“The impact of management practices on job satisfaction: insights from a state-owned institution”

AUTHORS	Molefe J. Maleka Edward M. Rankhumise

ARTICLE INFO	Molefe J. Maleka and Edward M. Rankhumise (2014). The impact of management practices on job satisfaction: insights from a state-owned institution. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, *12*(4)
RELEASED ON	Monday, 15 December 2014
JOURNAL	"Problems and Perspectives in Management"
FOUNDER	LLC “Consulting Publishing Company “Business Perspectives”

NUMBER OF REFERENCES	NUMBER OF FIGURES	NUMBER OF TABLES
0	0	0

© The author(s) 2026. This publication is an open access article.

BUSINESS PERSPECTIVES

businessperspectives.org

Molefe J. Maleka (South Africa), Edward M. Rankhumise (South Africa)

The impact of management practices on job satisfaction: insights from a state-owned institution

Abstract

The aim of this study is to investigate the impact of management practices on job satisfaction. The literature shows that employers in the private sector are struggling to retain black employees, and implementation of the Employment Equity Act (EEA) is moving at a slow pace in this sector. At the time of the study, there is a dearth of literature on the impact of management practices on job satisfaction in the South African context, especially research soliciting employees' views about EEA implementation and their sexual harassment experiences. In this study, the researchers adopted a qualitative research approach, using a state-owned institution as a case study. The interview protocol is developed from the literature, and data are collected from sixteen participants. The findings indicate that there are challenges with regard to management practices, including the implementation of affirmative action, with which participants are not happy. In addition, there are clear cases of sexual harassment in the institution, and most of all, top management is adopting a bureaucratic management style. This study contributes to the body of knowledge in relation to the factors that lead to the dissatisfaction of employees, since it reveals that if the management practices identified above are not properly addressed by the management of the state-owned institution in question, it would find it difficult to retain employees and keep them satisfied.

Keywords: affirmative action, bureaucracy, dissatisfaction, management practice.
JEL Classification: M54.

Introduction

In South Africa, from the early 1990s until 1994, labor relations legislation gave white males preferential treatment and excluded other racial groups and women from technical and managerial positions (Bendix, 2010). In the mining industry, white males were recruited from overseas countries such as Australia, the United Kingdom and Germany, and they were hired as technicians (Nel, Kirsten, Swanepoel, Erasmus & Poisat, 2012). Through acts such as the Industrial Conciliation Act of 1924, these white skilled workers enjoyed exclusive bargaining and organizational rights (Grossett & Venter, 1998). In 1953, through the recommendations of the Botha Commission, the Black Labor Act no 48, which had minimal organizational rights, was promulgated. This meant that there were two legislative frameworks governing white and black employees in the workplace (Swanepoel & Slabbert, 2012). The Industrial Conciliation Act of 1956 contained a clause which did not recognize blacks as "employees" and restricted "job reservation" to white workers (Du Toit, Bosch, Winfrey, Giles, Bosch & Rossouw, 2006, pp. 7-8). White unions were recognized by mining employers (Levy & Venter, 2011) and could bargain for higher wages, exclusive skills development interventions and preferential recruitment of members into technical skills and managerial positions (Bendix, 2010). In contrast, black workers were hired as cheap labor and were not developed, unlike their white counterparts, and they were paid meagre wages (Finnemore, 2009).

After the 1994 democratic elections, the labor legislation that gave bargaining and appointment preference to white males was abolished, and in 1995, the Labor Relation Act no 66 was implemented, which recognized every worker as an employee and gave organizational rights to employees, irrespective of their skill level and race (Basson, Christianson, Dekker, Garders, le Roux, Mischke & Strydoml, 2009). In 1996, the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa was adopted by Parliament, and section 23 of this Constitution focuses on labor practices, while section 9 deals with equality (van Niekerk, Christianson, McGregor, Smith & van Eck, 2012). In line with the latter, the Employment Equity Act no 55 of 1998 was promulgated, and its purpose was to give non-white employees equal opportunity to be appointed in technical and managerial positions, even if they are not as experienced as their white male counterparts (McGregor, Dekker, Budeli, Manamela & Tshoose, 2012).

Despite the EEA being legislated, the Commission of Employment Equity (2014) reports show that white males are over-represented in top management positions in the private sector. Similarly, another study found that few women were appointed into executive positions in the companies that are listed on the Johannesburg Stock Exchange (van Zyl, 2009). On the other hand, data shows that the EEA has been implemented in the public sector, especially in government departments and parastatals (Anstey, 2006).

