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ABSTRACT
One of the most challenging tasks confronting local government managers is to resolve, or at least ameliorate, some of the difficulties arising from the wide diversity found in the workplace. Although local government went through a process of transformation to ensure that it was more representative of the broader diverse community, it was merely an exercise in structural change. Structural change should not be the only mechanism of the current government to bring about change in the workplace. The management of change and affirmative action programmes alone will not obtain the employment equity workers are seeking. The management of diversity is needed to create employment equity in the workplace – a workplace encompassing everyone. Appropriate techniques for handling diversity must be found. These will have to become integral to the whole environment’s accepting diverse groups as vital resources in an organisation. The focus should also be on behavioural change, especially that of individuals and groups in the organisation (public sector). A balance is needed for structural as well as behavioural change with regard to diversity in the workplace. The ultimate aim in the democratisation and transformation of local government in South Africa is not to widen the rift between the various groups, but to foster understanding between them, thereby streamlining local government and enhancing its efficiency through service delivery.

INTRODUCTION
The South African approach to managing diversity is not unique in the world, and history has shown that the colonial and National Party governments used transformation and affirmative action for the structural change of their governments. Both governments failed to change their behavioural outlook on diversity management, and instead used their own perceptual understanding of how to deal with diversity. They then embedded their perceptual ideas in their public officials who had to execute whatever understanding they themselves had of diversity. The perceptual understanding of diversity was further embedded in the behavioural attitudes of local government managers. A negative behavioural modelling framework was established, which formed the basis for handling diversity in local government. The purpose of this article is to introduce a normative model for managing the diversity awareness of local government managers. The normative model is based on the following theoretical assumptions: namely:

- To change local government for the better, local government managers must be given the opportunity to change the way they think and interact.
- Changing the thinking of local government managers cannot be done through increased training or through command-and-control management approaches because one cannot command local government managers to alter their attitudes, beliefs, skills, capabilities and perceptions, or level of commitment.
The practice of learning within local government involves developing tangible activities like new governing ideas, innovations in infrastructure and new management methods, and tools for changing the way people conduct their work. Given the opportunity to take part in these new activities, people will develop an enduring capability for change. The process will pay back the organisation with far greater levels of diversity, commitment, innovation and talent.

Diversity can contribute to improved service delivery, increase efficiency and effectiveness and reduce costs, and at the same time improve the quality and extend the benefits of public services to all South Africans. Diversity is also seen as a tool to ensure a stable public service.

This article focuses firstly on the use of models for investigating diversity awareness in local government. Secondly, it introduces the different components of the normative model for managing diversity awareness – these include the purpose of diversity awareness as well as the different beliefs and paradigms of diversity management in the workplace. Thirdly, the focus is on the management syndromes influencing diversity management, and the results of ignoring diversity awareness management in local government.

**THE USE OF MODELS FOR INVESTIGATING DIVERSITY AWARENESS IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT**

Models form an important part of developing a framework for a research project or study. According to O’Sullivan and Rassel (1995:2), models are especially needed “after the researcher has stated the research and the question and the study’s purpose. Models also include selected elements, characteristics or events, and link them to each other”. According to Pekeur, and O’Sullivan and Rassel, models are used for many purposes. Pekeur (1992:44–45) states that models are used to do the following:

- Provide a framework of steps to be followed.
- Serve as a map for those using them and for those who are still to use them.
- Provide an outline or illustration of procedures to be followed, ensuring and/or promoting better understanding.
- Convey an image of research professionalism.
- Define the purpose of the study.
- Make the research easier.
- Serve as a learning channel for researchers, especially illustrating how to do a research project.

O’Sullivan and Rassel (1995:2–5) state that models:

- Organise the research study properly.
- Simplify reality by eliminating irrelevant details.
- Organise one’s thoughts better.
- Communicate more effectively, especially with regard to the purpose of the study to others, and later to present the findings.
- Define what is meant by each element within the study.
- Put the researcher on an interactive process to collect, analyse and present data which is consistent with the study’s purpose.
- Reach reasonable conclusions regarding the importance of elements and their relationship to one another.

**A NORMATIVE MODEL FOR MANAGING DIVERSITY AWARENESS IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT**

Managing diversity has become a popular research subject in the public sector and, in order to prevent possible overlapping with other research projects or studies, it was decided to build a model for investigating the diversity awareness and behaviour of local government managers.
towards diversity. Figure 1 refers to the diversity awareness reality model, which consists of the following interlinked phases:

- Phase 1 focuses on the purpose of diversity awareness.
- Phase 2 focuses on the belief windows through which diversity is viewed.
- Phase 3 focuses on the paradigms influencing diversity management in the workplace.
- Phase 4 focuses on the behaviour patterns (and or management syndromes) towards diversity in the workplace.
- Phase 5 focuses on the results of the different behaviour patterns.

Figure 1 Diversity awareness reality model

**THE PURPOSE OF DIVERSITY AWARENESS (PHASE 1)**

Karen Grote (1991:1) identifies three purposes for conducting diversity awareness in the workplace. They are:

- To become aware of ways in which managers discriminate against, judge or isolate others.
- To evaluate behaviour and to plan action steps to modify any undesirable behaviour.
- To increase self-awareness.

The foundational purpose of diversity awareness within the Diversity Awareness Reality Model (DARM) is to change the mindset of local government managers and leaders regarding diversity management, and the development of diverse people (employees) in local government, for example to change the mindset of local government managers who expect people from diverse backgrounds to think, believe and behave as they do. The desired result within DARM is two-fold, namely to focus on self-awareness and to aim for a reaction. Within DARM the focus of self-awareness will be:

- To investigate the attitudes and behaviour of local government managers working in local government towards diversity (differences) in the workplace.
- To increase self-awareness of differences.
- To help individual local government managers develop an awareness of their behaviour and attitudes to the various diversities which exist in the workplace and the ways they discriminate against, judge or isolate people (from diverse backgrounds) who work for or with them.
- To help local government managers to stand apart from themselves in order to examine their own thinking, motives, habits and/or tendencies that contribute to their behaviour towards diversity.

