Transforming the public service to serve a diverse society: can representativeness be the most decisive criterion?[1]

J S Wessels

Department of Public Administration and Management
University of South Africa
(wessejs@unisa.ac.za)

Abstract

The transformation of the South African public service to serve a diverse society is a reality. One of the most important criteria used to measure progress with the transformation process, is representativeness. This article investigates whether representativeness is a sufficient condition for transforming the South African public service to render the best possible service to a diverse South African society. Consequently, this article presents a conceptual framework as an instrument, first, to untangle the major transformation-related concepts in the public service and, second, to determine whether equality and equal opportunities can be achieved for all members of the diverse South African society, if representativeness is the most decisive criterion for public service employment. This framework distinguishes between the ends of transformation (equality and equal opportunities), the various transformation interventions (affirmative action and diversity management), the subjects of these interventions (designated groups and previously disadvantaged individuals), and the prerequisite conditions for these interventions (equity, justice, merit, diversity and representativeness). The article concludes that equality and equal opportunities cannot be achieved for all members of the diverse South African society, should representativeness be regarded as a sufficient condition for public service employment.

Keywords: equal opportunities, equality, representativeness, South African public service, transformation

1   INTRODUCTION

The need to transform the South African public service was identified before it became the official policy of the South African government in 1995 (Republic

of South Africa 1995: internet). Today, more than 13 years after the historic democratic elections of 1994, the process of transforming the South African public service to serve a diverse South African society, seems to be well underway. One of the most popular criteria to measure the success of transformation is that of representativeness in terms of population group (see Republic of South Africa 2000 and 2006).

This article will investigate whether representativeness is an appropriate criterion for measuring the success of transforming the South African public service to render the best possible service to a diverse society. Consequently, this article will present a conceptual framework as an instrument, first, to untangle the major transformation-related concepts in the public service and, second, to determine whether equality can be achieved for all members of the diverse South African society, if representativeness is regarded as a sufficient condition for public service employment.

2 DIVERSITY AND RELATED CONCEPTS

A survey of official publications as well as scholarly literature has shown the application of a variety of concepts in the discourse on transformation and diversity. This includes concepts such as, for example, 'transformation' (Republic of South Africa 2000: 1.2), 'diversity' (Ospina 2001: 15; Fraser-Moleketi 2001: 32), 'equality' (Republic of South Africa 1996), 'equal opportunities' (Republic of South Africa 1998), 'equity' (Kruger and Moiler 2000: internet), 'justice' (Rawls 1971: 5), 'merit' (Kruger and Moiler 2000: online), 'affirmative action' (Maboleka 2000: 108–109; Mello 2000: 32), 'managing diversity' (Rice 2001: 103; Foldy 2004: 530), 'representativeness' (Klug 1991: 331; Mello 2000: 37–38), 'historically disadvantaged' (Republic of South Africa 1998: s1), and 'designated' (Cao 2003; Tinarelli 2000; Republic of South Africa 1998). As each of these concepts has a distinct meaning (Pauw 1999: 11) which plays a specific role in discourses on transformation and diversity, it is necessary to isolate these meanings in order to disentangle the various discourses.

2.1 Transformation

'Transformation' is a key concept in the South African context. Just more than a year after the first all-inclusive democratic government of the Republic of South Africa was elected, that government published a policy document entitled *White Paper on the Transformation of Public Service* (Republic of South Africa 1995). This document defined 'transformation' as a 'dynamic, focused and relatively short-

term process, designed to fundamentally reshape the public service for its appointed role in the new dispensation in South Africa' (Republic of South Africa 1995: 1.2). It thus seems that the definition consists of two dimensions, namely the *action* (fundamental reshape), and the *purpose* (to fulfil its appointed role).

