Investigating the Management of Diversity in Former Model C Schools in Gauteng

B. R. Grobler[1], K. C. Moloi[2] and Judy Loiusa Ayres[3]

[1,3]University of Johannesburg, Faculty of Education, Johannesburg, South Africa
[2]Faculty of Human Sciences, Vaal University of Technology, Vanderbijlpark, South Africa
E-mail: [1]<bennieg@uj.ac.za>, [2]<conniem@vut.ac.za>

ABSTRACT The purpose of this article is to investigate the management of diversity in the staffroom of former model C schools in South Africa. Use was made of a structured questionnaire to probe the perceptions of teachers regarding the management of diversity. A factor analytic procedure and statistical testing indicated that four underlying factors enhance diversity management. These factors were, aspects enhancing the management of diversity, aspects cultivating a culture of mutual respect, aspects impeding the management of diversity and critical aspects influencing the management of diversity in the staffroom. Based on its findings, this study recommends that further investigation into the management of diversity be conducted in the context of a growing diverse staff and learner growth in the previously Whites-only schools. As schools continue to face the challenges of managing diversity, the need to build capacity among school management teams and teaching staff is imperative.

INTRODUCTION

There are implications when organisations fail to prepare for effective management of diversity. Because of the need to understand diversity in the workplace, it is essential to manage it effectively. Managing diversity in the workplace is a worldwide phenomenon, mainly due to a globalised, interconnected world, information technology and internationalisation (Dzvimbo and Moloi 2013: 581). While, according to April et al. (2012: 1749), diversity and diversity management have emerged on to the global business agenda over the last 20 years, "too much of the focus has been on how to efficiently box people into certain categories, typically geographic cultural ones, and then seeking to manage them through those lenses as opposed to fully embracing the uncertainty of diversity." Thus, Sharma (2016: 1), maintains that the globalisation of markets requires that organisations be prudent about its diverse workforce as the work environment is undergoing a massive metamorphosis. Patrick and Kumar (2012: 1), suggest that diversity management is a process that is intended to create and maintain a positive work environment in which the similarities and differences of the workforce are valued. However,

Saxena (2014: 76), argues that when different types of people in terms of thinking, perception and generation come together to work at the same place, there is a great possibility they may not agree at the same point about work issues and thus cause challenges in managing such a diverse workforce. In contrast to this view, Phillips (2014: 1) suggests that, decades of research by organisational scientists, psychologists, sociologists, economists and demographers show that socially diverse groups (that is, those with a diversity of race, ethnicity, gender and sexual orientation) are more innovative than homogeneous groups. However, April et al. (2012: 1749), argue that, unfortunately, the focus of many organisations, appears to be narrowly deployed at the 'managing diversity' level, or even the 'acknowledging diversity' level, but not getting to the necessary 'inclusion' level.

In view of the above, Intelligo (2017: 1) maintains that education and age are also diversity factors and thus over forty percent of South Africa's top employers ensure that they monitor and manage the differences in employees' educational backgrounds. Over the past twenty-three years, South Africa has seen various and diverse cultures, races, genders, and religions coalescing in society, in the workplace and in

schools, after the dismantling of the apartheid (segregationist) policies in 1994 (Nkholise 2014: 1). There has been a huge influx of black learners from former Department of Education and Training (DET) schools, which served black learners only, into previously Whites-only schools. This influx has been so large that the government is now insisting that the School Governing Body (SGB) and the staff must be representative of the majority of the learners in the school. This has resulted in large racial and cultural changes in the staff and School Governing Bodies (SGBs) in former model C, Whites-only schools, excarcebating the complexity of managing diversity. Little et al. (2013: 1), argue that, "diversity in the form of social, cultural, linguistic and ethnic issues poses a challenge to all educational systems globally, because some authorities, schools and teachers look upon the coalescing, as a problem, and an obstacle to the achievement of national educational goals, while for others it offers new opportunities." Thus, in the interest of managing diversity effectively, it is important that departments within an organisation create teams, with different educational backgrounds, to ensure a more diverse way of thinking, because employees can approach challenges with different perspectives. The Sasol Report (2014: 43), on the other hand states that, embracing a culture of inclusion is critical to ensuring that our diverse talent is strategically managed and nurtured to deliver successful business outcomes. On the contrary Levin (2017: 1), argues that education in most democratic countries was established primarily to prepare students for roles in the emerging industrial democracies of the 19th century.

Considering this, April et al. (2012: 1749), argue that today's modern organisations must face choices regarding how to implement diversity initiatives and treat their stakeholders, given the globalised nature of education. According to Teacher-Vision (2017: 1), effective teachers of culturally diverse students acknowledge both individual and cultural differences enthusiastically and identify these differences in a positive manner. This positive identification, observes, Teacher-Vision, creates a basis for the development of effective communication and instructional strategies as well as social skills such as respect and cross-cultural understanding that can be modelled, taught, prompted, and reinforced by the teacher. Steinhardt (2008: 1), sug-

gests that Culturally Responsive Classroom Management (CRCM), is an approach to running classrooms with all children, (not simply for racial/ethnic minority children) in a culturally responsive way. Steinhardt, further points out that, "more than a set of strategies or practices, CRCM is a pedagogical approach that guides the management decisions that teachers make, (i) It is a natural extension of culturally responsive teaching which uses students' backgrounds, rendering of social experiences, prior knowledge, and learning styles in daily lessons, (ii) Teachers, as culturally responsive classroom managers, recognize their biases and values and reflect on how these, influence their expectations for behaviour and their interactions with students as well as what learning looks like and, (iii) They recognise that the goal of classroom management is not to achieve compliance or control but to provide all students with equitable opportunities for learning and they understand that CRCM is classroom management in the service of social justice."

