in salary discrepancies in some cases and for smaller companies this is financially unsustainable (Van Dyk et al., 2001).
According to Coetzee (2005; cited Esterhuizen & Martins, 2008, p69) “under the reporting requirement of section 20 of the EEA 55 of 1998, organisations are evaluated in terms of how well they meet their employment equity targets”. However, organisations need to be aware if they only look at numbers without considering skills and development aspects of people they will not achieve the transformation that is needed (Coetzee 2005). Human (1993) and Thomas (2002) agree with this and state employment equity is generally seen as a recruitment matter to fill targets that have been set and not as the induction into and development of people into the organisational context and culture.

Diverse workforces introduce barriers that are related to communication as cultural differences become apparent in aspects such as language, frames or reference and value judgements (Uys, 2003; Werner, 2007). In South Africa employers need to be especially aware of barriers related to communication as there are 11 official languages and not everyone’s first language will be the business language.

Organisations that have a historically white corporate culture which employs black people may find it difficult to fit in and often feel alienated from the rest of the organisation (Thomas 2003). Therefore this could result in the culture of the workplace preventing and even obstructing the odds of certain individuals or groups achieving success in the workplace (Claassen, 2005). High job requirements are on occasion a subtle form of discrimination, an example of this would be an honours degree for a data capture position (Cascio 1998).

Numerous leaders within organisations do not view employment equity as a strategic business issue and as a result there is a lack of commitment to the process (Human 1993; Thomas 2002; Thomas, 2003; Twala 2004; cited Esterhuizen & Martins, 2008). Thomas and
Ely (1996; cited Esterhuizen & Martins, 2008) further states organisations usually do not achieve the business benefits of a diverse workforce because of managements take on how to manage diversity.

2.5.3 Barriers to EE at Individual level

Employment equity is often viewed as a form of reverse discrimination by previously advantaged groups and is viewed as one of the main issues when attempting to implement affirmative action measures (Coetzee 2005; Human 1993; Thomas 2002; Twala 2004). Twala (2004) also noted individuals who were not part of the apartheid regime (young white males) now have to face the impact of the legislation that has been implemented to redress the past injustices. Twala (2004) additionally states it is not clear whether all blacks and females were in actually previously disadvantaged and need to now be affirmed.

Human (1993), Thomas (2002) and Twala (2004) found employees who were appointed and seen as EE candidates (position that is marked for equity candidates, so only an equity candidate can apply; or where a black and white apply and they have the same qualifications and experience but the black is appointed) often do not receive appropriate support and in some instances they are even deliberately excluded from informal networks and critical information is even withheld from them which could impact if they are successful at the job even if they really have the necessary abilities and skills.

Employees from designated groups who require training and development to meet the inherent job requirements may have unrealistic expectations of their own abilities and this can result in an increase in conflict in companies (Thomas 2002). People who would be categorised as being part of designated groups and who expect secured positions, regardless
of whether they meet the job requirements, may adopt a culture of entitlement that undermines their initiative and self-confidence (Maritz 2002; Thomas 2002; Twala 2004).

2.6 BEST PRACTICES FOR THE EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION OF EE

According to Jain, Sloan and Horwitz (2003) the Employment Equity Index’s criteria has resulted in employers needing to develop ‘best practices’ for the effective implementation of the EE plan. The term best practice is defined as a method or technique that has constantly revealed results superior to those achieved with other methods; should be proactive and exceed more than the fundamental requirements of the EE legislation (Jain et al., 2003). In terms of EE best practice, compliance to it must promote equal opportunities and address one or more obstacles to the successful implementation of equal employment opportunities for all individuals (Jain et al., 2003). Several best practices have been identified for the effective implementation of EE initiatives.

2.6.1 Training and development

It is essential the EE plan should be linked to training and development as this will assist employers in aligning its skills development to employment equity. The Skills Development Act (1998) was therefore promulgated to assist with the training and development aspect of the EEA. Specific training needs to be allocated to help address the under representation of employees from designated groups in organisations. A National Skills Development Strategy has also been implemented in order to assist with transformation within organisations; the National Skills Development Strategy has set specific targets for training attendance, 85% black, 54% women and 4% people with disabilities.
2.6.2 Transparent Communication

The Act stipulates organisations have to consult with their employees and have to ensure the information be displayed where employees will have access to the information, for example on the companies portal. Research conducted by Leonard and Grobler (2005) found communication with all stakeholders formed a critical role in corporate transformation as honest communication with all employees is critical to obtaining support for EE initiatives. Leonard and Grobler (2005) further state if communication only takes place to act in accordance with the minimum legal requirements, achieving lasting transformation within the workplace will be unlikely.

2.6.3 Management commitment

Research has found the commitment of line managers is pivotal to the effectiveness of any EE strategy (Human, 1993; Thomas, 2002; Twala, 2004). Moreover for EE to be implemented successfully management must view it as part of the business strategy and not merely as compliance (Human, 2005).

2.6.4 Fair employment practices

Thomas (2003) states all employment procedures relating to the recruitment, selection, assessments and development of individuals should be visible and free from unfair discriminatory practices. It is also important to review the job entry requirements on a regular basis to ensure they actually predict job performance and are not used to exclude certain groups on the basis of subjective criteria (Human, 1993; Twala, 2004). A method that can be utilised is to ensure there is fair employment practices in the workplace are audits whereby individuals from all occupational groups complete a questionnaire whereby findings can be deduced on the employee’s views.
2.6.5 Inclusive organisational culture

According to Human (2005) and Thomas (2003) it is essentially line managers who attempt to create an all-encompassing organisational culture that values and understands diversity and promotes equity. Thomas (2003) therefore states it is important that new employees be inducted as soon as possible into the company’s culture, vision and values. However, the value systems of an organisations workforce should be incorporated in diversity initiatives.

2.6.6 Diversity management

Performance is not only linked to individuals’ ability but also to how they are managed (Human, 1996; Twala, 2004). Uys (2003) defines diversity management as the acknowledgement and appreciation of the dissimilar nature of the current workforce. Uys (2003) continues by stating the focus of diversity management is on skills, policies and competence needed to optimise employee’s contributions to the workplace. Diversity management therefore refers to the ability to manage the workforce successfully and to develop individuals despite their race, gender, religion or disability (Human, 1996; Uys, 2003). Organisations as a result implement diversity training which aims to raise the awareness of the benefits of a diverse workforce and to provide managers and employees with various tools and methods to show a better understanding and respect towards fellow colleagues.

2.6.7 Justification

According to Coetzee (2005) social scientists have acknowledged the significance of justice and fairness as a fundamental requirement for effective functioning of organisations. The perception a workforce holds of the fairness practiced by organisations influence employees’ commitment and productivity (Nowakowski & Conlon, 2005; cited Esterhuizen, 2008).
Employers need to keep in mind employees view EE strategies as part of organisational practices and therefore it is important for them to understand whether their workforce view these plans as fair or unfair (perceptions of justice); can affect workforce productivity. Research found if EE initiatives are justified it would contribute to employees perception of whether strategies are fair; therefore it is essential all EE strategies comply with legal as well as fairness requirements (Coetzee, 2005).

2.7 MODELS FOR IMPLEMENTING EE

Several models have been designed to assist organisations with effective implementation of their EE initiatives. The Employment Equity systems model as well as the form for managing highlight the business case for EE by providing guidelines that are integrated with legislation and look at best practices for the successful implementation of these initiatives.

2.7.1 The Employment Equity systems model

The process of the Employment Equity systems model starts on the left side of figure 2.1 with the first analysis of the organisation, assessment of the micro and macro enablers and the assessment of any obstacles to the achievement of EE. The progressive progress to the right side of the figure includes the micro processes that must be addressed in order to fulfil the requirements of the EEA. The descending movement of figure 2.1 illustrates the process of continued improvement within the organisation in aligning its employment equity processes.
Figure 2.1

The Employment equity systems model

Source: Duweke (2004, p. 212)
2.7.2 Model for managing the process of employment equity

The model proposed by Selby and Sutherland (2006) highlights the need to approach EE in a holistic manner as part of an integrated process (figure 2.2). This process starts with the development of a clearly defined business case for transformation, which incorporates the external as well as internal factors which drive EE. The business case is then integrated into the strategic objectives of the organisation and the EE objectives are then cascaded down to the company’s human resource strategy and planning. The next step would be for organisations to select a strategy in order for the company to achieve its transformation objectives. When organisations select the appropriate strategy they need to take into consideration the obstacles/barriers and risks of implementing EE as well as put measures into place to overcome the barriers identified. If organisations are able to shift through the entire model they will achieve EE compliance and sustainability (Selby & Sutherland, 2006).
2.8 Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment

The fundamental objective of the B-BBEE Act (No 53 of 2003) is to advance economic transformation and enhance the economic participation of black people in the South African
economy. The B-BBEE Act provides a legislative framework for the promotion of Black Economic empowerment, which has provided the Minister of Trade and Industry to issue Codes of Good Practice and publish Transformation Charters. The B-BBEE Act has additionally paved the way for the establishment of the B-BBEE advisory Council.

The Advisory Council of the B-BBEE was formed to assist with providing guidance and overall monitoring of the state of B-BBEE performance in the economy, the reason for this was to assist with making policy recommendations to address challenges in the implementation of this transformation policy.