The action dimension of transformation is explicated in a report by the Public Service Commission (Republic of South Africa 2000: 2.2), in order to '(a) create a genuinely representative public service which reflects the major characteristics of South African demography, without eroding efficiency and competence'; and '(b) facilitate the transformation of the attitudes and behaviour of public servants towards a democratic ethos underlined by the overriding importance of human rights …'. The reshaping of the public service accordingly seems to comprise two elements, namely the reshaping of the characteristic of the public service in terms of its representativeness, and the reshaping of its orientations or attitudes in terms of its democratic ethos.

The second dimension, i.e. the purpose of the aforementioned definition of transformation, must meet a specific criterion, namely that transformation has to lead the public service to fulfil its 'appointed role in the new dispensation in South Africa' (Republic of South Africa 1995: 1.2). This 'merit criterion' will be discussed in greater detail later. Within the South African context, this 'appointed role' is best formulated in the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996 (s 197(1)), namely to 'loyally execute the lawful policies of the government of the day'.

2.2   Diversity

The point of departure for this article is that the main purpose of the South African government's transformation policies is to 'create a genuinely representative public service which reflects the major characteristics of South African demography' (Republic of South Africa 2000: 2.2). What are the major characteristics of South African demography? According to the *Demographic Statistical Overview: 1994–2004*, the South African population grew rapidly during the past century, from 5 million in 1902 to 46.5 million in 2004. In this report, a profile of the diverse South African population is presented by, inter alia, province, gender, population group, age, life expectancy at birth, HIV/AIDS prevalence, and urban/non-urban (Republic of South Africa 2004: 6).

What exactly is diversity? Fraser-Moleketi (2001: 32) is very practical in her approach when she sets her definition directly in the public service context.

> Diversity encompasses all individual differences that affect the performance of tasks or the conduct of relationships and thus may have an impact on the outputs, outcomes and services, as well as on other facets of organizational life and activity.

Where Fraser-Moleketi focuses predominantly on the characteristics of diverse people, Auluck's (2001: 66–67) definition focuses on the value environment in which people are supposed to work, by defining diversity as 'providing an environment that promotes good working relationships'.

Although various categories of diversity can be distinguished, the literature consulted seems to focus predominantly on workforce diversity, providing for different types or categories of employee diversity (Ospina 2001; Fraser-Moleketi 2001; Auluck 2001; Rice 2001; Foldy 2004; Caiden and Caiden 2001; Rice and Arekere 2005; Pitts 2005). Rice and Arekere (2005: 2) state that public institutions have implemented workforce diversity initiatives 'to better serve their employees and external constituents while simultaneously enhancing productivity, effectiveness, and sustained competitiveness'. Ospina (2001: 15) identifies at least two broad categories of workforce diversity, namely diversity based on attributes directly related to the work or tasks of a specific organisation, and diversity based on social attributes which are usually indirectly related to the work. It is not the diversity attributes directly related to the work or tasks of public institutions that are debated in the various discourses on diversity, but the social attributes which are indirectly related to the work or tasks of public institutions. These attributes seem to be almost infinite, and include gender, race, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, physical ability, age, family, income, educational and geographical background, and status (Ospina 2001: 15). Caiden and Caiden (2001: 123) summarise diversity to mean 'variety', 'an intrinsic characteristic of the natural world.' From a South African perspective, Fraser-Moleketi (2001: 31–32) does not fully agree, stating that differences are not all physically pre-determined, but are 'amplified through other social and economic constructs'. She adds that 'diversity in many instances is socially constructed and as such is deeply political and accordingly needs political attention' (Fraser-Moleketi 2001: 31–32). It seems that Fraser-Moleketi does not have the diversity of public institutions in mind, but in particular the diversity of society. This is a typical example of the social characteristics of diversity which are indirectly related to the work of public institutions, but ultimately draw political attention to their impact on the composition of public institutions. Why? Probably not primarily to increase the performance and service delivery of public institutions, but rather to legitimise public institutions, 'whereby diversity stems from political and ethical mandates for representative bureaucracy in a democratic context' (Ospina 2001: 17).