Richard et al. (2010: 560) argue that diversity classroom management continues to be a serious concern for teachers and especially in urban and diverse learning environments. The authors present the culturally responsive classroom management practices of two teachers from an urban and diverse middle school to extend the construct, culturally responsive classroom management. These practices are: (a) understanding equity and equality, (b) understanding power structures among students, (c) immersion into students' life worlds, (d) understanding the self in relation to others, (e) granting students' entry into their worlds, and (f) conceiving school as a community with family members. According to Cummins (2013), it is therefore crucial that intercultural understanding is actively managed in workplaces. Benefits of managing diversity include: (i) enhanced customer relations and increased market share; (ii) improved employee relations and reduced cost of labour; (iii) improved performance in terms of skills, creativity, problem-solving and flexibility; (iv) it counteracts discrimination; and (v) it raises the morale of employees.

It is thus, important for the management to be conscious of leading the diversity process and to keep communication channels open to encourage participation. However, Levin (2017: 1), argues that where school choice has shown

powerful effects around the world is the systematic separation of students by ethnicity, social class and religion.

Whilst almost all organisations in South Africa have employment equity and affirmative action policies, few organisations have comprehensive diversity policies, and most initiatives seem to be limited to relatively simple hiring quotas or superficial training on peripheral diversity issues such as sexual harassment (Klarsfeld 2010: 233). This study begs the following questions: (i) Which aspects of diversity play an important part in effective diversity management in a diverse South African school context? (ii) What are the perceptions of teachers about possible barriers to effective diversity management in the staffroom? Madikizela (2017: 1) asserts that, "various studies have shown that through diverse teams, organisations increase their ability to come up with well-developed and scrutinized tangible solutions to most challenges." Madikizela (2017: 1), suggests that most organisations that foster sustainable growth, cannot achieve this without diversity. This is because of the many challenges, he argues, such as increased competition, lack of innovation, fast-paced technological developments, lack of competencies and skills, as well as speed of expansion, that organisations globally face.

This study investigates the management of diversity in former model C schools in the Gauteng province of South Africa.

Objectives

The objectives are to:
- Determine which aspects of diversity play an important part in effective diversity management in a diverse South African school context;
- Investigate teachers' perceptions of possible barriers to the diversity management process; and
- Provide guidelines to school principals regarding effective diversity management.

MATERIALS AND METHOD

To achieve the aims and objectives of this study, a literature search was conducted to clarify the concepts of diversity management. The design of this study falls within the quantitative paradigm. Quantitative refers to any approach to data collecting where the aim is to gather information that can be counted or measured in some form or another. Mertler (2017: 143) states that quantitative research is concerned with the attainment and interpretation of information which can be presented in the form of separate units that can be compared with additional units by using statistical techniques. Quantitative research is used to gather information about people's attitudes, opinions, beliefs, demographics and behaviour. Information gathered from a sample of respondents can be generalised to a population. In quantitative research, the investigators' goal is objectivity. That is, they seek to keep their personal values, beliefs, feelings and biases from influencing the data collection and analysis process. Thus, they typically administer tests that involve minimal personal interaction between them and the research sample. If interaction is necessary, such as when conducting an interview, they try to standardise the interaction process so that it is identical for every individual in the sample. According to Hesse-Biber (2017: 11), quantitative data can be tabulated in the form of frequencies, which will be obtained in the form of analysed scores. The purpose of quantitative research was to make objective deductions from a limited set of phenomena and to determine whether the phenomena can be controlled though certain interventions. Information gathered from the selected sample of respondents was generalised to a population, provided certain data requirements such as given by the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test were met (Field 2009: 145). The reserachers' goal was objectivity and quantification of phenomena by using numbers, statistics, structure and control. The researchers therefore entailed a survey design to collect data using a structured questionnaire.

Population and Sampling

The researchers opted for the quantitative approach due to its suitability for gathering information from a sample of educators representing a larger population of educators in former model C primary and secondary schools within the Johannesburg West District in Gauteng. The total number of primary and secondary schools in Gauteng West is 125. A random sample of 16 former model C primary and secondary schools which have a diverse educator corps were se-

lected to obtain teachers' perceptions regarding barriers to the management of diversity. Of the 16 randomly selected ex-model C schools, four were secondary and 12 were primary schools. Six hundred and twenty (620) questionnaires were distributed to these schools and 317 (51.1%) of those retuned were suitable for data analysis.

Pilot Testing the Data Collection Instrument

The pre-testing of the questionnaire was critical prior to administering it to the selected sample. The main purpose of the pilot study was to ensure that respondents have no difficulties in answering the questions and that there would be no problems in recording the data. The pilot study was conducted with 12 respondents from a primary school who did not form part of the research sample. Each respondent received a questionnaire to complete and had the opportunity to indicate all difficulties experienced, perceived ambiguities and any other additional information relevant to the topic that they felt needed to be included in the questionnaire. This assisted the researchers in streamlining the questionnaire and the necessary changes were made to the questionnaire before finalising it.