Implementing EEA has brought challenges to workplaces. One workplace struggled to retain non-

© Molefe J. Maleka, Edward M. Rankhumise, 2014.

white males because of a lack of coaching, and white managers were bureaucratic or hostile towards them (Booysen, 2009). It was found that EEA might have undesirable results, especially if black and female managers were not appointed on merit, mentored (Maleka, 2012) and trained (Rankhumise & Netswera, 2010). Scholars found that women in lower level positions are the main targets of sexual harassment by both supervisors and colleagues (Robbins, Judge, Odendaal & Roodt, 2009). Robbins and Judge (2011, p. 463) observed that employees "who are sexually harassed report lower job satisfaction and diminished organizational commitment", and are emotionally traumatized and unproductive. The definition of sexual harassment implies that it can be manifested in different ways, and research shows that it is mainly men in senior positions who use their power to sexually harass female employees, and that those who have been abused are dissatisfied and suffer psychologically as a result of this harassment.

The literature shows that in the South African public sector, EEA has been implemented in public institutions, but the factors that contribute to employees' dissatisfaction appear to be under-researched in South Africa. In view of this research gap, the researchers wanted to determine employees' views about implementing EEA and explore their experiences with regard to sexual harassment. While the South African literature seems to suggest that labor legislation and gender issues play a role in employee dissatisfaction, this is not based on employee dissatisfaction theory (i.e. Taylorism, human relations or bureaucracy). As a point of reference, the researchers reviewed literature on bureaucracy, in order to provide a theoretical framework for this study.

Bureaucratic management practice. In the 1950s, a management practice known as bureaucracy emerged (Lounsbury & Carberry, 2005). Bureaucracy is defined as a "component of formal organization that uses rules and hierarchical ranking to achieve efficiency" (Schaefer, 2008 p. 240). With the bureaucratic management practice, employees are expected to follow certain procedures when they execute tasks, and are reprimanded when they deviate from this (Ritzer, 2004). Bureaucracy is widely accepted in the US and Europe, and some of its practices are still applied in the workplace today (Babbie, 2010).

Since its conceptualization by Webber, bureaucratic management practices have been criticized for many reasons. They were blamed for creating impersonal managers (Fineman, Sims & Gabriel, 2010; Meier & O'Toole Jr., 2006; Watson, 2012) who perpetuate a hostile or bureaucratic culture (John & Saks, 2011). Furthermore, in a bureaucratic organization, it takes time to execute tasks (Du Brin, 2007) and gender imbalance is high (Babbie, 2010).

Research has shown that the use of abusive supervision indicates that supervisors or managers deliberately engage in mistreatment of their subordinates to achieve organizational goals, despite this behavior causing personal harm (Tepper, 2000). These managers indulge in these practices in order to achieve higher performance and, at times, to give a signal to employees that laziness and incompetence are not acceptable.

Since women are not appointed in senior management positions, they are susceptible to unfair labor practices such as sexual harassment (Watson, 2012). In some instances, it was found that in a bureaucratic organization, non-merit recruitment and appointing practices are evident (Bratton et al., 2010).

Lok and Crawford (2004) explain that organizational and job satisfaction has received attention in many organizations. This practice is imminent due to the fact that when employees are dissatisfied at work, they will certainly be less committed to their organizations and will ultimately look for other opportunities where they can derive happiness. Based on the aforementioned arguments on bureaucratic management practices, it can be surmised that the following are the main management practices causing employee dissatisfaction in a bureaucratic organization: non-merit recruitment and appointment practices, sexual harassment, inconsistent practices in decision making, and a bureaucratic culture.

Appointment practices. One of the bureaucratic management practices that have been identified as a source of employees' dissatisfaction is the issue of non-merit recruitments and appointments. Scholars have found that in some workplaces, appointments were not based on merit in terms of qualifications, experience and capabilities. This has been used as a scapegoat in the quest for implementing affirmative action. The appointments are in this case based on attending golf outings, where decisions are made regarding who is appointed (Bratton et al., 2010). Others have found that even though women had appropriate qualifications and experience, they were not appointed into top management positions (Alvesson & Due Billing, 2009; den Dulk & van Doorne-Huiskes, 2007; Edwards & Wajcman, 2005; Jacobsen, 2007; Vallas et al., 2009) because workplaces are mostly patriarchal (Schaefer, 2008). It has been found that managers who were appointed because of "old boys" club criteria were unkind,

ruthless and unapproachable (Coleman, 2007). As a result, their subordinates suffered from low morale (Bews & Uys, 2002; Dannhauser, 2007). Research has shown that even when organizations appoint employees based on merit and implement affirmative action, some employees were not satisfied (Booysen, 2007).