Within DARM the reaction aimed for is change – change that incorporates imagination, conscience and independent will. *Imagination* incorporates envisioning something entirely different from what one currently is experiencing, in other words envisioning a work environment where diversity is valued and acknowledged: “It’s the endowment that enables us to see ourselves and others differently and better than we are now” (Covey & Merrill, 1994:60). *Conscience* in this regard refers to people’s inner voice telling them when the way they treat people is not acceptable.
Covey and Merrill (1994:60) state: “It’s our internal guidance system, which allows us to sense when we act or even contemplate acting in a way that’s contrary to principle. It also gives us a sense of our unique gifts and mission.” Independent will refers to the power to take action. Within DARM, a change in attitude or behaviour will help the public manager:

- Not to ignore differences but to understand why people are different, and to use that understanding to foster a climate which enhances a culture of diversity in the workplace.
- To acknowledge and value diversity as a vital resource in the workplace.
- To reduce prejudice, hate, stereotyping, cultural insensitivity, discrimination and increased frustration among diverse workers.
- To help create a workplace where workers from diverse backgrounds feel appreciated and get along with one other.
- To put diversity into perspective regarding its role in preparing the way for integration in local government.

BELIEF WINDOWS ON DIVERSITY MANAGEMENT (PHASE 2)

The purpose of diversity awareness within DARM is also based on the “belief windows” that exist on diversity management in the workplace. A belief window refers to an invisible window through which one looks at things around oneself. It is called a belief window because beliefs are the things that filter one’s view of the world. Hanks, Pulsipher and Pulsipher (1997:11) state that whether “a belief is small or big it affects the way we see”. Belief windows also define our limits and set our capabilities. Within DARM the focus is on how beliefs get placed on one’s windows. Hanks et al. (1997:13) also state: “Beliefs do not just magically appear on our windows. We write them there ourselves. Each of us is responsible for our own Belief Window for selecting the things which will be written, although we may not always be aware of what we are writing.” According to Perry (1993:59–71), beliefs shape our culture, our culture shapes the people, and the people shape their lives. The powerful influence of beliefs will affect factors such as:

- The way people think.
- How they approach problem solving.
- How they raise their children.
- How they view their spouse and how children view their parents.
- How they communicate.
- How they worship.
- Their sense of humour.
- Their diet.
- Their values.
- Their standards of beauty.
- Their laws and household policies.
- How they view others.

The information for writing down beliefs comes in different forms, for example from new ideas.

New ideas

According to Tromp (1998:76), humans are bombarded with new ideas all the time. Munroe (1996) refers to ideas as seeds of creative power. He defines an idea as a “captured thought”. A captured thought represents a silent word. A word in return is an exposed thought. An idea forms the foundation of one’s words. According to Munroe (1996), if your ideas are wrong, your thoughts will be wrong. If your thoughts are wrong, your thinking will be wrong, and if your thinking is wrong, your words will be wrong. If words are wrong your life will be wrong. Rodin (2000:76) states: “Our perception of the world is colored by our perception of who we think we are. Therefore, how we see the world will depend on how see ourselves.” You actually become
what you think. A local government manager’s behaviour towards diversity in the workplace is a reflection of what he truly believes about diversity. Effective behavioural change starts with changing the thinking of people. Figure 2 refers to a framework by Munroe (1996) on the development of an idea.
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**Figure 2** A framework on the development of ideas (Munroe, 1996)

Munroe (1996) states: “An idea is a captured thought, and when exposed it becomes a word. When a word (idea) becomes an established thought it becomes an ideology. When an ideology becomes a theory it becomes a belief system. When one gets convinced by a theory it becomes a philosophy or paradigm [your way of thinking/system of beliefs/mindset]”. Apartheid, for example, was an established thought, which was made a belief system and eventually became the previous apartheid government’s philosophy of running the country. Thus, according to Munroe (1996), the only way to change your behaviour is to change your thinking, and the only way of changing your thinking is to change your ideas.

Pomerleau (1994:87–88) identifies the following ideologies on diversity management in the workplace:

- **Assimilationist ideology**
  This ideology derives from the melting pot concept whereby individuals of all nations will be melted into a new race. Pomerleau (1994:87) states: “The Assimilationist ideology attempts to assimilate ‘others’ into the culture, concomitantly serving to attenuate individual differences, and modifies their values and experiences to conform to the ways of the dominant group.” Critics of the ideology, Londen and Rosener (1991) state, in Pomerleau (1994:88): “This cultural assimilation process is like expecting left-handed people to write with their right hand because they work in a culture dominated by right handers.”

- **Pluralist ideology**
  This ideology wants racial, cultural and ethnic diversity to coexist in a society which is multicultural in character with a common identity and a more intense sub-identity.

- **Dualist ideology**
  This ideology refers to the dual role a person of a minority culture has to play within a dominant culture environment. The dualist ideology depicts the younger generation of the minority culture as being frequently crossed, pressured, isolated and estranged. They have to serve as a bridge between the dominant culture and their parents’ distinct and alien culture. The younger generation employees are burdened with the stigma of marginality owing to this dual role, where they are regarded as being too supportive of the dominant culture, while at work they may be viewed as too foreign.

- **Chauvinist ideology**
  According to Pomerleau (1994:88), this ideology is predicated on the single cause ideological culture where a class of people, charging that the Eurocentric culture is pervasively and
perniciously racist, eschews assimilation, fearing that it would undercut the doctrine of liberation. Gitlin (1993) states, in Pomerleau (1994:88): “What began as an assertion of dignity, a recovery from exclusion and denigration, and a demand for representation has developed into a hardening of its boundaries.”

- **Transmutationist ideology**
  This ideology seeks to transform the culture-specific cast of the Eurocentric “one-size-fits-all” model into a “common cultural strain”. The idea behind the transmutationist ideology is that by comingling diversity, the problems of clashing cultures and conflicting perspectives in the workplace would be attenuated through mutual accommodation, and that the process of managing the workplace would inevitably be transmitted. If managers can be encouraged to deal with a heterogeneous workforce by adapting the transmutationist ideology, then the crisis over exclusivity, according to Pomerleau (1994:89), might be overcome through a process of guaranteeing inclusivity.