The B-BBEE Codes of Good Practice come into view in February 2007 as an implementation framework for B-BBEE policy and legislation. After the implementation of the B-BBEE Codes of Good Practice institutional mechanisms were established for the monitoring and evolution of the B-BBEE in the South African economy.

2.8 ORGANISATIONAL JUSTICE

The term ‘organisational justice’ according to Baldwin (2006) refers to the degree to which employees perceive workplace procedures, interactions and outcomes to be fair. These perceptions of individuals can influence attitudes and behaviour for better or worse, in turn this can result in having a positive or negative impact on employee performance and the organisation’s success. Baldwin (2006) continues by stating the notion of organisational justice will often only become applicable and substantial when a violation of justice occurs. Examples of such perceived injustices within an organisation may include according to Baldwin (2006, p.1):

- “Unequal pay for men and women doing the same job
• Performance reviews being conducted by someone with whom the employee has had little previous contact
• The use of personality inventories to select new staff
• Arbitrary dismissals.”

Coetzee (2005) similarly states organisational justice refers to the decisions companies make, the methods they use to make decisions and the way in which they are managed. Employees judge the fairness of an organisation by the human resource decisions made in recruitment, performance appraisal and reward system. Employees’ judge the fairness of their performance appraisal ratings, the rewards tied to those ratings, the consistency and appropriateness of the appraisal process, and the explanations and feedback that accompany the communication of performance ratings (Bowen, Gilliland & Folger, 1999).

A study of Folger and Skarlicki (1999) found employees’ negative feelings about resistance to change can be overcome by applying fairness principles in the business. Fairness principles provide an opportunity to lessen some of the unfavourable organisational consequences of individuals’ resentment-based resistance to change. However, an organisation’s obligation to employees involves more than fair treatment with regards to the salaries and benefits given in exchange for labour (known as distributive justice) and more than fair treatment regarding the implementation of policies and procedures that determine the levels of compensation, (known as procedural justice). Additionally, organisations have an ethical obligation to treat all employees with adequate dignity as a person (known as interactional justice) (Folger & Skarlicki, 1999).
Psychologists in the field of industrial relations have identified three forms of organisational justice; they are distributive, procedural and interactional. Figure 2.3 provides an illustration of organisational justice.

**Figure 2.3**

**Organisational Justice**
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Source: Robbins, Judge, Odendaal and Roodt (2009, p156)

### 2.8.1 Distributive justice

According to Adams (1965; cited Baldwin, 2006) distributive justice refers to outcomes being distributed proportionally to inputs, this is known as the equity principle. Outcomes in the workplace may be, *inter alia*, wages, job security and promotion; while some inputs can be viewed as training, experience and education. According to Baldwin (2006) it can be rather complicated to establish what constitutes as a suitable level of reward for a particular level of input; people therefore tend to make this judgement in relative terms, looking for a contribution-outcome ratio that is comparable to that of their peers.
2.8.2 Procedural justice

Folger and Cropanzano (1998) define procedural justice as the fairness issues relating to the methods, mechanism and processes which are used to determine outcomes. Baldwin (2006) similarly defines procedural justice as being concerned with the fairness of the process that is used when making decisions which result in a particular outcome. Baldwin (2006) continues by stating procedural justice is capable of outweighing distributive justice, as individuals may perhaps be prepared to accept an unwanted outcome if they deem the decision process leading up to the outcome as being conducted according to organisational justice principles.

2.8.3 Interactional justice

Interactional justice refers to the quality of the interpersonal treatment the workforce receives particularly in terms of the formal decision making process (Baldwin, 2006). According to Bies and Moag (1986; cited Hamman-Fisher, 2008) interactional justice refers to an individual’s sensitivity to the level of interpersonal treatment the person receives during the implementation of organisational procedures. Bies and Moag (1986; cited Hamman-Fisher, 2008) further identified four key attributes of interactional justice which could increase people’s perceptions of fairness; which are truthfulness, respect, propriety of questions, and justification. Truthfulness, respect and propriety of questions are related to the nature of the communication which takes place; while justification deals with removing any feelings of discontentment which may be felt by employees after an unfair procedure has taken place.

2.9. THE ROLE OF JUSTICE PERCEPTIONS IN EE PRACTICES

According to Opotow (1997) distributive justice refers to the ‘what’ of EE and AA practices. Opotow (1997) continues by stating it focuses on whether societal resources (e.g. jobs,
promotions and educational opportunities) are distributed fairly. Procedural justice according to Opotow (1997) refers to the ‘how’ of EE and AA practices in the workplace; it therefore focuses on the fair and consistent application of procedures to all groups of employees.

According to Esterhuizen (2008) various economic together with political reform legislation has been implemented in South Africa. This legislation would include the Employment Equity Act and the Broad Based Black Economic Empowerment Act (BBBEEA) which already define the ‘what’ of EE and AA practices. The ‘what’ of EE and AA is fixed and therefore it can be concluded that the ‘how’ which is seen as the procedural and interactional justice has a vital role in the perceptions of justice of employees in the workplace.

2.10. AN INTEGRATED MODEL TO IMPLEMENT AND MANAGE EE FAIRLY

Researchers have established for EE and AA programmes to be successful they need to comply with legal and justice requirements (Coetzee, 2005; Cropanzano, Slaughter & Bachiochi, 2005; Kovach, Kravitz & Hughes, 2004). An EE programme that complies with not only the legal requirements but the justice requirements as well a integrated model was developed (Esterhuizen, 2008). This model draws not only on best practices for successful implementation of EE programmes but also on corrective actions for perceived injustices (Esterhuizen, 2008).

This model was designed by Esterhuizen (2008) based on the assumption that the distribution (‘what’) of outcomes has already been determined by the law (i.e. the representation of designated groups in all occupational categories in the workplace). As a result, individuals may already be experiencing distributive injustice in the work environment and the only way to act in accordance with the fairness requirements is to focus on the procedural and interactional justice (‘how’) aspects of the process (Esterhuizen, 2008).

Figure 2.4
An integrated model to implement and manage EE fairly


Step 1 – Design the Employment Equity strategy

It is important that management understand and accept that an effective EE strategy has to be part of the overall organisational strategy (Human, 1996; Human, 2005; Thomas, 2003; cited Esterhuizen, 2008). The EEA prescribes the specific actions and outcomes that an organisation should aim to achieve with its EE strategy. The strategy need to be communicated with all employees and a committee needs to be established which has an assigned senior manager. The workplace then needs to conduct an analysis of its workforce in order for the business to identify areas where there is under representation. This workplace analysis is used to set numerical targets for the EE plan (Esterhuizen, 2008).
Step 2 – Implement the EE strategy

After the EE strategy has been designed, the following step is to implement the strategy. Implementation of the strategy should be supported by regular communication with all employees of the details of the strategy (Jain & Hacket, 1989; Thomas & Robersthaw, 1999; cited Esterhuizen, 2008).

Step 3 – Evaluate the effectiveness of the EE strategy

Once the EE strategy has been implemented, its success in achieving the targets that were set needs to be evaluated. This evaluation will typically take place once a year when the organisation needs to submit its EE report to the Department of Labour. The EE report which is submitted yearly will determine whether the numerical targets have been met or if progress has taken place to meet the targets. The report would also help to identify barriers which are hindering the progress of the EE strategy.

After an organisation has implemented the EE strategy and has applied best practices and the targets are not met or other negative trends are apparent the organisation should assess whether this strategy has met the fairness requirements. An indication of perceived fairness violations may already be apparent in certain outcomes, *inter alia*, such as increased absenteeism and lack of trust (Beugre, 2005; Colquitt et al., 2001; cited Esterhuizen, 2008). However, management should be aware that any other organisational process could be the result for the negative outcomes. The organisation should therefore conduct an employee perceptions survey which will assist the business in determining employees’ specific perceptions regarding the EE process (Reb, Goldman, Kray & Cropanzano, 2006; cited Esterhuizen, 2008).

Step 4 – Identify target groups and focus areas
Information obtained from the EE report and the perceptions survey the organisation will be able determine if there is a specific group of employees who are unhappy or whether there is specific processes which need to be relooked at. The report and survey will also assist the organisation to propose affective corrective action (Esterhuizen, 2008).

Step 5 – Implement appropriate corrective action

Once specific problems have been identified corrective actions can be implemented. Corrective actions may in terms of the legal requirements of an effective EE strategy include linking a manager’s performance reward to the successful achievement of EE targets. Corrective action may also include special recruitment methods (marking a position for a EE candidate). In terms of improving employees perceptions of the fairness of EE programmes appropriate corrective action may include explaining and justifying the decisions made and processes followed. The successful application of the integrated model requires a continues process of implementing, evaluating and correcting the EE strategy (Esterhuizen, 2008).

2.11 CONCLUSION

After the 1994 elections when South Africa was declared a democratic republic, numerous legislation was implemented to eliminate the discriminatory practices of the past and to provide equal access to job opportunities. Once the legislation has been implemented organisations have adapted various EE models to assist in meeting these targets and strategies. The effectiveness of the organisation’s EE strategies are measured against the distribution of HDSA candidates who are appointed within the company and the perceived fairness of this practices. It is crucial management understand the significance of fairness within the company policies, procedures and practises as the level of fairness may have an impact on the organisation. If employees feel the organisation practices which pertain to EE
are unfair it may lead to negative outcomes (absenteeism, high turnover) which could impact the strategies’ successful implementation within the company.