Bureaucratic culture. A bureaucratic culture undermines unity between employees and managers (Giddens, 2006). This statement confirms what Townsend (2007) and Lewis and Cooper (2005) found, namely that knowledge workers were dissatisfied because they worked for bureaucratic managers who did not trust them and therefore supervised them closely. As a result, they did not share valuable and updated information with employees (McShane & von Glinow, 2005). In a bureaucratic culture, employee dissatisfaction can manifest itself in several ways – for example, by fiddling (Noon & Blyton, 2007) or by not taking instructions from managers (Bratton et al., 2010). A bureaucratic culture can create tension in the workplace, leading to depression (Gala & Fitter, 2002) and a high absenteeism rate (Warr, 2007).

In a bureaucratic organization, bullying seems to be vertical in most cases (Watson, 2012). This, however, is characterized by employees being given lower performance management scores, and if they question these scores, they are isolated and scolded by their superiors (Maleka, 2012). Another study indicated that a bullying manager coerced an employee to join him on Facebook, so that the manager could send her tasks online, and he also called her repeatedly on her cell phone to question her whereabouts (Robbins & Judge, 2011). Even though some employees accept being bullied, others may either confront their manager or lodge a grievance (Watson, 2012).

The factors discussed above could lead to employees' dissatisfaction at work, and this in turn will result in them being less committed to their work responsibilities, and more inclined to seek other opportunities so that they can resign. Should they fail to quit, they may withdraw emotionally from the organization (Lok & Crawford, 2004). Research has shown that leadership style contributes significantly to the success or failure of organizations and can either motivate or discourage employees. Ordinarily, leadership style tends to be based on the position and the authority associated with it. It is notable that other organizations, particularly those in Asia, are mostly ruled by persons rather than by law. In other words, managers dominate these organizations and are usually guilty of things such bullying, sexual harassment and so forth.

The purpose of this study is therefore to determine how employees perceive management practices that influence performance and the most important factors which positively or negatively affect them in the execution of their duties.

1. Research methodology

1.1. Research design. This study adopted a case study design. A case study is a research design which enables the researcher to collect data from different sources (Naumes & Naumes, 2012; Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2012; Yin, 2009). The primary purpose of case studies is to understand something that is unique to the groups or individuals, by collecting rich data from these individuals (Creswell, 2012). De Vos, Strydom, Fouche and Delport (2011) further explain that with a case study design, researchers are interested in the meaning that the subjects give to their life experiences, in order to immerse themselves in the activities of a single or small number of people, so as to obtain an intimate understanding of their social world.

For the purpose of this study, a state-owned institution (SOI) served as a case study, in order to determine how employees perceived the management practices within the institution. As the study used a qualitative methodology, the guiding principle was to understand the experiences of employees with regard to the management practices implemented by top management.

1.2. Population and method for the selection of participants. The population for this study consisted of employees in a SOI. Sixteen participants were purposefully selected, with the assistance of the industrial relations practitioner, to participate in the study. Of the sixteen participants, eight (n = 8) participated in the face-to-face interviews that were conducted, while the rest (n = 8) of the participants took part in the survey, which consisted of open-ended questions. The reason for having two groups of participants was to obtain richer data and enable a comparison to be made in terms of responses in relation to the aspects associated with management practices within a SOI. Purposive sampling was employed for this study, as the researchers believed that sampled participants possessed the relevant experience, knowledge and attributes to serve the purpose of the study, and that their responses would yield the required information for achieving the objectives of the study. The selection of participants was based mainly on their understanding of the subject matter under investigation, and on who would most benefit the study (Creswell, 2012).

1.3. Data collection. As previously indicated, primary data were collected using two research instruments, the first of which was the interview guide for face-to-face interviews. The reason for using face-to-face interviews as a data collection strategy was in order to understand the experiences of participants and the meaning that they attached to these experiences (De Vos et al., 2012). This enables the researcher and participants to explore the key issues related to the matter under investigation. The advantage of using face-to-face interviews was that they allowed the researcher to probe further when responses needed more clarity or further information was required. The second instrument was the online survey questionnaire, which consisted of predominantly open-ended questions. The researchers opted to use this data collection strategy in order to allow unusual responses to be elicited and to enable participants to answer in the same manner as those foisted on them by structured choices. This instrument also enabled the researchers to determine the participants' levels of knowledge and understanding of the phenomenon under investigation (Bryman, 2012).