**Different opinions**
Local government managers are also exposed to opinions that differ from their own. Reddy and Choudree (1996:26) refer to an opinion held by the previous apartheid government regarding integration in the workplace. “Official pronouncements over the years continued to emphasise that the government was committed to the concept of a white public service where integration would not be tolerated and in which non-whites would accordingly not be trained for employment. As far as the Indian and Coloured communities were concerned their participation in administration and public service activities was limited to the service of their own people in their own areas.”

**Positive reinforcement**
Positive reinforcement refers to compliments and encouragements local government managers receive from peers or management structures, for example for behaviours that encourage the acceptance of diversity in the workplace. The statement by Gordon (1992:29) serves as an example. “The advantage of starting with the premise that everybody is diverse is that you do not make white males the subject of the work but rather part of it. The idea behind managing diversity is to learn to look at people as individuals, to view their individual strengths and weaknesses instead of merely registering bothersome variances for arbitrary corporate norms, and to function as an organization as productively with heterogeneous workers as it once did with homogeneous ones.”

**Opposing viewpoints**
Tromp (1998:77) states that in discussions it often happens that when someone expresses an opinion, someone else voices a directly opposing view. According to Maxwell (1993:77), one reason could be that when people lack ownership of an idea they usually resist it, even when it is in their best interest.

**Criticism**
Individual local government managers receive criticism for actions taken or views expressed, for example for not contributing towards a diversity awareness climate in the workplace or for not creating more opportunities and support for women to advance to top management positions. According to Tromp (1998:77), “people will process information according to their unique perception and understanding. In making choices and interpreting information, every individual has his own distinctive way of identifying cause-and-effect relationships and selecting appropriate actions”. Information is processed according to the following:
- Cognitive ability.
PARADIGMS OF DIVERSITY MANAGEMENT IN THE WORKPLACE (PHASE 3)

In Phase 3 the focus is on how belief windows can contribute to the development of paradigms of diversity management in the workplace. According to Covey (1989:23–24, 28), “our attitudes and behaviors are also influenced by our own paradigms, which in turn affect the way we interact with other people. It affects the way we value differences in the workplace. If we keep on ignoring the value of differences but instead focus more on our own experiences, or own paradigms, we will constantly suffer from a shortage of data. A paradigm is like a map, it does not form the territory but it merely explains certain aspects of a territory. In other words, a paradigm is a theory, an explanation, or a model of something else. We have many, many maps in our head, which can be divided into two main categories: maps of the way things are, or realities, and maps of the way things should be, or values. We interpret everything we experience through these mental maps. We seldom question their accuracy. We assume that the way we see things is the way they really are or the way they should be. Our paradigms become very powerful instruments, especially if we see the world, not as it is, but as we are, or the way we have been conditioned to see it. When we describe what we see, we in effect describe our perceptions, our paradigms, and ourselves. When people disagree with us, we immediately think something is wrong with them.”
De Beer (1998:1–79) identifies five development paradigms that influence the valuing of differences within organisations. The same paradigms fail to see the significance or value of diversity in the workplace. The paradigms referred to are the paternalistic paradigm, the equal opportunity paradigm, the black advancement paradigm, the affirmative action paradigm and the management of diversity paradigm.

Paternalistic paradigm
The paternalistic model was based on a belief system called the feudal system, which was developed during the Middle Ages. This system referred to the relationship that existed between landowner and labourers. De Beer (1998:3) states: “As the serf had to do labour for the landowners of the Middle Ages, so the black workers in South Africa had to do labour for the predominantly white property owners and employers. Managing diversity activities focuses around the social segregation of white and black workers and the introduction of Westernization policies. The policy of apartheid introduced by the Nationalist government of 1948 was to ensure that Whites and Blacks would develop in different geographical areas or environments. The Unitary Westernization policies were to ensure that organizations were managed according to the Western value system. It was also done in order to protect Western values and the Western way of life.”

De Beer (1998:6) further states: “The implementation of the unitary Western value system is based on the premise that the Western value system is superior to African values. Implementation of the African value system in the organization would therefore lead to inferior work standards and lower productivity.”

The natural reaction of the black workers was to resist total Westernization because it ignored their deep-rooted cultural heritage and nationalistic aspirations. Figure 4 refers to the apartheid model used to segregate the white and black workers in the workplace. Managers with a paternalistic mindset made sure that black workers were prevented from advancing to the skilled or managerial level in a white organisation. Black workers could only advance to skilled positions and management levels in organisations operating in the black areas. In the paternalistic paradigm, employees of colour were also not expected to become involved in the decision-making process within the organisation. Because of the social segregation, negative stereotypes and attitudes developed between white and black employees, and often gave rise to an unpleasant coexistence between black and white employees in the organisation.

The equal opportunity paradigm
The focus of this paradigm was more on the removal of barriers that existed between white and black workers and for the creation of equal opportunities for higher positions in the workplace.

According to De Beer (1998:13), the shift from the paternalistic to the equal opportunity mindset was motivated by the following factors:

- There was an increasing awareness of leaders of all communities of the moral right of all human beings to be treated as equals.
- Exposure to senior positions had been withheld from black employees in the past, and management felt they were morally obliged to give them the opportunity to develop their managerial and high-level skills.
- There was a shortage of skilled manpower in organisations.
- There was a gradual shift in the values of Nationalist leaders from a pure ideological to a more pragmatic value system.
- Black employees and most of the white managers never accepted the black employees as permanent employees and believed that they would eventually move back to their own group areas.
Economic development in the black areas was very slow, and few job opportunities were available for blacks.

Emphasis was placed on an osmosis approach for integrating blacks into skilled and management positions. Figure 5 refers to the osmosis model for equal-opportunity advancement of black employees. After barriers were removed, black employees would gradually filter upwards in the organisational hierarchy. But management expected black employees to be self-driven and to develop the necessary work skills in their own time. Black employees moved very slowly into positions formerly reserved for whites. According to De Beer (1998:18), the osmosis process was so slow that the number of blacks who moved up in the hierarchy was negligible. This state of affairs gave way to the black advancement paradigm.