Data Collection: The Questionnaire

A random sample of former model C primary and secondary schools which have a diverse educator corps were selected to obtain teachers' perceptions regarding barriers to the management of diversity. Once the sample was drawn the questionnaire was administered to collect the data. The questionnaire was administered to 16 randomly selected former model C primary and secondary schools within the Johannesburg West District in Gauteng. Principals, school management teams and teachers participated in the survey by completing the questionnaire. In this way, the researchers targeted between 300 and 500 teachers at various post levels.

Data Analysis

Upon the return of the completed questionnaires, the questionnaires were coded to prevent any identification of participants and all ethical considerations were observed. The ques-tionnaires were submitted to STATKON, the Statistical Services of the University for analysis. Based on the normality of the data appropriate statistical tests were used to analyse the factor mean scores of the various groups in order to investigate possible associations between the dependent and independent variables. During data preparation the data was validated, edited, coded, entered and then cleaned (Wagner III 2017: 15). Data was analysed using PASW 18 and items in Section B and C were also tested to determine the normality of the spread of the data as these items made use of an interval scale.

Reliability and Validity

Heale and Twycross (2015: 1) indicate that any measuring instrument needs to be evaluated according to its practicality, its reliability and its validity. Practicality is concerned with a wide range of factors, such as resource availability, cost-effectiveness, convenience and interpretability. Reliability is an assessment of the degree of consistency between multiple measurements of the same variable. It is, therefore, concerned with whether alternative measurements at different times would reveal similar information. Validity refers to the extent to which a measure or set of measures correctly represent the constructs under investigation. It is thus concerned with how well the construct is defined by the measure(s). According to Bryman and Cramer (2011: 81), reliability is considered a measurement concept that represents the consistency with which an instrument measures a given performance or behaviour. A measurement instrument that is reliable will provide consistent results when a given individual is measured repeatedly under near-identical conditions. So, reliability refers to the quality of the indicators or instruments, such as questionnaires and tests which could be used to measure variables. According to Kamau (2014: 66), reliability refers to the consistency and stability of a score from a measurement scale, that is, whether the results in the survey could be duplicated in similar surveys. Validity, on the other hand, is a measurement concept that is concerned with the degree to which a measurement instrument measures what it purports to measure. Validity is not absolute but depends on the context in which a measurement instrument is used and the inferences that are based on the results of measure-

ment (Newsome 2016: 163). The extent to which a measure is "free from both systematic and random error indicates the validity of the measure" (Plano and Ivankova 2016: 166). In order words, validity is the extent to which a set of measured items reflects the theoretical latent construct that those items were designed to measure.

Ethical Considerations of the Research

Researchers are unconditionally responsible for the integrity of the research process. The power to produce knowledge requires responsibility for integrity in its production. Ethics is foundational to all research; with power comes responsibility (Kamau 2014: 67). Ethics concerns the privacy, safety and confidentiality of all the individuals who take part in the research. In this study, the respondents' identities were never asked and they felt free to complete the questionnaire in their own time and space. Ethics also involve consent. All the respondents were supplied with all the information that they needed to know, and they were informed in the cover letter that they could withdraw at any time. Ethics also involves the integrity and honesty of the researcher in generating, analysing and reporting the data. All the results were made available to the respondents.

DISCUSSION

Section A of the questionnaire asked respondents to respond via predetermined categories. These groupings of variables formed the independent variables used in this research. Of the 317 respondents who returned the questionnaire 85.4 percent were female while 13.6 percent were male. The sample thus had a higher ratio of females to males (6:1) than the expected ratio of 3 to 1. The sample was thus not representative of gender in Gauteng West. There were 248 educators in the sample (78%) while twenty-two percent indicated that they were HODs, Deputy Principals or Principals and as such they were grouped under management. This ratio of 3.5 to 1 is representative of the expected ratio of 3 to 1. Of the respondents, 78.5 percent indicated that they belonged to primary schools while 21.5 percent indicated that they were from secondary schools. This ratio of 3.6 primary schools for every one secondary school is representative of the type of school in Gauteng West. With

respect to mother tongue 49.2 percent indicated that it was Afrikaans while 38.9 percent indicated English and 11.9 percent were grouped under other. As the sample was mostly from ex-model C schools it was not expected that the sample would be representative of home language. Regarding the gender of their principal 69.4 percent of the sample indicated that their principal was male while 30.6 percent indicated female. To meet equity requirements this ratio should be closer to the ideal of one as to one instead of the present 2.3 to 1.

Inferential Analytical Procedures

The aim of Section B of the structured questionnaire was to investigate the perceptions of educators regarding diversity management in the staffroom of former model C primary and secondary schools within the Johannesburg West District in Gauteng. Respondents had to answer according to a six-point interval scale where 1 indicated strongly disagree while 6 was for strongly agree. The 20 items of Section B were subjected to a factor analytic process (PCA) and the Kaiser Meyer Olkin (KMO) value of 0.800 and Bartlett's sphericity of p=0.000 indicated that a reduction of items into factors would be feasible. Six first-order factors resulted but a Monte Carlo PCA for parallel analysis indicated that the Eigen values of three factors, from the PCA of the original analysis, had values greater than the Monte Carlo values but that the fourth one was smaller. Three factors were utilised (Pallant 2007: 191). The names given to the factors, the number of items that loaded significantly on them and the Cronbach reliability coefficients were:
- *Aspects enhancing the management of diversity in the staffroom* consisting of 8 items with a reliability coefficient of 0.75.
- *Aspects that cultivate a culture of mutual respect in the staffroom* composed of 7 items with a Cronbach Alpha of 0.77.
- *Aspects that impede the management of diversity in the staffroom* consisting of 4 items with a reliability of 0.68.