1.4. Trustworthiness. In order to ensure the trustworthiness of data in this study, the guidelines provided by Lincoln and Guba (1985) were followed. The researchers focused on the following elements:

1.4.1. Credibility. Data from the face-to-face interviews and open-ended questionnaire were reported verbatim. Data was collected from three sources: face-to-face interviews, online survey and SOI Annual Reports. Collecting data from multiple sources is known as triangulation (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Yin, 2009). With participants' verbal consent, interviews were recorded using a digital recorder.

1.4.2. Transferability. In order to enhance transferability, the researcher, in the results section, provided a detailed description of bureaucratic management practices that contribute to employee dissatisfaction.

1.4.3. Dependability. In this case study, the procedure followed to gather data was explained in the data collection section. Explaining the research protocol or procedure followed by the researcher to collect data is vital, since it can be used by other researchers to replicate the study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

1.4.4. Confirmability. Participants were afforded enough opportunity to verify the accuracy of collected data, as detailed in the transcripts. Data analysis was performed by the first researcher and an independent coder was used to verify the completed analysis. After verification, a discussion was held to agree on the main themes and sub-themes that emerged during data analysis.

1.5. Data analysis. The field notes and audio-taped interviews were transcribed verbatim by the researchers. In proceeding with an analysis of the data, the researchers and co-coder analyzed the data independently using Tesch's data reduction method (Creswell, 2009) of open-coding. Audiotapes were listened to once and then listened to for a second time. The field notes were then read in order to understand the data properly and to get a sense of the bigger picture. Topics were abbreviated as codes, and these were then written next to the appropriate clusters of the text. The related topics were grouped to reduce sub-themes to a manageable number of themes. A final decision regarding the wording for *topics* was then undertaken to turn these into categories (Creswell, 2009). After the data analysis was completed, the researchers and co-coder met to discuss the analysis and agree on significant emerging themes.

1.6. Ethical considerations. Prior to data collection, permission was obtained from the SOI to conduct the study. In ensuring anonymity, the researchers instructed the participants not to use their user names and passwords when they clicked on the link where they had to open the online survey. Once they had submitted their responses, these were transferred to an external server, and could not be linked and traced back to them. In order to safeguard the identities of the participants, only what they said was recorded, and noone was forced to participate in this study.

2. Findings

The discussion in this article was organized in accordance with the main themes that emerged during the analyses, namely management practices, sexual harassment, bullying and a bureaucratic workplace culture. The participants in this study provided an interesting and important account of their experiences and the challenges that influence their job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. The following section discusses and provides justification for the themes, by presenting verbatim statements from the respondents. The findings are discussed in accordance with the themes which were identified.

3. Themes that emerged

As previously stipulated, data in this study were collected through face-to-face interviews, an online survey questionnaire and SOI Annual Reports. The themes and sub-themes that emerged from open coding are indicated in Table 1 below, in order to clearly illustrate the main themes as well as sub-themes.

Table 1. Themes and sub-themes

Theme	Sub-theme
Appointment practices	Affirmative action
	Experience vs. qualifications
	Experience, qualifications and affirmative action
Sexual harassment	Different forms of sexual harassment
	Mental traumatization
	Outcome of the sexual harassment case
Bureaucratic workplace culture	Knowing the right people at the top
	Isolation
	Bullying instead of being treated with respect

3.1. Appointment practices. In the Annual Report, it was evident that the SOI appointments were in line with the Employment Equity Act no. 55 of 1998. For example, at middle management level, one black and one colored male manager were appointed. At the junior and supervisory level, two black females and three black males were appointed. Out of 618 appointments that were made at the semi-skilled level, only five white female employees were appointed, and this is in line with the provisions of the Employment Equity Act. The participants were asked the following question: Which recruitment factor do you think should be used to appoint employees? The following sub-themes regarding appointment practices emerged from the data:

3.2. Affirmative action. Participants posited that the AA policy was the only criterion used for recruiting and making appointments, and expressed the following view: *"… Both qualifications and skills are essential to employment. Not AA…"*. One participant, who wanted recruitment and appointment to be based on merit, rather than AA, said the following: *"… Ensure that the correct people are appointed in the jobs. People must be appointed on merit; it should not always be on AA..."*: *"… The recruitment policy should no longer consider what color the applicant is, rather that they can do the job…"*

It is notable from the responses that the participants were not happy about the manner in which appointments were made in their environment. Importantly, the sentiments expressed were that incumbents should be appointed on merit, not based on AA principles and the EEA.