![Figure 5 The osmosis model for equal-opportunity advancement of black employees (De Beer, 1998:18)](image)

**Black advancement paradigm**

The black advancement paradigm came about owing to the lack of progress shown by black employees to high-level positions. Despite the removal of inhibiting legislation, blacks still did not compete on an equal footing for skilled and managerial positions with white employees. According to Brooks (in Human, 1991b:77), this is due to numerous obstacles including educational, economic, organisational, legal and social impediments. Figure 6 refers to more obstacles to black advancement in the workplace.
Managers realised that the formal education system used for blacks was inadequate. In order to develop human potential, organisations accepted the responsibility to become more involved in providing basic education (in De Beer, 1998:22). Figure 7 refers to more reasons why black managers should enter organisations. The argument for black advancement in the public sector focuses around the appropriateness of filling posts previously held by whites only with blacks.

The first reason for this, according to Hugo (1989:4), would be because “the large black section of the population using the services of the public sector now and in the future would be better served by having a black person in the position of bureaucrat simply because of language and cultural empathy”. For this reason, the public service needs to become more demographically representative of the South African population. Secondly, by the year 2020, whites will constitute a mere 10.5% of a projected total population of 47.5 million South Africans. A public service, short of 30 000 civil servants will have to fill its positions with blacks. Thirdly, a growing proportion of matriculants are black, and employment must be found for them.

White attitudinal response has been indicated as the biggest obstacle to black advancement within South African organisations. Brooks (in Human, 1991b:71) states: “The National Party Government’s policies have expedited the emergence of a powerful white elite and produced an artificial schism between Whites and Blacks, which is deleterious to inter-racial attitudes in general and white attitudes to black occupational advancement in particular”. This behavioural modelling pattern was successfully implemented by the previous National Party government, which “treated cultural differences between white and black as genetic differences. Many blacks secretly fear this because they (like whites) do not understand that the differences are rooted in experience and not in genes” (Kotze, 1993:xii). According to Chapman (1996:114), “it is normal for people to have mental attitudes against those of a different culture especially if they never had the opportunity to work with a person from that culture”. This intolerance, according to Brookes (in Human, 1991b:77) can be explained in terms of:
The historical domination of skilled and semi-skilled positions in the public sector by white, Afrikaans-speaking people.

A deficiency of black advancement initiates in the public sector resulting in a lack of exposure of white civil servants to blacks of equivalent educational standing, which in turn, reinforced traditional racial stereotypes.

A growing fear among white civil servants that blacks would take over their jobs in a post-apartheid South Africa.

Another characteristic of the black advancement paradigm was the number of models that were introduced in developing black managers. The majority of the models focused on orientating the black manager to the Western work ethic. The rationale, according to De Beer (1998:25), is that “if black potential high level employees are purposefully exposed to training and modern values in the work environment, these employees will develop a modern work ethic”.

Affirmative action paradigm

The main focus of this paradigm within the public sector was to remove discriminatory practices and policies in employment, and to facilitate and promote access to the public service for all South Africans. The White Paper on Affirmative Action in the Public Service (1998:1) is a testimony of the South African government’s commitment to the transformation of the public service into an institution whose employment practices are underpinned by equity. The ultimate aim of affirmative action is to ensure that the public service, which represents and draws on the talents and skills of the diverse spectrum of South African society, is not only geared towards providing better services to all sectors of society, but also to ensure legitimacy in the eyes of the South African people. According to De Beer (1998:37), affirmative action is also the enforced empowerment and occupational advancement of disadvantaged minority groups, which include women, black people and the physically disabled. The objectives of the public service affirmative action policy are to:

- Enhance the capacities of the historically disadvantaged through the development and introduction of practical measures that support their advancement within the public service.
- Inculcate in the public service a culture which values diversity and support the affirmation of those who have previously been unfairly disadvantaged.

The following are the core underlying principles of affirmative action within the public sector:

- Integration with human resource management and development
- Productivity and improved service delivery
- Cost effectiveness
- Communication

The purpose of affirmative action policies and programmes must be fully communicated to all public servants.
- **Participation**
  Affirmative action programmes must be developed with the active participation of employees at all levels, and with representatives of organised labour.

- **Transparency**
  Affirmative action programmes and practices must be open to scrutiny within and outside the public service, within reasonable limits.

- **Accountability**
  Accountability for the delivery of affirmative action must be vested at the highest level of the organisation, with all line managers being vested with the responsibility of driving the process.

- **Reasonable accommodation**
  Affirmative action programmes must strive to eradicate barriers to employment and advancement in the physical and organisational environment, and provide support to all members of the target group.

- **Relative disadvantage**
  Affirmative action must take into account the relative disadvantaged status of groups, their needs within the target group and the needs of the organisation (White Paper on Affirmative Action in the Public Service, 1998:5; and the Employment Equity Act, 55 of 1998, Chapter 3).

**Discrimination and fairness paradigm**

The focus of this paradigm is on the creation of equal opportunities, fair treatment, recruitment and compliance with government regulations. The paradigm is based on the premise that prejudice has kept members of certain demographic groupings out of organisations. To ensure fairness, organisations must comply with the regulations set by government in restructuring themselves to reflect the demographic profile of society. A management process is needed to ensure that all employees are treated equally and with respect, and to ensure that no one is given an advantage over another. Thomas and Ely (1996:81) state: “Under this paradigm diversity is measured by how well the company achieves its recruitment and retention goals rather than by the degree to which conditions in the company allow employees to draw on their personal assets and perspectives to do their work more effectively.”

The benefit of the discrimination and fairness paradigm is that it tends to increase demographic diversity and the promotion of fair treatment within the workplace. According to Thomas and Ely (1996:81), some of the limitations of this paradigm are “that its color blind, gender blind ideal is to some degree built on the implicit assumption that we are all the same”. Under this paradigm it is also not desirable for a diversified workforce to influence the organisation’s concept of work or culture. The paradigm puts pressure on employees to make sure that important differences among them do not count. Thomas and Ely (1996:82) state: “By limiting the ability of employees to acknowledge openly their work-related but culturally based differences, the paradigm actually undermines the organisation’s capacity to learn about and improve its own strategies, processes, and practices.” By doing so, people are also kept from identifying with their work – a critical source of motivation and self-regulation.