This chapter has defined the various constructs which is of importance for the understanding of the EEA. The barriers to the successful implementation of EE in South Africa have been identified on individual, organisational and national level. Best practices were also reviewed which if implemented successfully should eliminate barriers to the successful implementation of EE within the workplace. The chapter then continued by providing an overview of the literature on organisational justice theory which underpins employees’ perceptions of fairness of the organisational procedures and practices which are implemented at the workplace. Employees’ perceived injustices could have an impact on key organisational outcomes, *inter alia*, outcome satisfaction, job satisfaction, organisational commitment, trust and withdrawal. Methods which can be used to correct these perceptions of injustice are eliminating gross injustices, providing accessible and effective mechanisms for responses to injustices and allowing employees’ voice. Based on the theories of organisational justice and the models for EE and an integrated one for the legal as well as fair implementation and management of the strategy in the work environment were discussed.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter focused on the methodology and the measuring instrument used to conduct the study. The chapter focused on the problem statement, objectives and the research approach. The research approach focused on the sample and population as well as the data collection instrument.

3.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT

According to Coetzee (2005) South Africa had to undertake radical changes to address the past injustices that were experienced by various ethnic groups. In 1998 Employment Equity Act was implemented to fulfil a constitutional mandate to prohibit discrimination and encourage Affirmative Action measures within the workplace. Organisational justice refers to people’s perceptions of fairness in an organisational setting. Individuals will base fairness judgements by taking into consideration the actual decision or the procedures used to reach a decision. Organisational justice can thus be divided into distributive, procedural and interactional justice (Coetzee, 2005). EE is of importance in the Mining industry because it is an industry predominately filled by male employees, of which the lower ranked positions are generally filled by black employees and higher rank positions are filled by white male employees. This generally results in employees viewing EE within the workplace as being ineffective and this may impact on organisational justice.

The following research question was developed with regard to determining whether employees experience fairness and non-discrimination with regard to practices and
procedures in the workplace due to Employment Equity (EE): What are the barriers to the effective implementation of EE programmes in a mining organisation in South Africa?

3.3 OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

The central objective of this study is to determine employees’ perceptions of fairness of the procedures used to implement employment equity within a mining organisation in South Africa. To achieve the central objective, the derived objectives are as follows:

- To measure employee’s responses to employment equity practices within a particular Mining organisation in South Africa.
- To determine whether there are differences in the responses/perceptions of EE based on biographical characteristics.
- To identify the barriers (areas of concern) to achieving EE success and where organisational procedures or group behaviour can be improved to increase employees’ perceptions of fairness of EE practices and procedures.
- To establish the factors influencing employee’s perceptions of EE practices in a mining company in South Africa?

3.4 RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

According to Bless and Higson-Smith (2000) the term hypotheses can be defined as a research problem, it is a question about the nature of the relationship between variables and become tentative, actual and testable answers to the problem.

Hypothesis 1:

There is no statistically significant difference in perceptions of employment equity, affirmative action and discrimination based on race
Hypothesis 2:

There is no statistically significant difference in perceptions of employment equity, affirmative action and discrimination based on age.

Hypothesis 3:

There is no statistically significant difference in perceptions of employment equity, affirmative action and discrimination based on tenure.

Hypothesis 4:

There is no statistically significant difference in perceptions of employment equity, affirmative action and discrimination based on disability.

Hypothesis 5:

There is no statistically significant difference in perceptions of employment equity, affirmative action and discrimination based on job level.

Hypothesis 6:

There is no statistically significant difference in perceptions of employment equity, affirmative action and discrimination based on education.

3.5 RATIONAL FOR THE STUDY

After the 1994 elections South Africa underwent drastic changes for it to become a more just society; the South African Government realised legislation was of paramount important to assistant organisation in promoting justice in the workplace, a working environment which is free of any form of discrimination. In 1988 the Government implemented the Employment
Equity Act to fulfil a constitutional mandate to prohibit discrimination in the workplace and encourage AA in the workplace.

According to Van Wyk (2002) as soon as employees regard something to be unfair, they tend to reject it and any further interventions an employee may have planned will be destined to failure. Van Wyk (2002) further state if South Africa wants to make a success of EE, organisations should understand how perceptions of it influence employees’ attitudes and behaviour and as a result impact on the success of the company. Although South Africa has made significant progress in restructuring and transforming societies and its institutions since the apartheid era, inequalities and unfair discrimination remain deeply entrenched in social structures, practices and attitudes thereby undermining the good intentions of the country’s constitutional democracy (Van Wyk, 2002). Organisations are therefore encouraged to make a special attempt to eliminate discrimination and manage those employees displaying resistance to change.

Negative feelings (about resistance to change) experienced by employees can be conquered by applying fairness principles in the workplace. These principles present an opportunity to alleviate some of the unfavourable organisational consequences of individuals’ resentment-based resistance to change. However, an organisation’s obligation to employees involves more than fair treatment with regards to the salaries and benefits given in exchange for labour, (known as distributive justice) and regarding the implementation of policies and procedures that determine the levels of compensation, (known as procedural justice). Additionally, organisations have an ethical obligation to treat all employees with sufficient dignity as a person (known as interactional justice) (Folger & Skarlicki, 1999).

Organisations in South Africa face the challenge of finding ways to implement EE strategies to gain competitive advantages without creating negative employee attitudes; attention will
focus on how to overcome the barriers that hinder the successful implementation of EE practices and procedures.

Mining organisations are seen to be the forerunners when it comes to abiding by the Employment Equity Act. A particular reason why EE is of importance in the Mining industry is due to an industry dominated by male employees. The lower ranked positions are generally filled by black employees and higher rank ones by white males. Due to this composition of the workforce employees often view EE as not being affective and may impact on organisational justice.

3.6 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research methodology focuses on the manner in which the problem is investigated with regards to the population, sample size, sampling procedure, method of data collection and data analysis techniques.

3.6.1 Method of data collection

Figure 3.1

Research Process

Source: Steyn, Smit Du Toit and Strasheim (2003); cited Coetzee (2005)
According to Steyn, Smit, Du Toit and Strasheim (2003; cited Coetzee, 2005) a research project can be defined as a specific research investigation that comprises of four stages, namely formulation of research question; empirical study; editing and coding; and analysing of data and conclusions (figure 3.1).

There are two research methods which can be utilised when conducting research, either quantitative or qualitative research method. Quantitative research is based on positivist thought and can be verified by observation and experimentation (Ford & Gonzales, 2010). The quantitative method also allows for distribution of variables that can be generalized to the entire population. The quantitative method allows for less interaction between the researcher and respondents, resulting in more objectivity and also utilises data collection methods such as questionnaires and experiments (Ford & Gonzales, 2010). The qualitative research method, however, investigates individual behaviours and characteristics to understand cause and solve problems. The qualitative method is also an inductive process which is used to investigate new perspectives on previously studied information which is not completely understood (Ford & Gonzales, 2010). The qualitative research method is less generalizable to the greater population than the qualitative method; however, provides a more accurate description of individuals and groups. Within the qualitative research there are various methods which can be implemented to gather information; such as interviews, focus groups and case studies (Ford & Gonzales, 2010).

Quantitative research has several advantages, which includes the possibility to isolate variables in the study and to discover the relations between the variables. Another advantage is it has a high measuring level and possibility for statistical analysis; is highly structured; objective view; replicable results; and less time consuming and costly compared to qualitative research methods (Fullenmann, Breitenmoser & Fischl, 2011). The disadvantages of quantitative research is it cannot be utilised if there is no existing theories available regarding
the subject matter; the method is also limited in terms of complex questions (respondents cannot provide full explanations); and there is a lack of flexibility (set questions) (Fullenmann, Breitenmoser & Fischl, 2011).

Fullenmann, Breitenmoser and Fischl (2011) identified several advantages as well as several disadvantages to the qualitative research method. The advantages to the qualitative method are there is a possibility to examine relations and structures in systems; there is room for flexibility due to process orientation (i.e. if during the research researchers find a need to extend the sample they can). The qualitative method also allows for a more holistic view point as the researcher is able gain more insight from the respondent. The research method allows for the research of new fields without theories, known as explorative approach as well as a subjective view point. The disadvantages to the qualitative research method are it is difficult to generalize to the entire population and there is an uncertainty and danger of inconsistent findings which is caused by the high flexibility. This research method is also time consuming and high in costs (when compared to qualitative methods) (Fullenmann, Breitenmoser and Fischl, 2011).

This study made use of the quantitative research method. This method would provide for high anonymity and confidentiality and this would be very advantageous for this study as people often do not want to express their perceptions of employment equity. This method would also provide generalizability and focused questions. There are various data collection methods such as observations, focus groups, or surveys which can be utilised to gather information for the study (Sekaran, 2003). The survey method for this study was utilised. According to Coetzee (2005) the survey method which makes use of a questionnaire, is utilised for descriptive reporting. Sekaran (2003, p. 233) defines a questionnaire as follows: “a questionnaire is a pre-formulated written set of questions to which respondents record their answers, usually within rather closely defined alternatives”. Sekaran (2003) goes on to say
questionnaires are an efficient data collection mechanism when the researcher knows what is required and how to measure the dependent and independent variables. A questionnaire can be used to identify individual differences and perceptions that cannot be observed by a researcher, for example respondents can provide information on past behaviours and attitudes which a researcher would not be able to observe (Coetzee, 2005).