3.3. Experience vs. qualification. It emerged that participants were dissatisfied with the SOI hiring inexperienced people with qualifications. This is what one of the participants had to say: *"…I have seen first-hand, lots of officials with nice fancy degrees, but lacking of experience, they tend to struggle with basic things, and we with experience who can do the job, and have been doing it for a long time, gets treated as if you don't know anything – university of life is a skill…"*. Similarly, another participant alluded to the fact that *"experience is better than all, we once had a situation where a person was appointed to come and supervise staff and only to find that the staff has to teach him the job first and that to me didn't make sense; and because some people are just certificate holders and don't know how to do the job..."*.

It is notable that participants were of the view that recruitment should be based on experience, and that qualifications should be regarded as an additional requirement. This essentially means that experience should be a key recruitment imperative, whereas qualifications and affirmative action should be regarded as secondary requirements.

3.4. Experience, qualifications and affirmative action. Participants said that they would be satisfied if experience, qualifications and AA policy were used as appointment and recruitment criteria because of the following reasons: *"... All are important and critical criteria - a combination of these aspects, well prepared and implemented, will result in attaining the correct skills. All factors are important, because if qualifications are the only element used, experienced people with the job will be left out; The combination of the points above will improve service delivery, because if the three are used, you get the best candidate suitable for the job whilst adhering to organizational policies..."*.

Although this is the preference of the participants, this measure will render the aims of EEA and AA fruitless. In this context, government's desire to promote equity and AA should be fulfilled. The implementation of EE and AA, as indicated by the participants, might, however, perpetuate some discourse.

4. Sexual harassment

The participants were asked the following question: In the past six months, have you experienced sexual harassment? Participants indicated that they had experienced sexual harassment. The following sub-themes regarding sexual harassment emerged from the data:

4.1. Mental traumatisation. One participant, who had experienced sexual harassment, when being interviewed about this experience, said the following: *"…The senior manager was sending me pornographic emails. As time went on, he would start talking about work and about me and him having a relationship…"*. With further probing, it became apparent that the harassed participant was

psychologically affected and went to the workplace wellness centre: *"…When I had a high stress level during the hearing for the grievance I had lodged, there was a lot of gossip and this and that, and people started blaming me for everything. X* [the name of the wellness staff member was mentioned] *got me a psychologist who could help me with depression and stress. The psychologist helped me to be stronger and to overcome my anger…".*

4.2. Outcome of the sexual harassment case. The participant who was sexually harassed was not satisfied with the outcome of the case, and said the following: *"…I mean, by moving a person from a Level 13 to a Level 12, you're not teaching that person anything. You're seriously not teaching that person anything. If* [the SOI] *wanted the outcome to be harsh, it should have demoted that person to a Level 10. Let him not have an allowance, let him have nothing, so that he can see ... you know what I did is wrong...".* The participant paused, her eyes filled with tears, and went on to say: *"…The other thing is that they did not tell us whether or not this guy is going for counselling or anything, because for me and other people, honestly, that man really needs help. What are the chances* [he might not sexually harass another female employee]*? Yes, they have communicated with us about the sanction, but at the end of the day, how do they ensure that it will not happen again? What kind of help are they giving him? He needs help! When I heard that he was given the outcome, hell it made me angry yesterday – I'm not going to lie..."*

From the analysis, it is evident that no drastic measures are being taken to root out sexual harassment in the organisation in question. Strong disciplinary measures should be taken against the perpetrators, in order to ensure that there is no recurrence of such acts.

5. Bureaucratic workplace culture

In the SOI's Annual Report, the workplace culture was described as "zero tolerance for grant fraud of any nature"; "conducive to high standards, ethical conduct and improved service delivery"; and "commitment, professionalism and discipline." The participants were asked the following question: How would you describe the workplace culture? The following sub-themes regarding the bureaucratic workplace culture emerged from the data:

5.1. Knowing the right people at the top. One participant, who was dissatisfied about the idea of knowing the right people at the top, said the following: *"...The other thing is that when democracy comes, there are people who are comrades that are appointed in higher positions and they are not experienced. This has a negative impact on the service delivery...".* Another participant lamented that favoritism was rife and that those who were favored benefited: *"... Favoritism, seniors bringing in friends and appointing them in high positions, and overlooking the current staff due for promotion...".* Similarly, another participant expressed the following view: *"… Jobs given to friends and not to the most competent candidate...".* It can be deduced from the responses by the participants that political connection plays a role in the appointment of people. Notably, if one does not know people in the upper echelons, it is unlikely that one will get a position or promotion, even though one qualifies for such within the organization.