**Access-and-legitimacy paradigm**

The access-and-legitimacy paradigm focuses on the acceptance and celebration of differences in a multicultural society where ethnic groups are gaining more consumer power. The premise of this paradigm is that organisations have a need for a demographically diverse workforce in order to help them gain access to even more differentiated segments. A diverse workforce is also needed to help organisations to understand and serve their customers better and to gain legitimacy with them. “Diversity isn’t just fair; it makes business sense” (Thomas & Ely, 1996:83). A characteristic of an organisation using this paradigm is that it almost always operates in an
environment in which there is increased diversity among customers, clients or the labour pool, and therefore a clear opportunity or imminent threat exists to the organisation. The paradigm has its strengths. According to Thomas and Ely (1996:83), “its market based motivation and the potential for competitive advantage that it suggests are often qualities an entire company can understand and therefore support”.

A limitation is that organisations supporting this paradigm tend to emphasise the role of cultural differences in the workplace more without really analysing those differences to see how they actually affect the work that is done. For example, “access-and-legitimate leaders are too quick to push staff with niche capabilities into differentiated pigeonholes without trying to understand what those capabilities really are and how they could be integrated into the organization’s mainstream work. However, once the organization appears to be achieving its goal, the leaders seldom go on to identify and analyze the culturally based skills, beliefs, and practices that worked so well. Nor do they consider how the organization can incorporate and learn from those skills, beliefs, or practices in order to capitalize on diversity on the long run” (Thomas & Ely, 1996:83–84).

According to Thomas and Ely (1996:83), a strong paradigm is needed that encourages open and explicit discussion of what identity group differences really mean and how they can be used as sources of individual and organisational effectiveness. A paradigm is needed that will also assist an organisation in what to do once it has achieved its diversity numbers.

**MANAGEMENT SYNDROMES INFLUENCING THE BEHAVIOUR PATTERN OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT MANAGERS REGARDING DIVERSITY IN THE WORKPLACE (PHASE FOUR)**

Flamholtz and Randle (1987:5, 23–170) identify the following management syndromes influencing the performance of managers in the workplace. Elements within these syndromes could represent a manager’s attitude and/or behaviour towards acknowledging diversity awareness in the workplace.

**The Doer Syndrome**

According to Flamholtz and Randle (1987:5), the Doer Syndrome refers to the phenomenon where people who have been promoted to managerial roles continue to think and act like technicians, functional specialists or “doers” rather than true managers. They are individuals occupying entry-level positions within the organisational hierarchy and in many cases are following examples set by doers before them. They find the transition from being doers to real managers very difficult. Doers are local government managers who believe with regard to the managing of diversity that employees from other racial, sexual or cultural groups cannot do their work properly (or cannot be entrusted with responsibilities), and that they as local government managers have to do it for them.

Another characteristic of doers is that they tend to base their self-esteem on their own performance rather than on the performance of their staff. They put more value on their own potential and tend to overlook the vast potential a diverse work group will have. Flamholtz and Randle (1987:27) put it as follows: “. . . even after they are promoted to management positions, they continue to explicitly and implicitly evaluate their own performance in terms of their ability as doers rather than as managers. Consequently these individuals tend to emphasize performance rather than managerial activities”.

Doers will spend most of their time performing tasks rather than planning the work of others, delegating tasks, supervising work and further developing their workers. Individuals who suffer from the doer syndrome may even believe that the only way of being a good manager is to focus only on themselves. According to Flamholtz and Randle (1987:28), they may “therefore, feel that they are in competition with their workers for the position of being an expert. They feel frustrated
by workers who possess greater expertise”. This type of syndrome can be very disruptive for a
diverse work group. Such managers could spend most of their time in maintaining their own
expertise without utilising the expertise of a diverse work group as a vital resource. Individuals
belonging to that diverse group will develop feelings of frustration. They may feel that their
expertise is of less importance than that of their manager.

According to Flamholtz and Randle (1987:28), individuals with the Doer Syndrome suffer from
an inability to handle control: “Whenever control is given up, the likelihood that the task will be
completed exactly as the individual himself or herself would have completed it, decreases”. Doers
are highly uncomfortable with this and try to retain as much control as possible. They also turn out
to be poor delegators, attempting to keep all decision-making authority to themselves, and because
of this, doers are usually overburdened managers. Many of them, according to Flamholtz and
Randle (1987:28), suffer from burnout and failure because they have no time to perform their
managerial responsibilities adequately.

The Pygmy Syndrome
The Pygmy Syndrome is a follow-on to the Doer Syndrome. It refers, according to Flamholtz and
Randle (1987:92), “to the tendency of a manager to feel threatened by talented workers, and,
consequently, to surround himself or herself with people who are relatively weak. By selecting
only such people, the manager can feel like a giant among pygmies”. Elements of the Pygmy
Syndrome could be present in a local government manager who feels threatened by people from
different racial, sexual and/or cultural groups. This is unfortunately not an uncommon situation in
the public sector, where people with potential are not recognised and utilised because individual
public managers view them as a threat, not a blessing.

Those suffering from this syndrome often feel inadequate; their sense of inadequacy is kept
under control as long as they perceive themselves as the best at some task in their immediate
environment. A person appointed through affirmative action could react in this way. When
someone more competent threatens the manager’s position, the reaction would be to eliminate the
competition by humiliating the person so that he or she is forced to resign. Another symptom of
the Pygmy Syndrome is when managers tend to compete with their workers for more recognition:
“I’m still the best guy in the field” (Flamholtz & Randle, 1987:92). Co-workers frequently
challenge the authority of Pygmy Syndrome managers. The individual manager suffering from the
Pygmy Syndrome will in turn act with hostility. In many cases, according to Flamholtz and Randle
(1987:92–93), managers will use their position of power as a buffer to scare workers off. By doing
this, the manager believes that no one will dare question his or her authority.