There are several advantages and disadvantages making use of a questionnaire. The advantages is the low cost of gathering data; high anonymity; standardised questions simplify the coding of data; it is time efficient as a lot of information can be gathered in a short time frame. The disadvantages would be there is a possibility of a low response rate; explanation and clarification of questions are not possible; the researcher has a little or no control over the conditions under which respondents completes the survey (Stone, 2005).

According to Leedy (1996; cited Coetzee, 2005) there are certain requirements which a questionnaire needs to meet in order to be a good questionnaire. The requirements would include the instructions for the questionnaire needs to be clear and unambiguous so it can eliminate confusion; a cover letter needs to be attached to the questionnaire which clearly states the purpose for the research; the questions should be clear, understandable and objective; questionnaire should be as short as possible; logical flow of questions; and the questionnaire needs to be directly linked to the research problem.

A cover letter was attached with the questionnaire explaining the nature of the study, assuring participants their responses will be kept strictly confidential and only members of the research team will have access to the information provided by the respondents. Section A of the questionnaire is based on the respondents’ personal particulars (biographical information). The section consists of eleven questions that were to be completed my ticking the appropriate box. The questions were based on the respondents gender; ethnicity;
disability, age; years of service; years of service in current position; staff category; highest educational qualification; EE appointment; ethnicity of supervisor; and gender of supervisor. All the questions in the biographical information section were based on the independent variables of the study.

The questionnaire itself consists of three sections, the Employment Equity Act (Section B); Affirmative Action (Section C); and Discrimination, Transformation and Diversity Management (Section D). Each section consists of several questions which the respondent would need to answer by marking the appropriate column with a tick. Each question will be answered on a five point scale. 1 being ‘disagree very strongly’, 2 being ‘disagree’, 3 being ‘uncertain/not sure’, 4 being ‘agree’ and, 5 being ‘agree very strongly’. Section A consists of six questions, section B of 12 questions and section C of 7 questions. At the end of the questionnaire the respondent can leave comments should he/she feel the need.

Due to the questionnaire being paper based it was distributed to random individuals for completion. Individuals were given five working days to complete the questionnaire and returned. A total of 110 questionnaires were distributed of which 92 was completed, however, two of the completed questionnaires could not be used due to certain questions having two responses; received 84% of the questionnaires back of which 82% were analysed for the research.

3.6.2 Population

Sekaran (2003) defines a population as the entire group of people, events, or aspects of interest the researcher would like to investigate. Coetzee (2005) elaborates by stating the populations of interest to researchers are generally so large that it is impossible to conduct research. Therefore it is necessary to obtain data from a sample of the population. A mining organisation based in South Africa has been selected to support the infrastructure of the
research environment. The focus will be on the organisation’s Corporate Centre (Head Office). Companies submit their EE plan and report per employer and the Corporate Centre is registered as a Limited (Ldt) company, whereas the actual business units (business sites) are registered under a different name. The total number of employees at the Corporate Centre is 827 (this excludes tenants, contractors and consultants).

3.6.3 Sample

A sample is a subset of the population and it consists of some members selected from the population (Sekaran, 2003). Thus not all the members from the population would form part of the study in this instance a convenience sampling method was selected; makes use of the most accessible members as subjects (Sekaran, 2003). The advantages of this sampling method according to Sekeran (2003) it is a quick, convenient and inexpensive method of gathering data. The disadvantages are, however, this method is not generalizable (Sekeran, 2003).

According to Coetzee (2005, p. 7.10) the general principle the researcher needs to consider when determining the desirable sample size is:

- “The size of the population;
- The variance (heterogeneity) of the variable being measured;
- The homogeneity of each stratum; and
- The anticipated response rate.”

Roscoe (1975; cited Sekaran, 2003), however, elaborates and proposes several rules of thumb for determining the sample size of a study which can be utilised with the information that Coetzee (2005) provided. The identified sample for this study was 110 candidates; however, a total sample of 90 candidate responses completed the necessary documents.
3.7 DATA ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES

This study will discuss descriptive statistics as well as inferential statistics. Sekaran (2003) states that descriptive statistics entails the conversion of raw data into a form of data that would provide information which can describe a set of factors applicable to the study. Inferential statistics will enable the researcher to infer from data analysis “(1) the relationship between two variables; (2) differences in a variable among different subgroups; and (3) how several independent variables might explain the variance in a dependent variable” (Sekaran, 2003, p. 401).

For the purpose of this study the researcher will make use of the Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS); making use of the Pearson product moment correlation coefficient and ANOVA for the interpretation of data collected.

3.7.1 Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient

According to Sekaran (2003) in a research study that consists of several variables, the researcher would like to know the mean and standard deviations of the dependent variable; as well as how one variable is related to another. A Pearson correlation coefficient will indicate the direction, strength and the significance of the relationships of all the variables in the study. According to Sekaran (2003, p. 402) “the correlation is derived by assessing the variations in one variable as another variable also varies”.

3.7.2 ANOVA

According to Sekaran (2003) an analysis of variance (ANOVA) assists with examining the significant mean difference among several groups on an interval or ratio scaled dependent variable. According to Coetzee (2005) ANOVA is utilised to determine the main and interaction effects of independent variables on an interval dependent variable. Coetzee (2005)
further states that ANOVE is used when there is a single interval dependent and one independent variable which consist of several categories. The F-test is the key statistic of ANOVA, the F-test measures the difference of group means. The F-test measures if the means of the group is formed by values of the independent variable are significantly different that they could have occurred by chance. If the group means do differ significantly then one can infer that the independent variable(s) did not have an effect on the dependent variable of the study (Coetzee, 2005).

3.8 RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY OF MEASURING INSTRUMENT

According to Sekaran (2003) the reliability of a measuring instrument indicates the level to which the instrument is without bias and therefore offers consistent measurement across time and across the various items within the instrument. Validity looks at the ability of the instrument to measure the intended concept (Sekaran, 2003)

3.8.1 Validity

The questionnaire utilised for the study was previously used in the study “The effectiveness of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998) in the Public Service with reference to the Department of Agriculture 2000 – 2006: A South African perspective” by Dumisani Zondi (2009) the study was previously focused on the private sector however for the purpose of this study it was adapted to be suitable for the population group of the study.

3.8.2 Reliability

Table 3.1

Cronbach’s Alpha Based on Standardized Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items</th>
<th>0.845</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Table 3.1 indicates the reliability of all the variables within the study. Reliability of the study was determined by the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient, and was calculated to be 0.845. According to Sekaran (2003) the general level of acceptable reliability is 0.7; this study achieved .845 and therefore exceeds the level which is generally acceptable. The alpha coefficient of 0.845 indicates that there is a high level of internal consistency and therefore this instrument can reliably be used to assess whether employees experience fairness and non-discrimination with regard to practices and procedures in the workplace due to Employment Equity (EE).

### 3.9 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The compelling premise in conducting research is accepting the responsibility for all procedures and ethical issues related to the practice. The integrity of the research project should be maintained and the choice should benefit participants and society at large. The researcher should self-assess and ensure the research is conducted as competently as possible and be in compliance and awareness of local customs, standards, laws, regulations and should not intrude in people’s lives or the communities of their study. The Health Professions Council of South Africa’s (HCPSA)’s Ethical Code of Professional Conduct for Psychologists is the regulatory framework within which the researcher adhered to for this study.

During the data collection of a study it is of importance that each respondent voluntarily participate and provide informed consent to be a participant. The questionnaire utilised for the study was investigated for reliability and validity, in order to prevent harm to the employees participating. The human rights as well as welfare of all employees taking part in the study were acknowledged and protected at all times during the study. The confidentiality and anonymity of all participants remained a priority throughout the study. The research for
this study was conducted according to the ethical code of psychologists, as specified by the Professional Board for Psychology.

3.10 CONCLUSION

This chapter discussed the objective of the study, the population and sample, the measuring instrument, data analysis techniques utilised, data collection method were described, and the ethical issues which the researcher had to adhere to. The results of the empirical study will be presented in Chapter 4. These results will be illustrated in graphs and interpreted/discussed.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESEARCH FINDINGS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter of the study will depict the results of the empirical study as discussed in the previous chapter. The sample consisted of 90 employees who range from senior management to skilled technical and academically qualified workers, junior management and supervisors.

The aim of the study was to determine the employees’ perceptions of EE fairness in terms of the policies and procedures which are implemented to achieve EE within the organisation. The study therefore aimed to determine whether the organisation has been able to meet and implement the commands of the EEA (55 of 1998). The study further aimed to measure employees’ responses between various demographic groups.

The demographic representation of the sample (n = 90) is illustrated and discussed. The relationship between various demographic variable is presented. The findings of the study are discussed.

4.2 DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF THE STUDY

The demographic profile of individuals provides a picture of their make-up. Demographics are also used to identify the study of quantifiable subsets within a given population which characterize that population at a specific point in time.
4.2.1 Gender

The study consisted of 90 respondents of which 45 were male and 45 were female (figure 4.1).