5.2. Isolation. A participant who felt isolated responded by saying: *"... People work in groups, and if you are not one of their groups they are going to make sure that they make your life miserable so that you can eventually resign. I think in labor relations, it is called constructive dismissal. If you do not speak his language from the area from when where he comes from you're victimized and recognized…".* Another isolated participant said that: *"…There are units that are preferred by department managers whereby some units are stripped and staff transferred to their preferred units. Now employees are isolated and redundant without anything to do as no proper study was conducted, decisions are just made because people are power hungry..."*

It is evident from the findings that employees and managers work in cliques or social groups. In general, this practice might not be conducive to running an effective organization, as most matters will be pre-discussed within clique groups.

5.3. Bullying instead of being treated with respect. The participants were asked the following question: Have you been bullied at your workstation? Instead of employees being treated with respect, it was found that some were bullied. One of the participants who was bullied during his performance appraisal responded by saying: *"…During performance appraisal a manager gives you ones and twos. When you try and find out why I was given the mark, the manager told me that he does not to speak to juniors because he's a manager. Not only me, but all the colleagues are working with, experienced that abuse...".* Another participant who was bullied said the following: *"…I was given a written warning because I was accused of talking too much. The lady from IR* [Industrial Relations] *who chaired the inquiry could see what kind of the manager I worked for. After the hearing, she told her manager that the written warning was unfair, her senior manager who was a pal to my senior manager told her to keep quiet…".* A

participant who was bullied and lodged a grievance said the following: *"... I had a chat with my supervisor to establish why he was bullying because I wanted to know why he was doing that and then filled in the grievance form…".*

It is evident that bullying was vertical, whereby junior employees were bullied by their superiors. Of concern was the fact that the IR senior manager was not objective, but instead colluded with the managers who bullied. Other employees exercised their organizational rights and lodged a grievance against a bullying manager.

Discussion

The objective of the study was to describe bureaucratic management practices that contribute to employee dissatisfaction, with specific reference to non-merit recruitment practices, sexual harassment and a bureaucratic culture.

One of the inherent limitations of this case study is that its results cannot be generalized, because the findings are unique to the participants' workplace. Another limitation is that this study was not longitudinal, and it would have given a clearer understanding of how bureaucratic practices cause employee dissatisfaction if it had been conducted over a longer period. In addition, this study only focused on three themes: non-merit recruitment and appointment practices, sexual harassment and a bureaucratic workplace culture. Despite these limitations, this paper made a contribution by providing an understanding of how bureaucratic management practices cause employee dissatisfaction, especially in the area of SOIs, where there appears to be a dearth of such research.

Suggestions for future research and recommendations to management and leadership

Since this study focused on management practices, further research is needed, particularly in the form of a survey which covers the entire workforce of SOI.

The following recommendations can be made:

- Current appointment and recruitment processes should be implemented in a participatory, transparent and fair manner;
- There should be consistent monitoring to ensure that the recruitment and selection policy is implemented fairly, without prejudicing other employees;
- A change management intervention should be implemented to instill a sense of unity, which will maximize harmony between managers and employees; and
- An ongoing awareness campaign should be implemented to make employees aware of the channels to follow when they are bullied and/or sexually abused.

Conclusion

In this study, it was found that even though the workplace implemented employment equity, there were non-merit practices that caused employee dissatisfaction. This finding is similar to the findings in the literature, where it was found that non-merit recruitment practices (i.e. experience and qualifications) aggrieved employees. The case study findings show that merit does not include experience and qualifications, but must include AA.

Previous studies have also highlighted the dissatisfaction of women who were subjected to sexual harassment by managers. This case study also revealed that lower level female employees were more likely to suffer sexual harassment at the hands of male managers. Similarly, it was found that sexually harassed women themselves were blamed, rather than the harassers. It was found that victims of sexual harassment were traumatized and received help from the psychologist in the SOI's Wellness Department.

There are different ways in which a bureaucratic culture manifests itself. This case study revealed that due to bureaucratic management practices, employees were isolated, those who had allies in top management benefited by being appointed into managerial positions, and others were given lower performance scores. Those who did not have allies in top management positions were bullied instead of being treated with respect. Therefore, in workplaces where a bureaucratic culture is prevalent, there appears to be little unity between employees and managers.

In conclusion, the case study findings have implications for human resource leaders and managers, in that they will struggle to retain employees and keep them satisfied if bureaucratic management practices such as appointment practices, sexual harassment and a bureaucratic culture are not adequately addressed.

References

1. Alvesson, M. & Due Billing, Y. (2009). *Understanding Gender and Organizations*, California, SAGE Publications.
2. Anstey, M. (2006). *Managing Change Negotiating Conflict* (3rd ed.), Cape Town, Juta and Co.
3. Babbie, E. (2010). *The practice of social research* (11th ed.), Belmont, Wadsworth.