On subjecting these three first-order factor to a second-order procedure only one factor resulted consisting of 19 items. However, as the first-order factors were sufficiently reliable and valid they were used to analyse the data. The mean scores of the items, the factor loadings and rank order for aspects enhancing the man-

agement of diversity in the staffroom are provided in Table 1. The histogram and box plot both indicate normal distribution of data and hence inferential statistical tests could be used when analysing the factor means for possible associations with the independent variables.

From the data in Table 1 the mean scores of Items B10 (5.08) and B9 (5.05) reveal that educators agreed that management teams in their schools encouraged religious tolerance and discouraged discrimination in their working environment. The factor mean score of 4.45 indicates that the respondents partially agreed with the aspects that enhance the management of diversity. From this, it appears that the management of diversity in the staffroom of the sampled schools could be improved.

Item B5 dealing with equitable ethnic representation on the staff elicited a score of 3.57 indicating only partial agreement. It would thus

seem as if the former model C primary and secondary schools still do not have an equitable representation of the various ethnic groups as required by the Employment Equity Act No. 55 of 1998 (Republic of South Africa 1998).

The statistical analysis of the data distribution of the second factor aspects that cultivate a culture of mutual respect in the staffroom revealed a normal distribution of data and hence inferential statistical tests could be used when analysing the factor means. The items, their mean scores, factor loadings and rank order for *aspects that cultivate a culture of mutual respect in the staffroom* (FB1.2) are provided in Table 2.

A factor mean score of 3.78 indicates that the respondents partially disagree leaning towards partially agree with the aspects which cultivate a culture of mutual respect in the staffroom. One would expect that respondents would agree on this important aspect of diversi-

Table 1: Items involved in the aspects that enhance the management of diversity in the staffroom

FB1.1 –Aspects Enhancing the Management of Diversity in the Staffroom (Alpha =0.75)

Item	Description	Factor loading	Mean score	Rank order
B10	Our school management team encourages religious tolerance	.713	5.08	2
B9	Our school management team discourages racial discrimination	.651	5.05	3
B18	At our school educators are encouraged to express their views on matters arising at staff meetings	.632	4.36	5
B20	I feel valued in a diverse workforce	.611	4.42	4
B7	Organisational support is available to me when I encounter diversity related problems	.596	4.09	6
B19	I consider viewpoints of my colleagues even though they differ from my own	.533	5.10	1
B16	School management acts impartially when dealing with grievances from educators	.458	3.95	7
B5	Different ethnic groups are equitably represented on our teaching staff	.408	3.57	8
Average			4.45	

Table 2: Items involved in the aspects that cultivate a culture of mutual respect in the staffroom

FB1.2- Aspects that Cultivate a Culture of Mutual Respect in the Staffroom (Alpha = 0.77)

Item	Description: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following?	Factor loading	Mean score	Rank order
B3	All educators show respect toward the leadership in our school	.707	3.62	5
B2	In our school all educators are equally competent	.704	3.02	6
B14	Educators carry out instructions from school management	.618	4.64	1
B15	Educators meet the deadlines linked to school management instructions	.616	4.46	2
B4	All school management team show respect toward educators	.535	4.24	3
B8	Affirmative action contributes to improved academic performance among all learners at my school	.521	2.65	7
B13	Before implementing decisions, our school management allows input from educators	.468	3.87	4
Average			3.78	

ty management as mutual respect is a cornerstone in effective diversity management. The mean of item B2 (3.02) revealed that educators partially disagreed that all staff are equally competent. Item B8 with a mean of 2.65 suggested that educators disagreed that affirmative action contributed to improved academic performance. The mean scores showed that the perception of unfair workplace discrimination possibly exists in the staffroom of the schools sampled. It implies that legislation to bring about change is not enough and organisational transformation must be systematic. Unless the dominant way of seeing the world is changed transformation is likely to remain superficial (Georgas 2016: 25).

The third factor underlying the management of diversity, the items, their mean scores, factor loadings and rank order for a*spects that impede the management of diversity in the staffroom* are given in Table 3.

Note: r before the item in Table 3 indicates that the scale of the items were reversed and what was strongly disagree (1) now becomes strongly agree. Hence the factor mean of 4.39 indicates partial disagreement with the items. It thus appears as if the respondents in the sample do not believe that these aspects which impede the management of diversity are practiced in their staffroom.

Section C of the questionnaire contained 10 items that probed the perceptions of educators regarding the extent that certain aspects impacted on the management of diversity in the staffroom. The responses were measured on a five-point interval scale where 1 indicated to no extent and 5 indicated to a very large extent. A PCA with varimax rotation had a KMO value of 0.847 and Bartlett's sphericity of p=0.000 indicating that factor analysis would be feasible. One factor explaining 46.3 percent of the variance resulted. This factor contained 10 items,

had a Cronbach Reliability coefficient of 0.87 and was named 'Critical aspects' that influence effective diversity management in the staffroom (FC1). Today's increasingly complex and diverse workforce in former model C primary and secondary schools consists of groups that have members with different demographic backgrounds, values, expertise and perspectives (Moloi 2014: 265). Moreover, the histogram showed a normal distribution of data.

The items, their mean scores, factor loadings and rank order are given in Table 4.