**Figure 4.1**

**Gender**
4.2.2 Ethnic

Figure 4.2 illustrates the ethnic composition of the sample of respondents. Majority of them were White and constituted 46.7%. African respondents were 35.6% while Coloured and Indian/Asian respondents comprised of the least number each receiving 8% respectively.

Figure 4.2

Ethnic
4.2.3 Disability

The vast majority of the sample does not have a disability (92.2%) while 7.7% have a disability, represented by physically (3.3%) and hearing challenged (4.4) (figure 4.3).

Figure 4.3

Disability

- Not applicable: 92.20%
- Other: 0%
- Partially sighted: 0%
- Physically challenged: 3.30%
- Hearing challenged: 4.40%

[Bar chart showing disability categories and their percentages]
4.2.4 Age

The age distribution across the 11 age brackets as depicted in Figure 4.4. The largest group of respondents were 41 to 45 years of age (20%). The distribution of age amongst individuals were 36 to 40 (16.7%); 45 to 50 (15.6%); and 51 to 55 (13.3%) years of age. A lower percentage of respondents were younger than 20 (1.1%); 20 to 25 (3.3%); 56 to 60 (4.4%); and 63 years and older (0%). There was no response recorded for 63 and above; this may be a result of the organisation retirement age (63).

Figure 4.4
4.2.5 Years in current position

Majority of employees have been in their current position for the period of 1 to 2 years (45.6%) or more than 4 years (25.6%). The remainder of the employees were spread across 3 to 4 years (10%); 2 to 3 years (10%); or less than 1 year (8.9%) in their current position (figure 4.6).

Figure 4.5

Years in current position
4.2.6 Job level

Respondents were grouped into five categories, namely top and senior management; professional; skilled technical; and semi-skilled. As this study was conducted on the headquarters of the organisation a rather large sample of the study comprised of skilled technical, professional and senior management; they were 31.1%, 41.1% and 27.8% respectively. Semi-skilled were on the lower end of the scale with 2.2% (figure 4.7).

Figure 4.6

Job level
4.2.7 Education

A high percentage of the sample has received tertiary education, with only 5.6% having a Grade 12 certificate as their highest level of education. 11.1% have received a certificate and 17.8% have received a diploma qualification. 45.5% of the sample has received a qualification from a university; 22.2% a degree, 20% an honours degree, and 23.3% have received the Masters qualification (figure 4.8).

Figure 4.7

Education distribution
4.2.8 EE appointment

In order to meet the EE numerical goals, certain positions are earmarked for EE candidates. However of the sample only 21.1% of the respondents were EE appointments. 46.7% were not EE appointments and 32.2% were unsure if they were an EE appointment (figure 4.9).

**Figure 4.8**

**EE appointment**
4.2.9 Ethnicity of supervisor

Majority of candidates have a supervisor of White ethnicity (68.9%). A very low number of individuals have Africa (18.9%), Coloured (10%) and Asian/Indian (2.2%) supervisors (figure 4.10).

Figure 4.9

Ethnicity of Supervisor
4.2.10 Gender distribution of supervisor

The gender distribution of the supervisors of the sample revealed that majority of the sample has male supervisors compared to female supervisors were respectively 56.7% and 43.3% (figure 4.11).

Figure 4.10

Gender distribution of supervisors
4.3 CROSS TABULATION OF DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

The EEA (55 of 1998) has been implemented to correct the effect of past discrimination. The Act has been put into place to accomplish a diverse, fully representative workforce which reflects the South African population. For this purpose cross tabulation was conducted between various demographic factors, such as race and gender; race and age; and ethnicity and gender of supervisors.

4.3.1 Cross tabulation between race and gender

Table 4.1 and Figure 4.12 depict the gender distribution in the various race groups. White respondents for male and female were the majority, they were respectively 26.7% and 20.2%, totalling 46.7%. African females comprised of 12.2% and African males 23.3%. The Asian/Indians and Coloured respondents comprised of a low small group. Asian/Indian females were 0.6% and Asian/Indian males were 3.3%. Coloured females were 0.6% and Coloured males 3.3%. Male respondents had a higher distribution in all race groups except White.

Table 4.1

Cross tabulation between Race and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Indian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.11

Cross tabulation between Race and Gender
4.3.2 Cross tabulation between race and age

Table 4.2 and figure 4.13 depicts the cross tabulation between race and age. In the age group younger than 20 there was a response rate of 1.1%, and for the age category 20 to 25 the response rate was 3.3%, both age groups consisted of Africans. The age category 26 to 30 years African consisted of 6.7%; Asian/Indians 1.1%; Coloured 1.1%; and Whites 3.3%. The age bracket for 31 to 35 years of age consisted of 6.7% African; 3.3% Asian/Indian; 0% Coloured; and 1.1% Whites. Age bracket 36 to 40 saw 6.7% African; 2.2% Asian/Indian; 3.3% Coloured; and 4.4% Whites. The age group 41 to 45 consisted of 5.6% African; 2.2% Coloured; and 12.2% Whites. The age group 46 to 50 comprised of 2.2% African; 1.1% Asian/Indian; 2.2% Coloured; and 10% White. Age group 51 to 55 consisted of 1.1% African and 12.2% Whites. Age bracket 56 to 60 consisted of 2.2% African and 2.2% Whites. The age grouping 60 to 63 has 1.1% Asian/Indian and 1.1% Whites. None of the respondents indicated they were above the age of 63; this may be a result of the organisation retirement age, which is set at 63 years of age. Figure 4.13 clearly illustrates as the age groupings increased the percentage of White respondents increased; between age grouping 41 to 55 years of age Whites clearly dominated.

Table 4.2

Cross tabulation between Race and Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>&lt;20</th>
<th>20-25</th>
<th>26-30</th>
<th>31-35</th>
<th>36-40</th>
<th>41-45</th>
<th>46-50</th>
<th>51-55</th>
<th>56-60</th>
<th>60-63</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>35.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Indian</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>8.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>12.22</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>12.22</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>46.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>12.22</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>15.56</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.12

Cross tabulation between Race and Age
4.3.3 Cross tabulation between supervisor race and gender

The cross tabulation between ethnicity and gender of supervisors is depicted in table 4.4 and figure 4.15. Majority indicated they have a White supervisor (female 31.1% and male 37.8%). 15.6% respondents states they have a male African supervisor and 3.3% have female African supervisors. Individuals representing 8.9% indicated they have female Coloured and 1.1% have Coloured male supervisor. Only 2.2% have a male Asian/Indian supervisor.

Table 4.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity supervisor</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.11%</td>
<td>37.78%</td>
<td>68.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>15.56%</td>
<td>18.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.89%</td>
<td>1.11%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Indian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.22%</td>
<td>2.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.33%</td>
<td>56.67%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.13

Cross tabulation between Ethnicity and Gender of Supervisor

![Cross tabulation between Ethnicity and Gender of Supervisor](image-url)
4.4 RESEARCH FINDINGS REGARDING EEA (55 OF 1998)

Several questions regarding the objectives of the EEA (55 of 1998) were posed to the sample.

The objectives of the EEA are to:

i) To enhance the capacity of historically disadvantaged

ii) To stop unfair discrimination from happening

iii) To put right the effect of past discrimination. Moreover to achieve a diverse, broadly representative workforce and efficiency in the work place.

4.4.1 Organisation meeting the objectives as set out by EEA

Majority (agree 36.7% and strongly agree 7.8%) were of the opinion the organisation has fully complied with the dictates of the EEA, however, an equally large percentage were neutral (25.6%) or disagree (disagree 24.4% and strongly disagree 5.6%) with whether the organisation has complied with the EEA (figure 4.16).

Figure 4.14

The organisation has fully complied with the dictates of EEA
4.4.2 EEA success rate in addressing past discrimination

Figure 4.17 illustrates respondents were not unanimous in their views on whether the implementation of the EEA has managed to address problems of systematic discrimination that people suffered as a result of race, gender, disability and sexual orientation within the organisation. A total of 38% agreed and 5% strongly agreed EEA has assisted with addressing problems of systematic discrimination; however 32% disagree and 7% strongly disagree; the rest 18% is neutral. This clearly illustrates there is disconnect between employees perception of the success of the EE within the organisation.

**Figure 4.15**

**EEA has successfully addressed problems of systematic discrimination**

![Pie chart showing the distribution of responses](chart.png)
4.4.3 Resources to assist disabled employees

Figure 4.18 reflects the opinion in terms of whether the organisation has all the resources necessary to assist individuals with a disability in the workplace; 23.3% disagree strongly; 25.6% disagree; 24.4% neutral; 23.3% agree; and 3.3% agree strongly.

Figure 4.16

Resources needed to assist disabled individuals
4.4.4 EEA role in ensuring equal employment opportunities

Majority (23.3% agree strongly; 44.4% agree) are of the opinion policies and procedures which comply with the EEA is still needed within the organisation in order to ensure equal opportunities. This statistic is rather alarming as it would indicate that should the EEA no longer be applicable the majority are of the opinion the organisation would not offer equal employment opportunities. 11.1% were neutral, 13.3% disagree and 7.8% disagree strongly (figure 4.19).