The Imposter Syndrome
The Impostor Syndrome contains elements influencing diversity awareness in the workplace.
Elements of this syndrome could be found in a multicultural local government manager (coming
from a different race or sex, or a person with disabilities from a different cultural group) who was
promoted to a management position previously reserved for a specific group only. The new
manager is perceived to be an impostor. The Impostor Syndrome comes in two variations: Super
Person and Ugly Duckling.

The Super Person Syndrome
The Super Person Syndrome is present in individuals who always have to be the best
(perfectionist), at the same time suffering from fear of failure. Because of their perfectionistic
nature they often fail to recognise the potential and good qualities of their subordinates. Clinging
to the Super Person Syndrome greatly undermines their ability as managers. Since the role of a
manager is so ill defined, Super Person managers will spend most of their time trying to find out
what other managers are doing to be perfect, resulting in getting nothing done. They could later be
perceived, according to Flamholtz and Randle (1987:38), as indecisive since they often take so long to act. The desire to be perfect, coupled with the fear of failure, leads to a tendency among Super People to be ineffective delegators. According to Flamholtz and Randle (1987:38), Super People do not like to delegate tasks to subordinates because they believe that others will not live up to their own standards of excellence. The opposite could occur when Super People managers believe their standards of excellence to be lower than those of their workers. Super People also follow a more directive style of management and tend to act more as performers of tasks than as managers. As a result, they usually end up doing more and more tasks, which in turn increases their own personal stress levels. “Their workers may come to believe that their manager does not trust them. The productivity and morale of the work group may drop and the Super Person may soon find that he is a failure as a manager” (Flamholtz & Randle, 1987:38). Managers suffering from the Super Person Syndrome place themselves in a situation in which they need to compete with their workers in order to protect their own self-esteem. Such managers perceive co-workers with greater expertise and potential as a threat to their position of being “the best” and will try to compete with workers, ignoring their responsibility as manager. Such managers have a variety of personal and interpersonal problems. According to Flamholtz and Randle (1987:39), the inability to overcome this syndrome can have profound effects on the individual’s ability to perform effectively in a managerial role.

The Ugly Duckling Syndrome
The Ugly Duckling Syndrome is present in those individual local government managers who believe that they are worthless. Their feelings of worthlessness are often created by external factors outside their control. Perceptions and stereotyping are some of the factors which could contribute to these feelings. A female local government manager, for example, who finds herself in a male-dominated environment could suffer from feelings of failure. Ugly Duckling Syndrome managers believe that they have reached their position of authority through pure luck and not because they are regarded as competent in their profession. They are prone to delegate tasks which they do themselves. Managers with this syndrome enjoy challenging tasks, because they offer a risk of failure.

Ugly Duckling Syndrome managers believe, since they perceive themselves to be worthless, that others (including workers) must at least be as skilful as they are. Ugly Ducklings, according to Flamholtz and Randle (1987:44), have “such a low opinion of themselves that they find it difficult to give praise to others. These individuals believe that lack of criticism is the same as praise”. This situation could, however, be detrimental to an organisation because workers are not being motivated to achieve the organisation’s goals. Ugly Ducklings also tend to make ineffective decisions, because these increase their chance of failure. This, then, proves to them and to others that they are worthless and inadequate. This in the end can obviously not be productive for an organisation. According to Flamholtz and Randle (1987:45), “the ugly ducklings also depend a lot on their workers to assist them in the decision-making processes which could be very effective”. Too much of it, unfortunately, could confuse workers, with no one really knowing who is in charge. The biggest problem, however, is that those managers suffering from the Ugly Duckling Syndrome are never satisfied with themselves unless they have failed. Success to them is undeserved.

The Napoleon Syndrome
The Napoleon Syndrome consists of elements closely related to the other syndromes. It represents managers who suffer from inferiority or an inadequacy complex. Inferiority refers to individuals feeling that they have weaknesses which could handicap them in relation to power. Feelings of inadequacy often have their basis in real or imagined physical shortcomings, e.g. short stature, a speech impediment, skin colour and disability. This could be overcome either through compensa-
tion or overcompensation. Compensation refers to constructive steps to overcome weaknesses such as attending classes to improve certain skills. Overcompensation occurs when individuals do not acknowledge their own weakness and try to overcome by gaining superiority over others (Adler in Flamholtz and Randle, 1987:71).

A manager in local government who feels inferior to or threatened by the vast potential of a diverse work group and resists change could have symptoms of the Napoleon Syndrome. The same applies to managers who have obtained their position of authority through an affirmative action process and are anxious that they may not be competent enough for the job. Managers suffering from the Napoleon Syndrome have low self-esteem and a high need for control. They tend to focus more on their own needs than on those of others, often abusing their powers.

The Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde Syndrome

Flamholtz and Randle (1987:101) state that the Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde Syndrome is not only found in literature. In many modern-day work environments, managers suffer from a split role syndrome, being both Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde. They can have a pleasant personality and at the same time can behave tyrannically. They can be managers who acknowledge potential held by a diverse work group, but may not want to utilise it. The split, according to Flamholtz and Randle (1987:101), is sometimes “so complete that those who experience only the person out of his or her work role are unable to believe that the individual they know as friendly and easygoing is uncaring and domineering when directing the actions of workers”. Individuals suffering from this syndrome have a high need for acceptance, control and self-esteem. When success is achieved, the Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde believes that his or her behaviour has to change accordingly. “He or she can no longer behave as one of the guys or gals” (Flamholtz & Randle, 1987:101).

Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde managers know that the main responsibility of a manager is to exercise control over workers and that the need to be liked by those whom they supervise is inconsistent with their own needs for control and self-esteem. They are aware of the fact that the only way their self-esteem can be enhanced is by ensuring that the organisation achieves its goals. It is therefore important to them when they exercise control not to be too friendly with their workers.

Sufferers from this syndrome find ways to separate their need to be liked from their need for control and self-esteem. Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde managers use control over the actions of workers as a method to ensure their success in the workplace. This thy achieve by enforcing the rules of control set by the organisation where they work. Workers who do not comply with these rules are usually heavily reprimanded, sometimes even in public. Hence, according to Flamholtz and Randle (1987:102), “workers of the Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde syndrome tend to describe their managers as unreasonable and domineering. Since they are only exposed to the Mr Hyde side they believe that their manager does not really care about their needs”.