The mean score of 2.50 indicates that the respondents believed to a small extent that the statements impacted on the management of diversity in the staffrooms at their schools. This implies that the respondents perceived the items in the factor as only occurring to a small extent. However, it would be preferable if respondents recorded a mean score of 2 or less as this would indicate that these critical issues only occurred to a very small extent in the staffroom. The mean of 2.50 leads the researcher to conclude that these aspects do occur to some extent and that these possible barriers impact on the day to day activities of educators' working environment. As a result, this would indicate that barriers to diversity management have an important impact on the activities in the staffroom (Cox 2008: 6).

The various factor analytic procedures thus produced four reliable factors which will serve as the dependent variables in this research. The various independent groups will be manipulated to determine whether their factor mean scores differ statistically significantly from one another with respect to the four factors. The first to be tested will be two independent groups.

Comparison between Two Independent Groups

When testing for significant differences between the factors mean scores of two indepen-

Table 3: Items involved in aspects that impede diversity management in the staffroom

FB1.3 – Aspects that Impede the Management of Diversity in the Staffroom (Alpha = 0.680)

Item	Description: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following?	Factor loading	Mean score	Rank order
rB12	Educators make derogatory comments about people from their own race group	.740	4.39	3
rB11	Educators make derogatory comments about people from other race groups	.719	4.32	4
rB17	Conflict due to cultural differences among educators occurs at our school	.668	4.43	2
rB6	Cultural diversity among our teaching staff complicates my job function	.566	4.44	1
Average			4.39	

Table 4: Items in the factor critical aspects that influence the management of diversity in the staffroom

Item	Description - To what extent do you think the following statements impact on the management of diversity in the staffroom at your school?	Factor loading	Mean score	Rank order
C1	Stereotypes about different ethnic groups	0.686	2.53	5
C2	Stereotypes about different gender groups	0.613	2.45	6
C3	Unsupportive environment for staff members culturally different from management	0.700	2.07	10
C4	Lack of communication channels	0.676	2.87	2
C5	My colleagues' inability to socially integrate with different ethnic groups	0.719	2.36	7
C6	Difficulty in balancing career and private life issues	0.655	2.80	3
C7	Fears of discrimination based on ethnicity	0.755	2.23	8
C8	Fears of discrimination based on gender	0.721	2.08	9
C9	The need to include the management of diversity in performance appraisals	0.572	2.68	4
C10	Resistance to change	0.683	2.91	1
Average			2.50	

dent groups, then Levene's t-test can be used. Levene's test is used to see whether the variances are different between the two groups involved. If the variances are similar (p>0.05) then equal variances are assumed and if they are significantly different (p<0.05) then equal variances are not assumed. Only those independent groups where statistically significant differences were observed will be discussed.

Type of School (A5)

The hypotheses for the school type that the respondents represent is firstly provided:

Hot – there is statistically no significant difference between the mean scores of the two school type groups regarding:
- FB1.1 Aspects enhancing the management of diversity in the staffroom.
- FB1.2 Aspects that cultivate a culture of mutual respect in the staffroom.
- FB1.3 Aspects that impede the management of diversity in the staffroom.
- FC1.0 Critical aspects that influence effective diversity management in the staffroom.

Hat – there is statistically a significant difference between the mean scores of the two school type groups regarding:
- FB1.1 Aspects enhancing the management of diversity in the staffroom.
- FB1.2 Aspects that cultivate a culture of mutual respect in the staffroom.
- FB1.3 Aspects that impede the management of diversity in the staffroom.
- FC1.0 Critical aspects that influence effective diversity management in the staffroom.

The data obtained regarding school type groups was as follows:

$$[FB1.1 - \bar{X}_P = 4.46, \bar{X}_S = 3.59, p > 0.05; FB1.2 - \bar{X}_P = 3.89, \bar{X}_S = 3.44, p < 0.01, r = 0.19;$$
$$FB1.3 - \bar{X}_P = 4.25, \bar{X}_S = 3.93, p < 0.05, r = 0.07; FC1.0 - \bar{X}_P = 2.41, \bar{X}_S = 2.75, p < 0.01, r = 0.17]$$

(X=Mean score; subscripts p = primary; s =secondary; p = probability value; r = effect size)

From the data, it can be seen that there were statistically significant differences (p<0.05) between the school type groups regarding FB1.2, FB1.3 and FC1.0. Regarding aspects that cultivate a culture of mutual respect (FB1.2), the primary school respondents agreed to a statistically significantly greater extent with this factor than did secondary school respondents. The same applies to aspects that impede the management of diversity in the staffroom (FB1.3). However, when it comes to critical aspects that influence the effective management of diversity in the staffroom (FC1.0) both groups believed that this occurred to a small to a moderate extent but primary school respondents believed this to a significantly smaller extent than secondary school respondents. It would appear that the management of diversity in the staffroom is less problematic for primary school respondents. Should one use only FB1.1 (aspects that enhance diversity management and) and FB1.3 (aspects that impede diversity management), then primary school respondents differed by 0.21 (4.46-4.25) while secondary school respondents differed by -0.34 (3.57- 4.25). This corroborates the argument that primary school respondents were more positive in their perceptions about the management of diversity in the staffroom than were secondary school respondents.