The word 'diversity' encompasses two concepts, namely 'diversity1', referring to the intrinsic state of variety in the natural world (an acceptable or desired state of being which has to be nurtured), and 'diversity2', referring to a socially constructed condition of variety (a possible unacceptable or undesired state of being which has to be challenged). Some policy interventions will, therefore, be aimed at nurturing or managing diversity1, while other policy interventions might seek to redress diversity2. Within the context of employment in public institutions, transformation (with affirmative action as its policy intervention) will aspire to redress diversity2, and manage diversity in nurturing diversity1. In this sense, these two concepts will be treated practically the same as the concepts 'equity' and 'inequity', and 'justice' and 'injustice', with the effect that only the desired concept will be included as 'diversity' (in this model) as a prerequisite or criterion.

2.3 Equality

Equality, as the third transformation-related concept to be discussed here, receives special attention in Section 9 of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996. First, Section 9 applies the concept to clarify the position of 'everyone' before the law (subsection 9(1)), namely that everyone 'is equal before the law and has the right to equal protection and benefit of the law'. Second, it explains the implications of this concept in practical terms, such as, inter alia, 'the full and equal enjoyment of all rights and freedoms' as well as fairness, also known as equity (subsections 9(2) up to 9(5)). The possible meanings of this concept are addressed in the *Green Paper on a Conceptual Framework for Affirmative Action and the Management of Diversity in the Public Service* (hereafter referred to as the *Green Paper*) (Republic of South Africa 1997b). Auluck (2001: 66) rightfully remarks that equality is based 'on the notion of "equal treatment"', which is guaranteed by subsection 9(1) of the Constitution. Clearly, 'equality' implies that all people are on par with one another, and enjoy equal opportunities.

The *Green Paper* distinguishes between two categories of equality, namely formal and substantive equality (Republic of South Africa 1997b: chap. 1). Formal equality 'implies the removal of laws that result in discrimination and segregation', whereas substantive equality 'necessitates the acknowledgement and eradication of the actual social and economic conditions that generate inequality' (Republic of South Africa 1997b: chap. 1). Substantive equality is thus only possible in an environment of equity.

2.4   Equal opportunities

Related to the concept 'equality', are the concepts 'equal opportunities' and 'equal employment opportunities'. The implication of the concept 'equal opportunities' within the context of government institutions is to have the opportunity to be treated equally, especially with regard to employment (Republic of South Africa 1997b) – hence the concept 'equal employment opportunities'. The *Green Paper* attaches two characteristics to the concept 'equal opportunities', namely that of a 'principle enshrined within the ideal of a representative public service to ensure equality in employment for the equal enjoyment of rights, opportunities, benefits and access in the workplace' and a 'tool to eradicate discrimination and unfairness in the workplace in pursuit of a representative public service' (Republic of South Africa 1997b: chap. 3). Equal employment is thus a condition characterised by fairness and representivity.

What is the implication of this definition of 'equal opportunities'? As a principle it seems to be a foundation of human resource management in South African public institutions. However, the second part of the *Green Paper's* definition refers to the concept 'equal opportunities' as a tool to eradicate discrimination and unfairness in the pursuit of a representative public service. It may be argued that the authors of this Green Paper were imprecise in their application of the various concepts. It is difficult to understand how a concept can simultaneously be a principle and a tool. 'Equal opportunities' within the context of the employment of public officials seem to be more of a principle than a tool. Policy interventions such as affirmative action and managing diversity seem to be the tools to pursue equality in the work situation.