4. Basson, A.C., Christianson, M.A., Dekker, A., Garbers, C., Le Roux, P.A.K., Mischke, C. & Strydom, E.M.L. (2009). *Essential Labour Law* (5th ed.), Cape Town, Labour Law Publications.
5. Bendix, S. (2010). *Industrial Relations In The New South Africa* (5th ed.), Kenwyn, Juta and Co.
6. Bews, N. & Uys, T. (2002). The impact of organizational restructuring on perceptions of trustworthiness, *South African Journal in Industrial Sociology*, 28 (4), pp. 21-28.
7. Booysen, L. (2007). Barriers to employment equity implementation and retention of blacks in management in South Africa, *South African Journal of Labour Relations*, 31 (4), pp. 47-71.
8. Bratton, J., Sawchuk, P., Forshaw, C., Callinan, M. & Corbett, M. (2010). *Work and Organizational Behaviour* (2nd ed.), New York, Palgrave MacMillan.
9. Bryman, A. (2012). *Social Research Methods* (4th ed.), Cape Town, Oxford University Press.
10. Castro, M.L. & Martins, N. (2010). The relationship between organisational climate and employee satisfaction in a South African information and technology organisation, *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 36, pp. 1-9.
11. Coleman, D. (2007). *Social Intelligence: The New Science of Human Relationship*, London, Arrow Books.
12. Commission of Employment Equity (2014). *14th Commission of Employment Equity Annual Report*, Pretoria, Government Printers.
13. Creswell, J.W. (2009). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.), Thousand Oaks, Sage.
14. Creswell, J. (2012). *Educational research: planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.), New York, Pearson.
15. Dannhauser, Z. (2007). *The relationship between servant leadership, follower, trust, team commitment and unit effectiveness*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Stellenbosch.
16. Den Dulk, L. & van Doorne-Huiskes, D. (2007). Social Policy in Europe: Its Impact and Work, in *Women, Men, Work and Family in Europe*, edited by Rosemary Crompton, Suzan Lewis and Clark Lyonette, Houndsmills, Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 35-57.
17. Dessler, G. (2011). *Human Resource Management* (10th ed.), Harlow, Pearson Education Limited.
18. De Vos, A.S., Strydom, H., Fouche, C.B. and Delport, C.S.L. (2011). *Research at grass roots: for the social sciences and human service professionals* (4th ed.), Pretoria, Van Schaik Publishers.
19. Du Brin, A.J. (2007). *Fundamentals of Organizational Behaviour* (4th ed.), United States, Thompson South-Western.
20. Du Toit, D., Bosch, D., Woolfrey, D., Godfrey, S., Rossouw, J., Christe, S., Cooper, C., Giles, G. & Bosch, C. (2006). *Labour Relations Law. A Comprehensive Guide* (5th ed.), Durban, LexisNexis Butterworths.
21. Edwards, P. & Wajcman, J. (2005). *The politics of working life*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
22. Fineman, S., Sims, D. & Gabriel, Y. (2010). *Organizing and organizations* (4th ed.), London, SAGE Publishers.
23. Finnemore, M. (2009). *Introduction to labour relations* (10th ed.), Cape Town, Lexis Nexis Butterworths.
24. Gala, B. & Fitter, F. (2002). *Working in the dark: keeping your job while dealing with depression*, Minnesota, Hazelden.
25. Giddens, A. (2006). *Sociology* (5th ed.), Cambridge, Polity Press.
26. Grosset, M. & Venter, R. (1998). *Labour Relations in South Africa. A Comprehensive Guide for Managers and Practitioners*, Johannesburg, International Thompson Publishing (Southern Africa) Pty Ltd.
27. Heilman, M.E. (2001). Descriptions and Prescription: How Gender Stereotypes Prevent Women's Ascent Up the Organizational Ladder, *Journal of Social Issues*, 57 (4), pp. 657-674.
28. Jacobsen, J.P. (2007). *The economics of gender* (3rd ed.), Oxford, Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
29. John, G. & Saks, A. (2011). *Organizational Behaviour: Understanding and Managing Life at Work* (6th ed.), Toronto, Pearson Education Canada, Inc.
30. Lewis, S. & Cooper, C.L. (2005). *Work-Life Integration: Case Studies of Organizational Change*, Hoboken, John Wiley and Sons Ltd.
31. Lincoln, Y.S. & Guba, E.A. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*, Beverly Hills, Sage.
32. Lok, P. & Crawford, J. (2004). The Effect of Organisational Culture and Leadership Style on Job Satisfaction and Organisational Commitment: A Cross-national Comparison, *Journal of Management Development*, 23 (4), pp. 321-338.
33. Lounsbury, M. & Carberry, E.J. (2005). From King to Court Jester? Weber's Fall from Grace in Organizational Theory, *Organization Studies*, 26 (4), pp. 501-525.
34. Macionis, J.J. & Plummer, K. (2007). *Sociology: a global introduction*, London: Pearson Education Limited.
35. Maleka, M.J. (2012). *An in-depth investigation of factors contributing to employee dissatisfaction at Business Application Solution Centre (BASC), Eskom*, Doctoral Dissertation, University of South Africa.
36. McDonald, P. & Dear, K. (2008). The incidence and patterns of discrimination and harassment affecting working women in Australia, *Women's Studies Journal*, (22) 1.
37. McGregor, M., Dekker, A.H., Budeli, M., Manamela, T.E. & Tshoose, C.I. (2012). *Labour Law Rules?* Cape Town, Siber Ink CC.
38. McShane, S.L. & Von Glinow, M.A. (2005). *Organizational Behaviour: Emerging Realities For The Workplace Revolution* (3rd ed.), Boston, McGraw-Hill.
39. Meier, K.J. & O'Toole Jr, L.J. (2006). *Bureaucracy In A Democratic State: A Governance Perspective*, Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins University Press.
40. Naumes, W. & Naumes, M.J. (2012). *The art and craft of case writing*, New York, M.E. Sharpe, Inc.