Highest Educational Qualification (A6 Recoded)

The highest educational qualification was recoded to two groups namely those respondents with less than a degree qualification (Group1) and those with a degree and higher qualification (Group 2). The hypotheses are like those set for school type and are not stated again. The relevant data as obtained from PASW 18 was:

$[FB1.1 - \overline{X}_{G1} = 4.56; \overline{X}_{G2} = 4.42; p > 0.05; FB1.2 - \overline{X}_{G1} = 3.86; \overline{X}_{G2} = 3.78; p > 0.05;$

$FB1.3 - \overline{X}_{G1} = 4.25; \overline{X}_{G2} = 4.16; p > 0.05; FC1 - \overline{X}_{G1} = 2.34; \overline{X}_{G2} = 2.58; p < 0.05; r = 0.16]$

From the data, it can be seen that the highest educational qualification group (G2) differs statistically significantly only with respect to critical aspects influencing effective diversity management in the staffroom (FC1). Respondents with qualifications of a degree and higher believed to a greater extent with the critical aspects that impact on effective diversity management than those respondents who have less than a degree qualification. Which language do you regard as your mother tongue?

As only Afrikaans and English mother tongue respondents were present in sufficiently large numbers, this group was recoded to two groups only namely Group 1 as Afrikaans and Group 2 as English. The appropriate statistical data was:

$[FB1.1 - \overline{X}_A = 4.43; \overline{X}_E = 4.56; p > 0.05; FB1.2 - \overline{X}_A = 3.81; \overline{X}_E = 3.67; p > 0.05;$

$FB1.3 - \overline{X}_A = 4.32; \overline{X}_E = 4.03; p < 0.01; r = 0.16; FC1 - \overline{X}_A = 2.39; \overline{X}_E = 2.52; p > 0.05]$

The data shows a statistically significant difference regarding aspects that impede the management of diversity only (FB1.3). Afrikaans mother tongue respondents agreed to a smaller extent (or disagreed more strongly) with the items in this factor than did English mother tongue respondents (scale reversed). This could possibly be because the schools with Afrikaans mother tongue respondents are likely to be more mono-cultural than the English mother tongue respondents whose schools are highly likely to be multicultural, and hence more barriers are present when it comes to the management of diversity.

Gender of School Principal

The appropriate data as provided by PASW 18 was:

$[FB1.1 - \overline{X}_{MP} = 4.43; \overline{X}_{FP} = 4.62; p > 0.05; FB1.2 - \overline{X}_{MP} = 3.84; \overline{X}_{FP} = 3.66; p > 0.05;$

$FB1.3 - \overline{X}_{MP} = 4.31; \overline{X}_{FP} = 3.86; p < 0.001; r = 0.29; FC1 - \overline{X}_{MP} = 2.40; \overline{X}_{FP} = 2.64; p < 0.05; r = 0.14]$

(X=Mean score for male and female principals; p = probability; r = effect size)

The data indicates that there were statistically significant differences between respondents who had male and those who had female principals. Regarding the aspects that impede the management of diversity (FB1.3), respondents who had male principals disagreed to a statistically significantly larger extent (they agreed less strongly) with the factor than did respondents who had female principals. As the scale was reversed the interpretation becomes rather complex. The effect size is close to being moderate in size (r=0.29) and indicates some practical importance to the interpretation of this factor which may be situated in the perceptions of the gender roles in society. The importance of earnings and promotion corresponds to the masculine, assertive and competitive role. The importance of relations with the manager and with colleagues corresponds to the feminine, caring and the socio-environment role. Male principals are thus more likely to be less caring about possible aspects which impede the management of diversity in the staffroom. In addition, no significant differences could be found between the genders regarding their factor mean scores in aspects that impede the management of diversity in the staffroom (FB1.3). Hence this difference does not appear to be between male and female respondents but between the respondents who had male and those who had female principals. There were also about 2.3 times more male principals than female principals in the sample. In respect of the critical aspects influencing effective diversity management, respondents with female principals perceive this factor as impacting to a greater extent on effective diversity management than did respondents who have male principals. Saxena (2014: 76), corroborates this finding and points out that everyone is different from each other because of their different religion, gender, educational background to which they belong, age and the perception.

Comparison between Three or More Independent Groups

When testing three or more independent groups for possible significant differences then one can make use of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). If differences are found among all three groups taken together then post-hoc tests can be used to make a pair-wise comparison. The only groups that differed statistically significantly from one another were the age groups and

this was only relative to the factor concerning the critical aspects influencing effective diversity management in the staffroom. Hence only this factor will be analysed and discussed. Hypotheses at the multivariate level are provided:

HoA – There is statistically no significant difference between the three age groups taken together with respect to the critical aspects influencing effective diversity management in the staffroom.

HaA - There is a statistically significant difference between the three age groups taken together with respect to the critical aspects influencing effective diversity management in the staffroom.

The appropriate data was:

$$[FC1 - \overline{X}_{21-40\,yrs} = 2.59; \overline{X}_{41-50\,yrs} = 2.37; \overline{X}_{50+} = 2.35; p < 0.05; r = 0.05]$$

The data indicates that there was a statistically significant difference between the three age groups considered together but no differences could be found at the pair-wise level. Hence the null hypothesis can be rejected and there is statistically a significant difference between the three age groups considered together. The extent to which critical aspects impact effective diversity management in the staffroom (FC1) appear to become smaller with age.

Research Findings and the Implications for School Managment and Leadership

Diversity has many dimensions and is a complex concept. Within an expanded context, diversity includes, inter alia, lifestyle, age, personal background, education, function and personality. Diversity is not synonymous with differences because it encompasses differences and similarities. Contemporary diversity management theories use what is called an inclusive definition of diversity where diversity is viewed as the collection of many individual differences and similarities that exist among people. Diversity management focuses on recognising the unique qualities in everyone. The management of workforce diversity requires a strategic approach. This strategic orientation implies that management must adopt a long-term approach in planning as a method of achieving organisational goals. In a working environment where mutual adaptation is implemented, people are recognised and differences are accepted. Those involved accept and understand diversity, recognising that doing so calls for adaptation by all

concerned. Fostering mutual adaptation is not an overnight process and requires social awareness skills such as leveraging diversity where leadership respects and relates well to people from varied backgrounds and understands diverse worldviews whilst being sensitive to group differences.