2.5   Equity

In his chapter 'the management of diversity: the UK civil service journey continues', Auluck (2001: 66) discusses the relationship between the concepts 'diversity' and 'equity'. His view is that diversity derives from the idea of 'fairness of treatment', also known as equity, based on the recognition, valuing and harnessing of 'difference'. However, Fraser-Moleketi (2001: 33) is not convinced by the analytical distinction between the concepts 'diversity' and 'inequity'. She believes there are various examples of inequities developed on the basis of diversity, and that 'those diversities in turn are perpetuated and increased through inequity' (Fraser-Moleketi 2001: 33). *The White Paper on Human Resource Management in the Public Service* (Republic of South Africa 1997a: chap. 2, par. 2.3) derives 'equity' as a concept from the Constitution and defines it as follows, 'Where there has been unfairness, corrective measures must be implemented so as to ensure

that human resource practices are free from discrimination, invisible barriers and unjustness which will impede equal employment opportunities.' The application of corrective measures seems to be closely related to the concept of 'equity'. This observation is confirmed by the *Green Paper* (Republic of South Africa 1997b: chap. 3), which refers to employment equity as something to be achieved through affirmative action programmes (Wessels 2005: 129–130).

This official interpretation of the concept is confirmed by scholars such as Brand and Scholtz (2001: 119); Veldtman (2001); and Kruger and Moiler (2000: internet), who view equity as 'a state of being' to be achieved by affirmative action and other policy interventions. These interventions will have to be fair and equitable, recognising, valuing and harnessing societal diversity (Wessels 2005: 130).

2.6   Justice

Justice, similar to equity, may also be viewed as a 'state of being' or standard which serves as criterion for the assessment of interventions by government or employers, with regard to the employment of individuals in the public sector. The *Green Paper* (Republic of South Africa 1997b: chap. 1) considers 'justice' as a concept invoked by the broad term 'equality'. Policy interventions such as affirmative action are seen as tools to bridge the gap between the injustices of the past, and a democratic future (Adam 2000: 54–55; Kruger and Moiler 2000: internet; Republic of South Africa 1997b: chap. 1). More than 30 years since the first publication of his standard work, *A theory of justice*, Rawls's ideas on justice and social justice are still relevant. He defines justice as 'the first virtue of social institutions' (Rawls 1973: 3) and regards social justice as providing 'a standard whereby the distributive aspects of the basic structure of society are to be assessed' (Rawls 1973: 9). In a statement which can be made directly applicable to transformation policy interventions in South Africa, he states that 'laws and institutions, no matter how efficient and well-arranged, must be reformed or abolished if they are unjust' (Rawls 1973: 3). Justice is clearly seen as a criterion or standard against which transformation policy interventions can be measured.

2.7   Merit

As a concept, 'merit' is not frequently used in diversity-related discourse. Closely associated with performance, expertise and technical qualifications, merit also serves as a principle for the recruitment, selection, promotion and dismissal of employees (Fox and Meyer 1995: 81). Traditionally, the merit principle has been regarded as essential in public service , although the so-called deinstitutionalisation

of public institutions has been shown to lead to greater patronage and more interference with the appointment and promotion of staff (Peters 2000: 132).

The *White Paper on the Transformation of the Public Service* (Republic of South Africa 1995: par. 1.2) states that transformation has to lead the public service to fulfil its 'appointed role in the new dispensation in South Africa'. What is this role? The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (1996: ss 197(1)) states that the public service must 'loyally execute the lawful policies of the government of the day'. The implication of this constitutional role of the public service is that performance, expertise and technical qualifications (in other words, merit) of public officials should play a decisive role in their recruitment, selection, promotion, and dismissal. The importance of these criteria is also reflected in the last part of the definition of the concept 'transformation' by the Public Service Commission. This definition specifically includes a proviso: '… without eroding efficiency and competence' (Republic of South Africa 2000: 2.2(a)). However, the *White Paper on Human Resource Management in the Public Service* (Republic of South Africa 1997a: Executive Summary par. 17) states that merit 'must be defined within the context of employment equity'. Merit as a criteria seems to be regarded (by the White Paper) as subordinate to the criterion of equity. In a similar approach, Beauchamp and Walters (1994: 27) relate merit to justice by including it in one of their five candidate principles of distributive justice (to each person, according to merit).