Figure 4.17

Is the EEA still needed to ensure equal employment opportunities

within the work place?
4.4.5 Equal employment opportunities within the work place

A percentage is of the opinion not all employees enjoy equal employment opportunities (10% disagree strongly; 26.70% disagree). Figure 4.20 further illustrates a significant percentage is neutral (28.9%), which indicates the individuals are not certain if enough is being done by supervisors and managers to promote a workplace free of discrimination. The reminder of the sample is of the opinion everybody within the organisation does enjoy equal employment opportunities (28.9% agree; and 5.6% strongly agree).

**Figure 4.18**

*Do all employees experience equal employment opportunities within the organisation?*
4.4.6 Appointment according to qualifications and nepotism

A percentage of 43.4 (17.8% strongly disagree; 25.6% disagree) is of the opinion not every individual within the organisation is appointed according to job requirements (qualifications) and nepotism does exist within the organisation. Those that were unsure (22.2%) whether every individual has the necessary qualification for the position they appointed within and whether nepotism exists. The reminder of the sample (5.6% strongly agree; 25.6% agree) is of the opinion everyone is appointed with qualifications needed for the position and nepotism does not exist.

**Figure 4.19**

**Everybody is appointed and placed in his/her position according to the required qualification and no nepotism exists within the organisation**

![Pie chart showing the distribution of responses to the question about appointment according to qualifications and nepotism.](chart.png)
4.5 RESEARCH FINDINGS RELATED TO AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

There was a request to respond to several questions related to the effectiveness of AA in terms of the objectives of AA. The objectives of AA are:

i) To enhance the capacities of the historically disadvantaged through the development and introduction of practical measures that supports their advancement within the Public Service.

ii) To inculcate in the organisation a culture which values diversity and support the affirmation of those who have previously been unfairly disadvantaged?

iii) To speed up the achievement and progressive improvement of the numeric targets set out in the White Paper on the Transformation of Organisations.
4.5.1 AA fairness

Half, 52.2% (11.1%; 41.1% disagree) individuals are of the opinion AA has previously been fair to both partied from previously disadvantaged and previously advantaged groups. Neutral was represented by 20% and 27.7% (4.4% agree strongly; 23.3% agree) is of the view AA has been fair to previously advantaged and disadvantaged groups (figure 4.22).

Figure 4.20

Affirmative action has in the past been fair to both persons previously disadvantaged and those from previously advantaged groups
4.5.2 AA success rate in readdressing past inequalities

Figure 4.23 depicts employees’ perception of AA measures assisting with bridging the gap created by past inequalities. A percentage 38% is of the opinion AA has assisted in bridging the gap created by the inequalities of the past. However, a percentage 37.8 and (5.6% disagree strongly; 32.2% disagree) is of the opinion AA measures has not managed to bridge the gap created by the legacy of the past. A further 23.3% were neutral and therefore unsure if AA had had a positive effect in assisting the organisation with lessening the gap between various racial groups which were created by the past legacy of the country.

**Figure 4.21**

Has AA assisted in lessening the gap created by past inequalities

![Bar chart showing employee perceptions](chart.png)
4.5.3 AA programmes has resulted in promoting diversity within the organisation

Half (1.1% agree strongly; 48.9% strongly) agree AA programmes has assisted in producing positive results in terms of promoting diversity amongst the workforce. A further 21.1% were neutral and the remainder 28.9% (5.6% disagree strongly; 23.3% disagree), felt AA initiatives have not assisted with the promotion of diversity within the workplace (figure 4.24).

Figure 4.22

AA programmes has yielded positive results in promoting diversity in the organisation

![Bar Chart](chart.png)
4.5.4 AA role in expertise acquisition

Majority, 38.9% responded as neutral in terms of whether AA has benefited the organisation in terms of acquisition of expertise; 27.8% feel AA has benefited the company in acquiring expertise; however, 33.3% feel AA has not assisted the organisation in acquiring expertise. The large number of individuals who are neutral and disagree in terms of AA assisting in acquiring expertise can be seen as steep, as the organisation has created shadow positions to assist with knowledge being transferred to EE candidates who would move into certain positions which currently have a white male in the position (figure 4.25).

Figure 4.23

Has AA benefited the organisation in expertise acquisition?
4.5.5 Lowering of job requirements (qualifications) to meet AA targets

The organisation is responsible for developing a five EE year plan and submitting it to the department of labour. The organisation will then need to submit a yearly report to the department of labour to track the progress in terms of the numerical goals set in the five year plan. A group of 43.3% (8.9% agree strongly; 34.4% agree) are of the opinion less qualified individuals are appointed from designated groups to meet numerical goals as set out by the EE plan; 21.1% responded as being neutral. A further 35.5% of the sample feels that the requirements in terms of qualifications are not lowered in terms of meeting the numerical targets which are set.

Figure 4.24
Job requirements (qualifications) are lowered to meet numerical targets for designated groups
4.5.6 White females form part of the designated group

White females are considered to be part of the historically disadvantaged group and 50% (10% agree strongly; 40 agree) agree. However, 20% responded as neutral and 30% (8.9% disagree strongly; 21.1% disagree) feel White females should not be considered part of the historically disadvantaged/designated group (figure 4.27).

Figure 4.25

Should white females be considered part of the historically disadvantaged group
4.5.7 Being informed of AA policies/programmes

A percentage of 56.7 (5.6% strongly agree; 51.1% agree) feel all employees’ within the organisation are well informed about the AA/EE policy/programmes; 18.9% were neutral; and 24.5% (5.6% strongly disagree; 18.9% disagree) felt all employees are not aware of the policies/programmes related to AA/EE (figure 4.28).

Figure 4.26

Employees are well informed about AA/EE policies/programmes

within the company
4.5.8 AA is not reversed/unfair discrimination

Even though 44.5% (15.6% agree strongly; 28.9% agree) responded as saying AA is not reversed/unfair discrimination; a large percentage responded as neutral, 24.4%; and AA is reversed/unfair discrimination, 31.1% (12.2% disagree strongly; 18.9% disagree) (figure 4.29).

Figure 4.27

AA is not reversed/ unfair discrimination
4.5.9 Black managers are given token position as a result of AA

The respondents were requested to answer a question related to whether black managers were given token positions as a result of AA/EE. Respondents were not aligned in their responses, 6.7% strongly agree Black managers were given positions as a result of AA; 33.3% agree Black managers received the position due to AA; 24.4% responded as neutral; 31.1% disagree and feel Black managers do not receive their position due to AA; and lastly 4.4% strongly disagree and feel Black managers do not receive the position due to AA (figure 4.30).

Figure 4.28

Black managers are placed in token positions due to AA/EE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree strongly</td>
<td>6.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>33.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>24.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>31.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree strongly</td>
<td>4.40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5.10 Employees from designated groups are being trained in order to replace the current job incumbents

The organisation has created shadow positions to assist with knowledge transfer to the EE candidates who have been identified to take over certain position which are filled with White males (White males close to retirement age or space creation package has been offered). A percentage of 2.2 feel strongly about training being provided to individuals of designated groups who will replace current incumbent; 48.9% agree; 21.1% responded as neutral; 24.4% disagree and feel that training is not provided; and 3.3% strongly disagree that training is not provided. The reason why almost half of the sample responded as neutral, disagree, or disagree strongly is they are not aware training is provided to earmarked candidates or they feel the training provided is not adequate (figure 4.31).

Figure 4.29
Training interventions are in place to assist those who will replace current incumbents
4.5.11 AA has been beneficial in promoting equality in the mining industry

Half of the sample (4.4% agree strongly; 47.8% agree) feel AA has been beneficial in assisting the organisation to promote equality within the mining industry; 21.1% were neutral; and the reminder (3.3% disagree strongly; 23.3% disagree) feel that AA has not assisted in promoting equality amongst various races within the mining industry (figure 4.32).

Figure 4.30

Has AA been beneficial in promoting equality within the mining industry
4.5.12 Employees are satisfied with AA/EE

A percentage 73.3 (24.4% disagree strongly; 48.9% disagree) are not happy/satisfied with AA/EE; a further 20% are neutral; and 6.7%, responded as being happy with AA/EE (figure 4.33).

Figure 4.31

Employees are happy/ satisfied with AA/EE
4.6 FINDINGS REGARDING DISCRIMINATION, TRANSFORMATION AND DIVERSITY MANAGEMENT WITHIN THE ORGANISATION

Several statements based on discrimination, transformation and diversity management were posed to respondents. The findings

4.6.1 What constitutes fair/unfair discrimination

Here 38.90% (2.2% strongly agree; 36.7% agree) state they are aware of what constitutes fair and unfair discrimination. A further 26.7% state to be neutral, this may indicate the employees have a vague understating of what is fair and unfair. However they are not certain. A percentage (30% disagree; 4.4% strongly disagree) then stated they are not certain what constituted as fair/unfair discrimination. This is a meaningful percentage considering the organisation hosts yearly diversity interventions which look at various topics, including fair and unfair discrimination and has policies in place which clearly state what is fair and unfair discrimination (figure 4.34).

**Figure 4.32**

**Employees understand what fair and unfair discrimination is**
4.6.2 Unfair discrimination

Majority (58.9%) were unaware whether the organisation has received any cases of unfair discrimination in the past. A further 32.3% (5.6% strongly disagree; 26.7% disagree) are of the opinion the organisation has not received any cases of unfair discrimination. A small percentage of the sample (8.9%) is of the opinion organisation has in the past had cases of unfair discrimination (figure 3.35).