The effective management of workforce diversity (FB2.0) in the staffroom is founded on three factors, namely aspects enhancing the management of diversity in the staffroom (FB1.1), aspects that cultivate a culture of mutual respect in the staffroom (FB1.2) and aspects that impede the management of diversity in the staffroom (FB1.3). In addition, there are certain critical aspects that influence effective diversity management in the staffroom (FC1.0). Accordingly, Mahlaba (2016: 1), suggests that diversity management is vital to organisation growth in today's very competitive marketplace. A diverse workforce can bring about productivity and competitive advantage. However, it is very vital that the organisation understands diversity and knows how to implement, monitor and report on diversity and, consequently, use it to its advantage.

With respect to aspects that enhance the management of diversity in the staffroom (FB1.1) the perceptions were that school management teams do encourage religious tolerance and discourage discrimination in the workplace. However, equitable representation of the various ethnic groups, as mandated by the Employment Equity Act No. 55 of 1998 (SA 1998), does not seem to have been achieved. Respondents from primary schools have a more positive perception than do secondary school respondents about the enhancement of diversity management in the staffroom. To corroborate this finding, Phillips (2014: 1), argues that it seems obvious that a group of people with diverse individual expertise would be better than a homogeneous group at solving complex, non-routine problems. It is less obvious that social diversity should work in the same way - yet the science shows that it does. Phillips goes on to say that, the key to understanding the positive influence of diversity is the concept of informational diversity. When people are brought together to solve problems in groups, they bring different information, opinions and perspectives. The same logic applies to social diversity. People who are different from one another in race, gender and other

dimensions bring unique information and experiences to bear on the task at hand.

Regarding aspects that cultivate a culture of mutual respect in the staffroom (FB1.2) the perceptions were that it could at best be classified as something that needs to be improved. Respect towards persons in positions of authority, greater input from educators into decision-making and the role of affirmative action all need to be clarified and discussed using the skills applicable to a dialogue such as participatory and reflective openness if a culture of mutual respect is to be encouraged (Moloi 2005: 57). The perception of unfair discrimination in the workplace seems to be present. This is logical as the concept of discrimination is not a fair practice and adding a prefix such as unfair to discrimination will not change it in practice. The problem lies in the mandate itself as it is tautological to speak of unfair discrimination. Mutual respect can only be cultivated if discrimination, of whatever kind, is not practiced by any educator.

It also seems logical that if one develops aspects that enhance diversity management (FB1.1) whilst minimising the aspects that impede the management of diversity (FB1.3), that effective diversity management in the staffroom will improve. Presently respondents with English as mother tongue have less positive perceptions about aspects that impede the management of diversity than do respondents with Afrikaans as mother tongue. In addition, it appears as if female principals are better able to manage the impediments to diversity in the staffroom than their male counterparts.

There are certain aspects that form barriers which impact on the day to day activities of an educators' working environment. As a result, this would indicate that barriers to diversity management have an important impact on the activities in the staffroom and would influence management strategies. Such barriers are stereotyping on grounds of gender and ethnicity; fears of discrimination based on gender and ethnicity; poor communication channels; difficulty in balancing career and family life; resistance to change; and an unsupportive environment for staff members culturally different from management.

CONCLUSION

The results have shown that it is important to manage workforce diversity for effective leadership in a changing South African school envi-

ronment. Managing diversity does not mean controlling or containing diversity, it means enabling every member of a school's workforce to perform to his or her potential. In South Africa, we have to recognise that diversity exists. It is a country with 11 different official languages. It is home to many religions and issues of race have dominated our history. We all know that our society is full of differences. In the past, these differences have led to many inequities. The challenge now is to see whether we can turn these differences into strengths. Harnessing the huge range of talents, outlooks, cultures and backgrounds which exist in every school, is not just a political or human rights goal – it also makes real sense for the school. A school that accepts diversity and recognises the contributions of all its staff members is healthier and more productive than a school that does not. Unmanaged diversity in the workplace might become an obstacle for achieving organisational goals. Therefore, diversity can be perceived as a "double-edged sword".

RECOMMENDATIONS

Managing diversity must form part of an institution's strategic management process. Before deciding on the way forward when developing a strategy for managing diversity, school leadership must know what the diversity situation in the school is. It is recommended that school management analyse the demographics of their school which could involve, inter alia, analysis of the age, race, gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, physical ability, religion, work experience, marital status and educational background of each staff member (principal, educators and non-teaching staff) in the school. The study of demographic trends would inform the strategic management process and could assist school leaders to identify the changes needed to manage workforce diversity effectively.

The school's vision, values, strategic plan and actual daily activities must form the cornerstone for any diversity management strategy. Staff members must be empowered by the school's vision and mission statements, and there should be clear plans on the table with respect to the effective management of diversity. School leaders should develop human resource management skills to be able to competently manage workforce diversity. It is recom-

mended that the effective management of a diverse workforce be viewed as an investment in the future and that diversity awareness strategies and training in workforce diversity management should be implemented by the Department of Education. Opportunities for dialogue about the value of diversity must be provided without coercing those who fear this change into participating or penalising them for their lack of involvement. School leaders must devise interventions or strategies to address a changing work environment.