2.8   Affirmative action

Affirmative action as a policy intervention has already been mentioned. What is affirmative action? As this article is set in the context of the South African public sector, it makes sense to start with a review of the relevant official documents, which reveals that the South African Government attaches the following characteristics to the concept 'affirmative action':

- 'A strategy for the achievement of employment equity through redressing imbalances' (Republic of South Africa 1997b: chap. 3); and
- 'A means to enable the disadvantaged to compete competitively with the advantaged of society' (Republic of South Africa 1997b: chap. 1).

Affirmative action seems to be a policy intervention to, inter alia, break down barriers to equality and equal employment opportunities (Adam 2000: 52; Kruger and Moiler 2000: internet; Mabokela 2000: 108–109; Mello 2000: 32; Cao 2003; Wagner 1989). Although a case can be made for affirmative action as an

intervention or a tool to pursue various ends, it is certainly not an end in itself (Wessels 2005: 133).

2.9   Managing diversity

While affirmative action as a policy intervention is usually strongly supported by a variety of legislation and other programmes, diversity management strategies seem to be somewhat different in nature, as they essentially go beyond the basic legal requirements. The process of valuing diversity views people's differences as an asset, rather than a burden to be tolerated (Auluck 2001: 66). Rice (2001: 103) shows that in managing diversity the emphasis is on the behavioural aspects in terms of getting the best from every employee, and is strategically driven. Diversity management is aimed at utilising the diverse status quos to the benefit of the organisation.

2.10   Representativeness

As a concept, representativeness is closely related to the concept 'affirmative action' as affirmative action programmes are usually accompanied by guidelines on the representation of the various population groups in the public service. These guidelines frequently include targets or quotas to be met, as illustrated by the following statement in a report of the Public Service Commission (Republic of South Africa 2004: viii):

> The *quantitative analysis of AA* revealed that although a general improvement in representation of Blacks at national departments has taken place in middle management (56% Blacks as opposed to 44% Whites) and senior management (68% Blacks as opposed to 32% Whites), departments still have a long way to go to meet the 75% target set for Blacks for April 2005. As far as gender representation is concerned, women make up 56% of all employees within the Public Service whilst they only represent 30.5% at middle and senior management level.

Representativeness as a measuring criteria for the success of the transformation of the South African public service, is derived from the *White Paper on the Transformation of the Public Service* (Republic of South Africa 1995: s 10.1), which states that representativeness 'is one of the main foundations of a non-racist, non-sexist and democratic society, and as such is one of the key principles of the new Government'. Representativeness needs to be counterbalanced by the rights (Republic of South Africa 1996: chap. 2) of everyone in the country, as promoted and protected by those very same public institutions which are supposed to be characterised by their representativeness.

2.11   Historically disadvantaged and designated

The literature reviewed for this article shows that the concepts 'historically disadvantaged' and 'designated' groups or persons have different but related meanings. Authors do not use the two concepts simultaneously, but either the one or the other. Cao (2003) and Tinarelli (2000) are only two scholars who use the concepts 'designated groups' and 'designated persons'. The Employment Equity Act (Republic of South Africa 1998) defines the concepts 'designated groups' and 'designated employer'. In terms of the Employment Equity Act (Republic of South Africa 1998: s 1), 'designated groups' means 'black people, women and people with disabilities' – with 'black people' as a 'generic term which means Africans, Coloureds and Indians'. However, there seems to be disagreement on this view (Adam 2000: 48–55). Some scholars (Klug 1991; Mello 2000; Adam 2000) and official documents (Republic of South Africa 2001; Republic of South Africa 1993) appear to prefer the concepts 'historically disadvantaged groups' and 'previously disadvantaged groups' (Wessels 2005: 136).