**Figure 4.33**

*Are employees aware of unfair discrimination cases which have taken place*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree strongly</td>
<td>5.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>26.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>58.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>8.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree strongly</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.6.3 Transition ensured improved quality of working life and access to resources for previously disadvantaged

A percentage of 59.9 (3.3% agree strongly; 56.6% agree) feel the transformation process has ensured there is an improved quality of working life as well as access to resources which those of previously disadvantaged groups did not have prior to the transformation process; 23.3% were neutral; and 17.8% had negative feelings (figure 4.36).

Figure 4.34

The transformation process ensured improved quality of working life and access to resources for previously disadvantaged
4.6.4 The organisation promotes, maintains and celebrates cultural diversity

More than half 54.5% (6.7% strongly agree; 47.8% agree) is of the opinion the organisation has been able to promote, maintain and celebrate cultural diversity within the organisation; 26.7% were neutral; a further 18.8% (4.4% strongly disagree; 14.4% disagree) disagree and state the organisation has not been able to promote, maintain and celebrate cultural diversity (figure 4.7).

**Figure 4.35**

The organisation has in the past managed to promote, maintain and celebrate cultural diversity
4.6.5 Meaningful training provided to all for diversity management

Once a year the organisation has diversity initiates; this may include workshops and industrial theatre plays. A percentage 57.8 (11.1% strongly agree; 46.7% agree) feels the diversity training which the organisation offers is meaningful; 21.10% is neutral; and 21.10% (3.3% disagree strongly; 17.8% disagree) (figure 4.38).

Figure 4.36

The organisation has provided a meaningful training to every employee regarding diversity management
4.6.6 Employees with life threatening diseases (such as HIV/AIDS and cancer) receive comparable treatment as any other

Those living with any life threatening diseases 68.9% (16.7% agree strongly; 52.2% agree) enjoy the same treatment as other employees’ once they disclose their condition; 18.9% was neutral; 12.2% (2.2% disagree; 10% disagree) feel that if an employee disclose their status they will not receive the same treatment as other employees’ (figure 4.39).

**Figure 4.37**

Employees with life threatening illnesses (e.g. HIV/aids, cancer, etc) enjoy the same treatment like any other employee in the organisation
4.6.7 The organisation achieved a diverse workforce

Some feel 58.9% (8.9% agree strongly; 50%) agree the company has succeeded in accomplishing a diverse workforce which is broadly representative of all race groups within SA; 15.6% feel neutral; 25.6% have a negative feeling (figure 4.40).

**Figure 4.38**

The organisation has managed to achieve a diverse workforce broadly representative of the people in South Africa

![Pie chart showing the distribution of attitudes towards diversity](chart.png)

4.7 INFERENTIAL STATISTICS

**Hypothesis 1:**

There is no statistically significant difference in perceptions of employment equity, affirmative action and discrimination based on race
Table 4.5 Differences in Employment Equity, Affirmative Action and Discrimination based on race

ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment Equity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>162.853</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54.284</td>
<td>3.532</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1321.869</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>15.371</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1484.722</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>93.157</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31.052</td>
<td>.936</td>
<td>.427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>2852.499</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>33.169</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2945.656</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>294.156</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>98.052</td>
<td>5.574</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1512.744</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>17.590</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1806.900</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in table 4.5 indicate that there is no statistically significant difference in perceptions of affirmative action based on race (F = .936, p > 0.05).

However, there are statistically significant differences in perceptions of employment equity based on race (F = 3.532, p < 0.05).
Similarly, there are statistically significant differences in perceptions of discrimination based on race ($F = 5.574, p < 0.01$).

Hence, the null hypothesis is partially accepted.

**Hypothesis 2:**

There is no statistically significant difference in perceptions of employment equity, affirmative action and discrimination based on age.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment Equity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>78.440</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.716</td>
<td>.496</td>
<td>.873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1406.282</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>17.579</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1484.722</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative Action</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>318.972</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35.441</td>
<td>1.079</td>
<td>.387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>2626.684</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>32.834</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2945.656</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discrimination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>162.551</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.061</td>
<td>.879</td>
<td>.548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1644.349</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20.554</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1806.900</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in Table 4.6 indicate that there is no statistically significant difference in perceptions of affirmative action based on race ($F = .496$, $p > 0.05$).
However, there are no statistically significant differences in perceptions of employment equity based on race (F = 1.079, p > 0.05).

Similarly, there are no statistically significant differences in perceptions of discrimination based on race (F = .879, p > 0.05).

Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted.

**Hypothesis 3:**

There is no statistically significant difference in perceptions of employment equity, affirmative action and discrimination based on tenure
Table 4.7 Differences in Employment Equity, Affirmative Action and Discrimination based on tenure

ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Equity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>47.567</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.928</td>
<td>.458</td>
<td>.837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1437.155</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>17.315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1484.722</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>130.330</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21.722</td>
<td>.640</td>
<td>.698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>2815.326</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>33.920</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2945.656</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>210.919</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35.153</td>
<td>1.828</td>
<td>.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1595.981</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>19.229</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1806.900</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in table 4.7 indicate that there is no statistically significant difference in perceptions of affirmative action based on tenure ($F = .458, p > 0.05$).

However, there are no statistically significant differences in perceptions of employment equity based on tenure ($F = .640, p > 0.05$).

Similarly, there are no statistically significant differences in perceptions of discrimination based on tenure ($F = 1.828, p > 0.05$).
Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted.

**Hypothesis 4:**

There is no statistically significant difference in perceptions of employment equity, affirmative action and discrimination based on disability.
Table 4.8 Differences in Employment Equity, Affirmative Action and Discrimination based on disability

ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment Equity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>5.306</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.653</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>1479.417</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>17.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1484.722</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative Action</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>7.471</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.735</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>2938.185</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>33.772</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2945.656</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discrimination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>69.824</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34.912</td>
<td>1.749</td>
<td>.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>1737.076</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>19.966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1806.900</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results in table 4.8 indicate that there is no statistically significant difference in perceptions of affirmative action based on disability (F = .156, p > 0.05).

However, there are no statistically significant differences in perceptions of employment equity based on disability (F = .111, p > 0.05).

Similarly, there are no statistically significant differences in perceptions of discrimination based on disability (F = 1.749, p > 0.05).

Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted.

**Hypothesis 5:**

There is no statistically significant difference in perceptions of employment equity, affirmative action and discrimination based on job level.
Table 4.9 Differences in Employment Equity, Affirmative Action and Discrimination based on job level

ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment Equity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>189.152</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.525</td>
<td>2.020</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1295.570</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>15.609</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1484.722</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative Action</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>361.487</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60.248</td>
<td>1.935</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>2584.169</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>31.135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2945.656</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discrimination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>159.366</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26.561</td>
<td>1.338</td>
<td>.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1647.534</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>19.850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1806.900</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in table 4.9 indicate that there is no statistically significant difference in perceptions of affirmative action based on job level (F = 2.020, p > 0.05).
However, there are no statistically significant differences in perceptions of employment equity based on job level ($F = 1.935$, $p > 0.05$).

Similarly, there are no statistically significant differences in perceptions of discrimination based on job level ($F = 1.338$, $p > 0.05$).

Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted.

**Hypothesis 6:**

There is no statistically significant difference in perceptions of employment equity, affirmative action and discrimination based on education.
Table 4.10 Differences in Employment Equity, Affirmative Action and Discrimination based on education

ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment Equity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>120.074</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24.015</td>
<td>1.478</td>
<td>.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1364.649</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>16.246</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1484.722</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative Action</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>261.075</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>52.215</td>
<td>1.634</td>
<td>.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>2684.580</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>31.959</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2945.656</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discrimination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>153.510</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30.702</td>
<td>1.560</td>
<td>.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1653.390</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>19.683</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1806.900</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in table 4.10 indicate that there is no statistically significant difference in perceptions of affirmative action based on education (F = 1.478, p > 0.05).

However, there are no statistically significant differences in perceptions of employment equity based on job level (F = 1.634, p > 0.05).
Similarly, there are no statistically significant differences in perceptions of discrimination based on job level (F = 1.560, p > 0.05). Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted.

4.8 CONCLUSION

The EEA was implemented to address past imbalances which were created due to the apartheid regime. The Act was created with the objective to accommodate the previously disadvantaged groups of the country and to lessen the gaps which were created as a result of the apartheid era by having a workforce which has equitable representation in the workplace.

EE was implemented to promote equitable representation of all races within the workplace; however, the findings of the survey indicate EEA has not successfully addressed problems of systematic discrimination and a large percentage of employees do not experience equal employment opportunities within the workplace. Attention should also be given to the way in which EE policies are implemented within the workplace, if not handled correctly it may lead to racial divide, instead of addressing the gap created by the past it further increases the divide. EE can come across as being reversed discrimination as employees may feel Black managers are placed within token positions because of EE. A larger percentage of employees revealed they are not well informed in terms of EE policies/programmes within the company and they are also not satisfied with EE.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION, LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

According to the EEA (55 of 1998) organisations in South Africa are obliged to comply with the dictates of the Act. Organisations therefore are not only pressurised to meet numerical targets but to ensure the method to implement EE/AA within organisations are fair. An employer’s responsibility to its employees involves far more than fairness with regard to the salary and benefits which are given in exchange for labour (distributive justice); an employer is obliged to ensure the implementation of policies and procedures that benchmark salaries and benefits of employees are fair (procedural justice). EE is often surrounded with feelings of hardship and loss and interactional justice therefore plays apart in influencing individuals’ attitudes and behaviours required for successful performance. One of the challenges which organisations therefore face would be to implement EE without creating negative attitudes amongst employees.