REFERENCES

April K, Ephraim, N, Peters K 2012. Diversity management in South Africa: Inclusion, identity, intention, power and expectations. *African Journal of Business Management,* 6(4): 1749-1759.

Bryman A, Cramer D 2011. *Quantitative Data Analysis with IBM SPSS 17, 18 and 19.* New York: Routledge.

Cox T 2008. *Synergy by Diversity.* Michigan: Taylor Cox & Associates, Inc.

Cummins J 2013. Language and identity in multilingual schools: Constructing evidence-based instructional policies. In: D Little, C Leung, P Van Avermaet (Eds.): *Managing Diversity in Education: Languages, Policies, Pedagogies.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters, pp. 3-26.

Dzvimbo KP, Moloi KC 2013. Globalisation and internationalisation of higher education in sub-Saharan Africa. *South African Journal of Education,* 33(3): 581-613.

Field A 2009. *Discovering Statistics using SPSS.* London: SAGE.

Georgas T 2016. *Managing Educational Change in a Time of Social and Economic Crisis in Greece.* EdD Thesis. UK: Institute of Education, UCL.

Heale R, Twycross A 2015. Validity and Reliability in Quantitative Studies. BMJ Journals. From <http://group.bmj.com/group/rights-licensing/permissions> (Retrieved on 6 September 2017).

Hesse-Biber SN 2017. *The Practice of Qualitative Research.* 3rd Edition. Los Angeles: Sage.

Intelligo 2017. Five Lessons in Diversity Management. Management News. From <www.bizcommunity.com/Article/196/610/160136.html> (Retrieved on 6 September 2017).

Kamau L 2014. *Mixed Methods Research: A Practical Guide for Researchers and Graduate Students.* Saarbrucken, Germany: LAP Lambert Publishing.

Klarsfeld A (Ed.). 2010. *International Handbook on Diversity Management at Work: Country Perspectives on Diversity and Equal Treatment.* Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Levin HM 2017. Worldwide, School Choice Hasn't Improved Performance. The Experience of Other Countries Suggests Betsy Devos' Voucher Vision Falls Flat. From <https://www.usnews.com/news/best-countries/articles/2017-01-30/little-global-evidence-suggests-school-choice-helps-performance> (Retrieved on 24 September 2017).

Little D, Leung C, Van Avermaet P 2013. *Managing Diversity in Education: Languages, Policies, Pedagogies.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Madikizela K 2017. Diversity as a Competitive Advantage in the Workplace. Pragma. From <https://www.pragmaworld.net/diversity-as-a-competitive-advantage-in-the-workplace/> (Retrieved on 6 September 2017).

Mahlaba G 2016. The Need for Diversity Management. From <https://www.bdo.co.za/en-za/news/articles/the-need-for-diversity-management> (Retrieved on 18 September 2017).

Mertler CA 2017. *Action Research. Improving Schools and Empowering Educators.* 5th Edition. Los Angeles: Sage.

Moloi KC 2014. The complexity of dealing with change in the South African schooling system: 20 years into democracy. *African Identities,* 12(3-4): 264-282.

Newsome BO 2016. *An Introduction to Research, Analysis, and Writing: Practical Skills for Social Science.* London: Sage Publications.

New York University Steinhardt 2008. *Culturally Responsive Classroom Management Strategies.*New York: Metropolitan Center for Urban Education, Steinhardt School of Culture Education and Human Development.

Nkholise M 2014. *Determining Guidelines for Effectively Leading Culturally Diverse Teams at Volkswagen South Africa.* Master's Dissertation. South Africa: Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University.

Pallant J 2007. *Survival Manual: A Step by Step Guide to Data Analysis Using SPSS for Windows.* 3rd Edition. UK: Open University Press.

Patrick HA, Kumar RV 2012. Managing Workplace Diversity: Issues and Challenges. SAGE Open,1-15. From <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/2158244012444615> (Retrieved on 19 September 2017).

Phillips KW 2014. How Diversity Makes Us Smarter. Being Around People Who are Different from Us Makes Us More Creative, More Diligent and Harder-Working. From <https://www. scientificamerican. com/article/how-diversity-makes-us-smarter/> (Retrieved on 20 September 2017).

Plano Clark VL, Ivankova NV 2016. *Mixed Methods Research: A Guide to the Field.* London: Sage.

Republic of South Africa 1998. *Employment Equity Act No. 55 of 1998.* Pretoria: Government Printer.

Richard H, Milner V, Blake Tenore F 2010. Classroom management in diverse classrooms. *Urban Education,* 45(5): 560-603.

Sasol Sustainable Development Report 2014. Enhancing Workforce Diversity. From <http://www. sasol. co.za/extras/sasol_sd/docs/our_focus/enhancing_workforce_diversity.pdf> (Retrieved on 6 September 2017).

Saxena A 2014. Workforce diversity: A key to improve productivity. *Procedia Economics and Finance,* 11: 76-85.

Sharma A 2016. Managing diversity and equality in the workplace. *Cogent & Business Management,* 3(1): 1-14.

Teacher-Vision 2017. Strategies for Teaching Culturally Diverse Students. From <https://www. teachervision. com/teaching-strattegies/strategies-teaching-cultural-ly-diverse-sttudents> (Retrieved on 5 September 2017).

Wagner III WE 2017. *Using IBM SPSS Statistics for Research Methods and Social Science.* 6th Edition. London: Sage Publications.