Like the Napoleon Syndrome managers, the Dr Jekyll and Hyde Syndrome managers develop buffers for controlling workers, thereby ensuring that their authority is never challenged. Another strategy is to ensure that their superiors never see the Mr Hyde side of their personality. Flamholtz and Randle (1987:102) state that “whenever they are successful at this strategy, superiors and peers find it difficult to believe a worker who complains that his or her manager is abusive and unreasonable. They will attribute subordinates’ complaints as without sound proof and more as his or her inability to work in a group”. In South Africa, complaints by workers about Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde Syndrome managers are usually branded as either racist or sexist. Individuals suffering from this syndrome usually realise they have a problem. This realisation, according to Flamholtz and Randle (1987:102), is usually “triggered by a critical incident such as the departure of one or more workers for reasons such as personality problems”. To such managers, this could sometimes come as a shock, because of the belief that they were only behaving like an effective manager.
They will, in some instances, begin to work hard at changing the way they manage in order to become more effective.

**The Hamlet Syndrome**

Managers who do not know how to make decisions effectively and efficiently suffer from the Hamlet Syndrome. Decision making represents a threat to both their self-esteem and their need to be liked. According to Flamholtz and Randle (1987:117), “[t]hey fear that if they make the wrong decision, they will be seen as inadequate. If they make a decision that nobody likes, then others will resent them”. Hamlets therefore tend to delegate all their decision-making responsibilities to peers or workers, and do nothing at all themselves, hoping that the problem will resolve itself. According to Flamholtz and Randle (1987:118), the Hamlet Syndrome can be divided into three variations:

- **Information Seeker Hamlets**
  Managers suffering from this variation believe that they can only make rational and effective decisions if they are allowed enough time to collect information. They will then spend all their energy on finding all the possible alternatives before making a decision. There is, of course, nothing wrong with thorough research but Information Seeker Hamlets tend to carry it to the extreme. “They continue to collect information until a higher authority presses them to make a decision. If no such pressure exists they may postpone the decision indefinitely until, eventually, the decision is made for them” (Flamholtz & Randle, 1987:118).

- **The Buck-passer**
  Managers suffering from this variation deny their decision-making responsibility by passing it on to either a worker or a peer. This avoidance of decision-making responsibility often leads to frustration among individual superiors and workers. In the end, tasks are not completed and problems remain unresolved.

- **The Agoniser**
  These are “individuals who are paralysed by an intense fear that the decisions they make will, somehow, hurt them, their organization or other employees” (Flamholtz & Randle, 1987:118–119). Like the Information Seeker, the Agoniser has an intense fear of not having enough information but does not seek further information. A very interesting characteristic of Agonisers is that they openly avoid responsibility. They only take those decisions which could benefit them directly. Agonisers do not like planning and delegating, resulting in workers doing nothing or whatever they please. Flamholtz and Randle (1987:119) state that “the Hamlet’s superior may begin to wonder whether they have promoted a true leader, and if this individual is constantly seeking their advice before making a decision, the answer to their question will be a flat, No”.

**The Godfather Syndrome**

The Godfather Syndrome is displayed by managers who have a lot of power together with the ability to reward or punish others at whim. However, underneath this image of power lies a deep-seated insecurity in the sense that they believe themselves to be unworthy or suffering from some weakness which could be exploited by others to destroy them. In an effort to reduce their insecurity, they hide behind a veil of power established by surrounding themselves with weak people who are dependent on the Godfather manager to satisfy their needs, and with people who have good credentials of which they become the owner. By hiring and controlling these people, Godfathers can show that they are a significant person.

The only reward Godfathers expect from their subordinates is their loyalty and respect for their power. This, according to Flamholtz and Randle (1987:57), serves three purposes. “First, to increase the Godfather’s sense of self worth, secondly, if the Godfather has loyal workers, the
chances are minimized that the inadequacies he is trying to hide will be revealed and thirdly, by having loyal workers, the Godfather is able to provide himself with strong protection from outsiders who may attempt to injure him.”

The Godfather Syndrome consists of two variations, the Malevolent Godfather and the Caretaker Godfather.

- **The Malevolent Godfather**
  Such managers believe that all people are worthless and seek to prove this by constantly humiliating and degrading those over whom they have control. They will charm people into joining and afterwards will start devaluing them. Flamholtz and Randle (1987:57) state: “Once the Malevolent Godfather has acquired people, he derives a great deal of amusement from playing with them. He likes to put people against one another in a sort of organizational chess game and then watch what happens, never really caring what the outcome is.” Another characteristic of managers suffering from the Malevolent Godfather syndrome is a deep-rooted anger. The only difference between Malevolent Godfathers and Caretaker Godfathers lies in their motives.

- **The Caretaker Godfather**
  The Caretaker Godfather plays a more benign role than the Malevolent Godfather. Such managers are like a benevolent autocrat or parental figure because their need is to take care of people. In comparison with the Malevolent Godfather, the Caretaker Godfather is a strong influential manager to whom others naturally look for help and support. Flamholtz and Randle (1987:63) state that “this type of Godfather does not necessarily want to humiliate people, and he may only inadvertently make them dependent on him. He is merely being strong for them and providing what they tell him they need”. His self-esteem is satisfied through the value workers put on his ability to provide for their needs. According to Flamholtz and Randle (1987:63), this situation can change dramatically if the Caretaker Godfather “comes to believe that, even though he is providing them with ample resources to satisfy their needs, they are still not loyal to him, and he will feel betrayed and will lash out at those who have betrayed him”. The actions of others can, in essence, be responsible for transforming the once-benign Caretaker Godfather into an angry Malevolent Godfather.