If it is true that affirmative action is intended to discriminate in favour of members of the designated groups not because they are black or female, but because they are disadvantaged, it would be more correct and equitable to define the designated group for affirmative action purposes as 'individuals disadvantaged on the grounds of race, gender and disability' (Republic of South Africa 1997b: chap. 1; Mello 2000: 32). The implication of this definition would be that when candidates are considered for appointment or promotion, only those who can prove that they are disadvantaged on the grounds of race, gender or disability will be regarded as part of the designated group. This principle is reflected in the Preferential Procurement Regulations, 2001 (Republic of South Africa 2001: 1(h)) which restrict the meaning of the concept 'historically disadvantaged individual' within the context of procurement to specific people, dates and citizenship.

Although it may be true that the majority of members of the designated groups may be previously disadvantaged, it may also be true that designated groups include members who are not historically disadvantaged individuals (Wessels 2005: 137). Examples of such individuals are members of designated groups who obtained South African citizenship post-1994, or went to school or were born after 1994.

3   CONCLUSION: A CONCEPTUAL MODEL

Earlier, the distinct meanings of the various concepts were unpacked in order to serve as tools for solving the main guiding question of this article, namely whether

equality can be achieved for all members of the diverse South African society if representativeness is the most decisive criterion for public service employment. In order to answer this question, Wessels's (2005: 125-141) conceptual model will be adapted. This modified model (see Table 1) consists of four categories, namely ends, conditions/criteria, interventions, and subjects (the latter referring to the concepts describing the people at the receiving end of the transformation-related policy interventions).

Table 1: A framework of the main concepts used in the discourses on public service transformation

Concepts	End	Conditions/ Criteria	Subjects	Interventions
Equality	X			
Equal employment	X			
Equity		X		
Justice		X		
Merit		X		
Diversity		X		
Representativeness		X		
Designated groups or individuals			X	
Historically disadvantaged groups or individuals			X	
Transformation				X
Affirmative action				X
Diversity management				X

As a starting point, we focus on the category 'ends'. An important premise for this argument is that all the functions executed by the public service, and all the services rendered by it to society in terms of the lawful policies of the government, seek ultimately to create equality and equal opportunities for the entire society. These two concepts ('equality' and 'equal opportunities') are thus classified as part of the category 'ends' in the conceptual model (Table 1). Section 2 of this article also

identified three concepts referring to policy interventions, namely transformation, affirmative action, and diversity management. Transformation as a concept refers to the reshaping of the public service, and includes affirmative action as an intervention. Interventions such as affirmative action have direct implications for the appointment and promotion of public servants. These concepts are classified as part of the category 'interventions' in the conceptual model (Table 1).

Based on the foregoing, we can construct the following argument:

Premise one:	As all the functions executed by the public service and all the services rendered by it to society in terms of the lawful policies of the government, seek ultimately to create equality and equal opportunities for the entire society, and
Premise two:	As interventions such as affirmative action and diversity management aimed at transforming the public service (by breaking down barriers to equality and equal opportunities), are executed by the public service in terms of the lawful policies of the government,
Conclusion one:	Interventions such as affirmative action and diversity management seek ultimately to create equality and equal opportunities for the entire society.

The third category in the conceptual model makes provision for the concepts referring to the subjects of the policy interventions, namely the so-called designated groups or individuals, and historically disadvantaged groups or individuals. From the foregoing concepts, the following argument can be construed:

Premise three:	As the entire society has a right to equality and equal employment opportunities in the South African public service, and
Premise four:	As all the historically disadvantaged members of the designated groups are members of the entire society,
Conclusion two:	All the historically disadvantaged members of the designated groups have a right to equality and equal employment opportunities in the South African public service.

The fourth category in the conceptual model (see Table 1) makes provision for those concepts referring to conditions or criteria for transformation-related policy interventions. These conditions or criteria are equity, justice, merit, diversity and representativeness. This category of concepts brings us to the crux of this article,

and simultaneously poses the main theoretical question of this article: can any single criterion be a sufficient condition for transforming the public service to substantive equality, with equal employment opportunities for everyone? The importance of the question is especially evident, bearing in mind that official reports in South Africa – such as the Public Service Commission's *An Audit of Affirmative Action in the Public Service* (Republic of South Africa 2006) – have proclaimed representativeness (targets and quotas) a sufficient condition.