41. Nel, P.S., Kirsten, M., Swanepoel, B.J., Erasmus, B.J. & Poisat, P. (2012). *South African Employment Relations: Theory and Practice* (7th ed.), Hatfield, Pretoria, Van Schaik Publishers.
42. Noon, M. & Blyton, P. (2007). *The realities of work: experiencing work and employment in contemporary society*, United States, Palgrave MacMillan Ltd.
43. Rankhumise, E. & Netswara, F.G. (2010). Identifying the barriers to affirmative action training: perceptions of affirmative action appointees in Mpumalanga public hospitals, *South African Journal of Human Resource Management*, 8 (1).
44. Ritzer, G. (2004). *The McDonaldization of Society*, Revised New Century ed. Thousand Oaks, Pine Forge Press.
45. Robbins, S.P. & Judge, T.A. (2011). *Organizational Behavior* (14th ed.), Boston: Pearson Education Limited.
46. Robbins, S.P., Jugde, T.A., Odendaal, A. & Roodt, G. (2009). *Organisational Behaviour. Global and Southern Perspective* (2nd ed.), Cape Town, Pearson Education South Africa (Pty) Ltd.
47. Saunders, M., Lewis, P. & Thornhill, A. (2012). *Research methods for business students* (6th ed.), Harlow, Pearson Education Limited.
48. Schaefer, T.R. (2008). *Sociology Matters* (7th ed.), New York, MacGraw-Hill.
49. Swanepoel, B.J. & Slabbert, J.A. (2012). *Introducing Labour Relations Management in South Africa: Adding Value to Africa*, Durban, LexisNexis Butterworths.
50. Tepper, B.J. (2000). Consequences of Abusive Supervision, *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, pp. 178-190.
51. Townsend, A. (2007). *Assertiveness and diversity*, New York, Palgrave McMillan.
52. Vallas, S.P., Finlay, W. & Wharton, A.S. (2009). *The Sociology of Work: Structures and Inequalities*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
53. Van Niekerk, A., Christianson, M.A., McGregor, M., Smit, N. & van Eck, B.P.S. (2012). *Law at Work* (2nd ed.), Durban, LexisNexis Butterworths.
54. Van Zyl, E. (2009). Leadership traits, *Leadership in the African Context*, edited by Ebben van Zyl, Cape Town, Juta, pp. 105-117.
55. Vecchio, R. (2003). *Organizational Behaviour: Core Concepts* (5th ed.), Philadelphia, The Dryden Press.
56. Venter, R. & Levy, A. (2011). *Labour Relations in South Africa*, Cape Town, Oxford University Press.
57. Walton, R.E. (2003). From control to commitment in the workplace, in *The Sociology of Organizations: Classic, Contemporary and Critical Readings*, edited by Michael J. Handel. London: Sage Publications Ltd., pp. 114-122.
58. Warr, P. (2007). *Work, happiness and unhappiness*, London, Lawrence Erlbaum.
59. Watson, T.J. (2012). *Sociology, Work and Industry* (5th ed.), London, Routledge.
60. Yin, R.K. (2009). *Case study research: design and methods* (4th ed.), California, SAGE Publications, Inc.
61. Zippel, K.S. (2006). *The politics of sexual harassment: a comparative study of the United States, the European Union and Germany*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.