**RESULTS AND FEEDBACK (PHASE 5)**

Results within Phase 5 not only refer to the consequences of one’s behaviour but also reflect one’s thinking towards diversity in the workplace. According to Gau (2000:1), one needs to understand that wrong thinking does not produce right results. The following examples by Londen and Rosener (1991:12–13) illustrate the results of how belief windows and paradigms on diversity management can influence diversity awareness in the workplace:

- A high turnover of workers from other groups, which in turn will contribute to high recruiting and retraining costs.
- An increase in discrimination complaints owing to the mismanagement of diverse employees.
- A flare-up of everyday conflicts over a comment, gesture or joke – perhaps delivered without malice but perceived as an insult – which will create tension between co-workers.
- Deliberate acts of sabotage, aimed at making co-workers who are different look bad in corporate turf battles between members of different ethnic and racial groups, which in turn could lead to a waste of time and money.
- Absenteeism, associated with psychological stress owing to poor communication and misunderstanding between diverse employees, which could result in an enormous amount of personal energy and creativity being wasted on active resistance to change.
- Increased frustration among diverse workers, which could lead to low productivity and morale as well as a lack of motivation (Londen & Rosener, 1991:12–13).
Diverse workers feeling that they are being devalued owing to the discrimination against them. They may react with cynicism, caution or guarded optimism when changes unfold. This in turn could contribute to a loss of commitment and loyalty, increased disrespect for authority, lack of teamwork and *esprit de corps*, lack or total absence of respect for and recognition of differences, and the growing perception that no opportunities exist in the workplace for advancement of people from diverse backgrounds.

- Stereotyping and labelling of people from diverse backgrounds, which will lead to misunderstanding on various issues, for example why certain employees are promoted.
- Workers feeling threatened and concerned about the possible effects of current and future change on their jobs and career goals. They could also feel that they are being unfairly treated when certain people such as expatriates are promoted (when diversity is eventually recognised by management) (Jamieson, 1991:8).

Phase 5 is also a mirror reflection of one’s mindset of what one truly believes about diversity. Feedback helps one to step back from one’s own life and reflect on how one could have been thinking, why one has been thinking, not seeing what one was supposed to see, choosing the behaviours one chose and the consequences of the chosen behaviour. Feedback within Phase 5 also helps one realise that diversity awareness as a tool for managing diversity can only work if one’s own beliefs are in line with reality, and that negative behaviours can be overcome through changing incorrect beliefs.

McGraw (1999:47) states: “People in general are suspicious of those they don’t live with, work with, worship with, and grow up with.” You have to meet those people where they are in terms of what they believe and then persuade them to move their beliefs in line with reality thinking. “You must understand someone and know what makes them tick before you can connect with them. They need to see similarities between you and your values and their own. That is the basis of bonding” (McGraw, 1999:47). As a result, one needs to establish the kinds of things one will need to know to deal effectively with people from a diverse background in the workplace. But one needs to make a conscious commitment to learn about how and why people do what they do. In doing so, one will find that different things drive the behaviour of different people.

Table 8 refers to questions one should ask to understand people and the ten most common characteristics shared by people. Thomas and Ely state: “Diversity should be understood as the varied perspectives and approaches to work those members of different identity groups bring.”

Table 9 refers to eight preconditions that will help to position organisations to use identity-group differences in the service of organisational learning, growth, and renewal.

For the post-1994 government, managing diversity goes well beyond a demographically representative workforce. The focus is on “the contribution diversity can make to improve service delivery, to increase efficiency and effectiveness, reduce costs, at the same time improving the quality and extending the benefits of public services to all South Africans. As stated in the *White Paper on Human Resource Management in the Public Sector* (1997:26), diversity is seen as a tool to ensure a stable public service.
Table 8 Questions to ask about people you don't know and ten common characteristics shared by people (from McGraw, 1999:48–50)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONS TO ASK ABOUT PEOPLE YOU DON'T KNOW</th>
<th>TEN COMMON CHARACTERISTICS OF PEOPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• What do they value most in their lives?</td>
<td>• The number one fear among all people is rejection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For example, is ethics a big deal?</td>
<td>• The number one need among all people is acceptance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What are their expectancies and beliefs about how life does</td>
<td>• To manage people effectively, you must do it in a way that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and should work?</td>
<td>protects or enhances their self-esteem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What resistance or predispositions, fears, biases, prejudi-</td>
<td>• Everybody approaches every situation with at least some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cies do they have?</td>
<td>concern about “what’s in it for me”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What positions or approaches or philosophies are they</td>
<td>• Everybody wants to talk about things that are important to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most likely to reject or accept?</td>
<td>him or her personally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What do they need to hear from a person in order to con-</td>
<td>• People hear and incorporate only what they understand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clude that that person is fundamentally “okay” and to be</td>
<td>• People like, trust and believe those who like them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trusted?</td>
<td>• People often do things for other than the apparent reasons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What sort of things do they consider relevant?</td>
<td>• Even people of quality can be, and often are, petty and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How do they feel about themselves?</td>
<td>small.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What do they want most in their lives?</td>
<td>• Everybody wears a social mask. You must look beyond the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mask to see the person.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 Eight preconditions organisations have to follow when making a paradigm shift regarding diversity in the workplace (Thomas & Ely, 1996:85–86)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EIGHT PRECONDITIONS FOR MAKING A PARADIGM SHIFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The leadership must understand that a diverse workforce will embody different perspectives and approaches to work, and must truly value variety of opinion and insight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The leadership must recognise both the learning opportunities and the challenges that the expression of different perspectives presents for an organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The organisational culture must create an expectation of high standards of performance from everyone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The organisational culture must stimulate personal development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The organisational culture must encourage openness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The culture must make workers feel valued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The organisation must have a well-articulated and widely understood mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The organisation must have a relatively egalitarian, non-bureaucratic structure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUMMARY

An normative model for assessing the diversity awareness of local government managers and their behaviour towards diversity in the workplace was developed and proposed in this article. The model is based on the time management model of Smit (1994) and the input and outputs model of Hanks and Pulsipher (1997). This was followed by a brief discussion on the use of models to investigate diversity awareness in local government. The normative model for managing diversity awareness was explained. The model consists of the following five interlinked phases. Phases 1 and 2 focused on the purpose of diversity and the different belief windows influencing the thinking of local government managers regarding diversity in the workplace. Phase 3 was on the paradigms influencing diversity management and Phase 4 on the various management syndromes which influence the attitude and behaviour of local government in acknowledging diversity in the workplace. Phase 5 focused on the results of ignoring diversity awareness, and the role of feedback within the Diversity Awareness Reality Model.
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