In the discussion on equality and equal employment opportunities as the ultimate end of public service transformation, equity and representativeness were identified as necessary conditions. It was also demonstrated that the criterion 'representativeness' cannot be mentioned without considering that another criterion, namely 'diversity' (which refers to the natural state of variety in society) has to be reflected in, inter alia, the representativeness of the public service. Another criterion is 'justice'. According to Rawls (1973), substantive equality and equal opportunities are not possible in an unjust institution or through unjust policy interventions. Justice is, therefore, also a necessary condition for equality and equal opportunities.

Not one of these criteria has been shown to be a sufficient condition for equality and equal opportunities, given that equality and equal opportunities are achieved through the removal of inequities by means of transformation-related policy interventions such as affirmative action programmes (see Conclusion one, above), and a lack of organisational diversity is managed by means of diversity management programmes. In order to be able to restore equity and representativeness or manage diversity, these interventions themselves will have to be fair and equitable, recognising, valuing and harnessing societal diversity. Merit, as a criterion, is closely related to the ability to execute the lawful policies of government in order to ensure the equal enjoyment of all rights and freedoms by everyone in the country. However, this does not render merit a sufficient condition for equality and equal opportunities. Merit is, nevertheless, a necessary condition.

Merit is distinguished from the other criteria in that it is possible to rank candidates or options from best to worst. Such a ranking makes it possible to select (in calculating all the necessary criteria) the second best candidate without compromising society's opportunity to equal enjoyment of rights and freedoms. Equity and justice do not cover a spectrum – something is either equitable or just, or not. Conversely, representativeness and diversity are the only two criteria which can be measured statistically. As with merit, it is possible to adapt the degree of representativeness in the process of selecting the most appropriate candidate for a position, without compromising society's opportunity to equal enjoyment of rights and freedoms.

From the discussion one can conclude that all the criteria or conditions included in the conceptual model (Table 1) are necessary conditions for equality or equal opportunities. Not one of them – and specifically not only representativeness – is a sufficient condition for equality and equal opportunities. This implies that equality and equal opportunities cannot be achieved for all members of the diverse South African society, if representativeness is regarded as a sufficient condition for public service employment.

NOTE

1. Based on a paper read at the Seventh International Conference on Diversity in Organisations, Communities and Nations, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 3–6 July 2007.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adam, K. 2000. Affirmative action and popular perceptions: the case of South Africa. *Culture and Society* 37(2): 48–55.

Auluck, R. 2001. The management of diversity: the UK civil service journey continues. In *Managing diversity in civil service*, United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNESA) and the International Institute of Administrative Sciences (IIAS), 59–80. Amsterdam: IOS Press.

Beauchamp, T.L. and L. Walters, eds. 1994. *Contemporary issues in bioethics*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Brand, H.E. and S. Stoltz. 2001. An analysis of affirmative action in a South African Public Sector Department. *South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences* (SAJEMS) 4(1): 118–132.

Caiden, N.J. and G.E. Caiden. 2001. Strategies for meeting the challenges of diversity management in the civil service. In *Managing diversity in civil service*, United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNESA) and the International Institute of Administrative Sciences (IIAS), 123–136. Amsterdam: IOS Press.

Cao, L. 2003. The Diaspora of ethnic economies: beyond the pale? *William and Mary Law Review* 44(4): 152.

Foldy, E.G. 2004. Learning from diversity: a theoretical exploration. *Public Administration Review* 64(5): 529–538.

Fox, W. and I.H. Meyer. 1995. *Public Administration Dictionary*. Cape Town: Juta & Co.

Fraser-Moleketi, G. 2001. Tackling diversity. In *Managing diversity in the civil service*, United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNESA) and the International Institute of Administrative Sciences (IIAS), 31–40. Amsterdam: IOS Press. Amsterdam: IOS Press.