This chapter will provide a summary of the research findings related to the objectives and hypotheses of the study and provide recommendations.

5.2 HYPOTHESES

The main aim of the study was to determine employees’ perceptions of fairness regarding the procedures used to implement employment equity within a mining organisation in South Africa. Several hypotheses were identified to assist in measuring perceptions of employment equity, affirmative action and discrimination within the mining industry.
Hypothesis 1:

There is no statistically significant difference in perceptions of employment equity, affirmative action and discrimination based on race.

The null hypothesis is partially accepted

Hypothesis 2

There is no statistically significant difference in perceptions of employment equity, affirmative action and discrimination based on age.

The null hypothesis is accepted

Hypothesis 3

There is no statistically significant difference in perceptions of employment equity, affirmative action and discrimination based on tenure.

The null hypothesis was accepted

Hypothesis 4

There is no statistically significant difference in perceptions of employment equity, affirmative action and discrimination based on disability.

The null hypothesis was accepted

Hypothesis 5

There is no statistically significant difference in perceptions of employment equity, affirmative action and discrimination based on job level

The null hypothesis was accepted
Hypothesis 6

There is no statistically significant difference in perceptions of employment equity, affirmative action and discrimination based on education

The null hypothesis was accepted

5.3 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND FINDINGS

The main aim of the study was to determine employees’ perceptions of fairness regarding the procedures used to implement employment equity within a mining organisation in South Africa. In order to achieve the main objective of the study, the derived objective therefore is:

- To measure employee’s responses to employment equity practices within a particular Mining organisation in South Africa.

It is evident that the organisation has made significant progress in terms of complying with the dictates of the EEA; this is evident in the Table 5.1 which reflects the demographics of the organisation in terms of gender and race. Table 5.2 reflects the disability status of the organisation; it is evident that the organisation still has room for improvement. Certain employees still feel that the organisation does not fully comply with the dictates of the EEA. Half of the sample feels that the EEA has addressed problems of systematic discrimination. Majority of employees experience equal employment opportunities within the organisation, however a large group feel that they are still discriminated against. In terms of recruitment practices with regard to the appointing individuals in positions with the relevant qualifications a large percentage of respondents felt qualification level is lowered in order to fill positions with HDSA candidates and that nepotism does exist.
To determine whether there are differences in the responses/perceptions of EE based on biographical characteristics.

The research found that there is still difference in employee responses based on biographical characteristics. There was a large divide in terms of employees’ responses in terms of whether AA has been fair to both previously disadvantaged and advantaged groups in the past. Large group of employees feel that AA has not assisted in lessening the gap created by past inequalities. Respondents were also divided in terms of whether white females should form part of the previously disadvantaged group. Large group of employees view EE/AA as being reversed discrimination and that it is therefore blocking appointment/promotions of white males within the organisation. Respondents’ were not aligned in terms of their responses with Black individuals receiving token positions due to EE/AA.

To identify the barriers (areas of concern) to achieving EE success and where organisational procedures or group behaviour can be improved to increase employees’ perceptions of fairness of EE practices and procedures.

The organisation faces several barriers in terms of achieving EE success.

- In terms of demographic factors the organisation face barriers in terms of the low employment rate of Indian/Asian and Coloured employees (refer to table 5.1)
- Employees do not understand the objectives/purpose of the EEA and therefore view the act as reverse discrimination
- HDSA candidates who have been identified to replace white male incumbents do not receive adequate training to ensure that they are able to fulfil the duties of the position when they do take it over
- Employees who view EE/AA as reverse discrimination
- Employees attend diversity training annually however the training initiative is not viewed as meaningful and the impact of the training is not lasting.
- In terms of recruiting disabled individuals, the organisation will need to ensure that the workplace is user friendly for those who have disabilities.
- The recruitment process should be transparent, all employees should understand that the recruitment process is standardised throughout the organisation and that the job requirements are not lowered in order to fill positions with EE candidates. The EEA was not implemented to fill positions with unsuitable HDSA candidates.
- A large group of employees are not informed about the EE plan/policy/programmes and this is seen as a barrier as it creates negative perceptions amongst the workforce.
- To establish the factors influencing employee’s perceptions of EE practices in a mining company in South Africa?

Several factors influence employees’ perceptions of EE practices within the organisation. Employees responded that they are not all aware of the EE plan, policies, programmes; and what constitutes fair and unfair discrimination. Employee perceptions of EE practices may also be influenced by the fact that employees do not receive regular information regarding the numerical targets and whether the organisation has met targets. Employees are not aware of diversity initiatives or EE action plans which are implemented in order to assist with meeting numerical targets.
• To provide recommendations to the organisation enabling them to contribute towards solving the proposed formulated problem.

Research findings indicate there are several challenges which the organisation needs to overcome in terms of implementing EE without employees having a negative perception of policies and procedures which are related to EE. Research indicates there is a large disparity between employees from previously advantaged and disadvantaged group’s opinions regarding EE implementation within the organisation. Recommendations related to the study findings are:

• Top management should educate employees on the employment equity plan. Employees should understand the objectives of the EEA and understand it is not implemented as reverse discrimination. Management should inform employees of the numerical goals as well as the current state of the organisation.

• EEA2 reports should be available on internal portal so that employees can review statistics of organisation and educate themselves in terms of EE. EE policies and procedures should be transparent, so that employees do not attach negative feelings to EE.

• Management needs to ensure all employees are aware of the company policy regarding discrimination.

• Training and development initiatives need to be linked to the organisation succession planning to ensure individuals receive adequate training and mentoring for future positions.

• Recruitment procedure should be fair to all employees; the requirements for all positions should not be lowered in order to meet EE targets.
• Management/HR should be able to explain/justify all appointments which are related to EE targets.

• The diversity training which is presented yearly should be investigated and a more meaningful training initiative should be implemented. The initiative should provide meaning to employees.

• Diversity management should be linked to key performance indicators of managers to ensure management commitment and accountability to the process, managers promote diversity within departments.

• Employees should be informed of what constitutes a disability and the organisation should ensure it provides an environment whereby employees feel safe to disclose disability status.

• An investigation regarding the building accessibility for individuals with a disability needs to be investigated and results should be implemented.

• Employees who form part of the previously advantaged group should be acknowledged and transformational programmes should be developed whereby they can form part of, e.g. coaching and mentoring.

• EE policies should be implemented without disadvantaging the previously advantaged groups; and this should be communicated to individuals or previously advantaged groups.

• Managers should receive training interventions which are designed to specifically assist managers in developing conflict management techniques which are focused on how to resolve conflict in a culturally sensitive manner. Managers should also be trained to be sensitive to gender and racial issues.
- The role of the EE committee within the organisation should be promoted by providing the elected committee with the necessary authority and resources.
- Regular feedback sessions should be held with employees.
- Have EE as a standing point in monthly meetings so as to lessen the negative connotation to it, employees start understanding it better and it becomes more transparent.

5.4 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A literature and empirical study was conducted to meet the research objectives of the study. The literature review focused on the implementation of EE, the EE models, and EE practices which have an impact on employees’ perceptions of fairness.

A questionnaire was identified to assist with the data collection for the study. The questionnaire was used to collect data regarding biographical information, perceptions and attitudes regarding EE within the workforce.

The sampling method for the study was a convenience sampling. The questionnaires were paper based and the questionnaires were distributed randomly to employees within the organisation. Table 5.1 presents a representation of the demographics of the organisation. F band represents top management; E band senior management; D band professional; and C band skilled employees. The organisation has 827 employees, 90 employees participated in the study which is 11%. Table 5.2 presents a representation of the disability statistics of the organisation.
5.5 LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RECOMMENDATIONS

The study encountered several limitations; the first limitation of the study is it was limited to a single organisation within the mining industry. Therefore it is difficult to generalise the conclusions of the study to other organisation. It is therefore recommended other mining organisations participate to assist in making the results generalizable. Another limitation of the study is the sampling method utilised is a non-probability sampling method in the form of convenience sampling. This resulted in certain groups being under-represented in the study and as an outcome selection bias has been introduced, which reduces the degree to which the results of the study may be generalised to the entire population. It is advised in future a stratified random sampling method be utilised. The method of data gathering utilised is quantitative and therefore can be seen as a limitation as respondents were asked to respond
according to forced ranking and therefore could not always express their opinion. The method of data collection should also be reevaluated to receive quantitative data.

The questionnaire was only distributed in English and this can be seen as a limitation. For future investigations the method of data collection should be provided in more than one language so as to ensure that all employees understand the questions posed to the respondent.

5.6 CONCLUSION

Chapter five focused on the research findings in terms of it measuring the objectives of the study. Limitations of the study were discussed as well as recommendations which are organisation specific.
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