Hodges-Aeberhard, J. 1999. Affirmative action in employment: recent court approaches to a difficult concept. *International Labour Review* 138(3): 247.

Klug, H. 1991. Rethinking affirmative action in a non-racial democracy. *South African Journal on Human Rights* 7: 317–333.

Kruger, D.J.F. and P.H. Moiler. 2000. Affirmative action within local authorities: a conceptual and contextual evaluation. *Society in Transition* 31(1): 69–81.

Mabokela, R.O. 2000. We cannot find qualified blacks: faculty diversification programmes at South African universities. *Comparative Education* 36(1): 95–112.

Mello, D.M. 2000. An analysis of the implementation of affirmative action in the South African public sector. *Politeia* 19(1): 31–45.

Ospina, S. 2001. Managing diversity in civil service: a conceptual framework for public organizations. In *Managing diversity in civil service*, United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNESA) and the International Institute of Administrative Sciences (IIAS), 11–30. Amsterdam: IOS Press. Amsterdam: IOS Press.

Pauw, J.C. 1999. The concept public administration. In *Reflective Public Administration: views from the South*, ed. J.S. Wessels and J.C. Pauw, 9–25. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

Pitts, D.W. 2005. Diversity, representation, and performance: evidence about race and ethnicity in public organizations. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 15: 615–631.

Rawls, J. 1973. *A theory of justice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Republic of South Africa. 1995. *White Paper on the Transformation of Public Service*. http://www.info.gov.za/whitepapers/1995/transformation.htm#1 (accessed 29 March 2007).

Republic of South Africa. 1996. *The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996*. As adopted on 8 May 1996 and amended on 11 October 1996 by the Constitutional Assembly. Pretoria: Government Printer.

Republic of South Africa. 1997a. *White Paper on Human Resource Management in the Public Service*, 1997. Pretoria: Government Printer.

Republic of South Africa. 1997b. *A Conceptual Framework for Affirmative Action and the Management of Diversity in the Public Service*. Green Paper. Pretoria: Department of Public Service and Administration.

Republic of South Africa. 1998. Employment Equity Act, 55 of 1998. *Government Gazette* No. 19370 of 19 October 1998. Pretoria: Government Printer.

Republic of South Africa. 2000. *Report on State of Representativeness in the Public Service*. Pretoria: Public Service Commission.

Republic of South Africa. 2001. *Preferential Procurement Regulations*, 2001 (accessed 31 January 2005).

Republic of South Africa. 2004. *Demographical and Statistical Overview: 1994–2004*. Pretoria: Department of Social Development. http://www.population.gov.za (accessed 31 January 2005).

Republic of South Africa. 2006. *An audit of affirmative action in the public service*. Pretoria: Public Service Commission.

Rice, M.F. 2001. The need for teaching diversity and representativeness in university Public Administration Education and Professional Public Service Training Programmes in sub-Saharan Africa. In *Managing diversity in civil service*, United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNESA) and the International Institute of Administrative Sciences (IIAS), 99–110. Amsterdam: IOS Press.

Rice, M.F. and D.M. Arekere. 2005. Workforce diversity initiatives and best practices in business and governmental organizations. In *Diversity and Public Administration: theory, issues, and perspectives*, ed. M.F. Rice. New York: M.E. Sharpe.

Stacey, R. 2003. 'We, the people': the relationship between the South African Constitution and the ANC's transformation policies. *Politikon* 30(2): 133–148.

Tinarelli, S. 2000. *Employers' guide to the Employment Equity Act*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Veldtman, S. 2001. Gender discrimination in the SANDF: women as combat soldiers in the South African Army, with reference to the Western Province Command. M.A. dissertation. Stellenbosch: University of Stellenbosch.

Wagner, D. 1998. Race-based programs are on the defensive. *Race Discrimination: Laws, Regulations and Rules* 13(9): 296.

Wessels, J.S. 2005. Equal employment opportunities: a conceptual puzzle. *Politeia* 24(2): 125–141.